

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

114B



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
June 16, 2011

SUBJECT: PLOT PLAN NO. 23642 / VARIANCE NO. 1875 - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: T-Mobile West – Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (R-RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 E. Benton Road – 4.57 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 5 Acres Minimum (R-A-5) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58 foot high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50 feet. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30 foot high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348, Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

RECEIVE AND FILE The Notice of Decision for the above referenced case acted on by the Planning Commission on May 18, 2011.

Carolyn Syms Luna

Carolyn Syms Luna
Planning Director

Initials:
CSL:vc
D.M.

(continued on next page)

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

DATE *6/16/11*
Tina Grande
Departmental Concurrence

Dep't Recomm.:
 Policy

Consent

Per Exec. Ofc.:
 Consent

Prev. Agn. Ref.

District: Third

Agenda Number:

ATTACHMENTS FILED

1.5 a+b

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Re: PLOT PLAN NO. 23642/VARIANCE NO. 1875
Page 2 of 2

The Planning Department recommended Approval; and,
THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

ADOPTED a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42016**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVED **VARIANCE NO. 1875**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVED **PLOT PLAN NO. 23642**, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER MAY 18, 2011
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.2: PLOT PLAN NO. 23642/VARIANCE NO. 1875** - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: T-Mobile West – Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (R-RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 E. Benton Road – 4.57 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 5 Acres Minimum (R-A-5). (Quasi-judicial)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- II. The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58 foot high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50 feet. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30 foot high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

III.

MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Damaris Abraham at 951-955-5719 or e-mail dabraham@rctlma.org.

The following person(s) spoke in favor of the subject proposal:

Barbara Sato Applicant's Rep 418 N. Cloverdale Ln. Walnut CA 91789

There were no speakers in neutral of the subject proposal.

There were no speakers in opposition of the subject proposal.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

NONE

IV. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 4-0; Commissioner Snell absent:

ADOPTED a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42016**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVED VARIANCE NO. 1875, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVED PLOT PLAN NO. 23642, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER MAY 18, 2011
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

V. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org

Agenda Item No.: **3.2**
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisory District: Third
Project Planner: Damaris Abraham
Planning Commission: May 18, 2011
Continued From: April 6, 2011

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642
VARIANCE NO. 1875
Environmental Assessment No. 42016
Applicant: T-Mobile West
Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58 foot high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50 feet. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30 foot high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area.

The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

The project site is located northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 East Benton Road.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

April 6, 2011

On February 28, 2011 the project was heard at Director's Hearing and was approved as a 58 foot high palm tree in order to accommodate the extension of the palm fronds and to provide better cover the antennas. The project was then set for Planning Commission Receive and File on April 6, 2011. On April 6, 2011, the Planning Commission assumed jurisdiction and set the project for hearing.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Existing General Plan Land Use(Ex. #5): | Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) |
| 2. Surrounding General Plan Land Use(Ex. #5): | Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) to the north, south, east and west |
| 3. Existing Zoning(Ex. #2): | Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning(Ex. #2): | Rural Residential (R-R) to the north
Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) to the south, east and west |
| 5. Existing Land Use(Ex. #1): | Single family residence |
| 6. Surrounding Land Use: (Ex. #1) | Scattered single family residences to the north, south east, and west |
| 7. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 4.41 Acres
Lease Area: 390 square feet |
| 8. Environmental Concerns: | See attached environmental assessment |

D.M.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42016**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVAL of **VARIANCE NO. 1875**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVAL of **PLOT PLAN NO. 23642**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
3. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.
4. The proposed project is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
5. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
6. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

FINDINGS: The following findings are in addition to those incorporated in the summary of findings and in the attached environmental assessment, which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) on the Southwest Area Plan.
2. The proposed use, a wireless communication facility disguised as a 55 foot high palm tree, is permitted use in the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) designation.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acres Minimum) to the north, south, east and west.
4. The zoning for the subject site is Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5), and the proposed use, a disguised wireless communication facility is a permitted use, subject to approval of a plot plan and a variance in the zone.

5. The proposed project as designed is consistent with the development standards set forth in the Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) zone.
6. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Rural Residential (R-R) to the north and Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) to the south, east, and west.
7. Ordinance No. 348 section 18.27 (a) states that variances may be granted when, because of special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of Ordinance No. 348 deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification. The current placement and height of the facility is most viable due to the topography and the location of the project site. The proposed project is located in an area that has unique characteristics of rolling hills which create a coverage gap within certain areas. The project site is very hilly with the parcel sloping downward to the south. The site also has a steep slope to the north with the property line being at the top of the slope. Adhering to the maximum height allowed by the zone will prevent the wireless facility from reaching the minimum coverage needed for the area and will deprive the applicant of the subject application the coverage that other properties in the vicinity will normally enjoy.
8. The variance proposing to reduce the setback requirements can be supported for the following reasons. The project site is very hilly with the parcel sloping downward to the south. The site also has a steep slope to the north with the property line being at the top of the slope. In addition, the project site is characterized by several rock outcroppings located on the parcel and restricts the project to its proposed location. Therefore, the current placement of the facility is viable due to the topography of the site.
9. The reduced setback will not limit public health, safety, or welfare, as the setback from adjacent structures is greater than the height of the proposed facility. Also, the structure is being placed at a higher grade than adjacent properties.
10. This project is not located within a Criteria Area of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
11. Environmental Assessment No. 42016 identified the following potentially significant impacts:
 - a. Aesthetics

These listed impacts will be fully mitigated by the measures indicated in the environmental assessment, conditions of approval, and attached letters. No other significant impacts were identified.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. As of this writing, no letters, in support or opposition have been received.
2. The project site is not located within:
 - a. A city sphere of influence.
 - b. A Flood Zone.
 - c. A Fault Zone.

- d. A Liquefaction Area.
 - e. A Subsidence Area.
 - f. A County Service Area.
 - g. An Airport Influence Area.
 - h. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area.
3. The project site is located within:
- a. The boundaries of the Temecula Valley Unified School District.
 - b. A High Fire Area
4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 924-110-011.

Agenda Item No.: 1.1
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisory District: Third
Project Planner: Damaris Abraham
Planning Commission: April 6, 2011

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642
VARIANCE NO. 1875
Environmental Assessment No. 42016
Applicant: T-Mobile West
Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT NOTICE OF DECISION STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58 foot high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50 feet. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30foot high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area.

The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

The project site is located northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 East Benton Road.

RECOMMENDATION:

RECEIVE AND FILE the Notice of Decision for the above referenced case acted on by the Planning Director on February 28, 2011.

The Planning Department staff recommended **APPROVAL**; and,
THE PLANNING DIRECTOR:

ADOPTED a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42016**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVED VARIANCE NO. 1875, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVED PLOT PLAN NO. 23642, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

DA:da

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP23642\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\PC Cell Tower Receive and File Staff Report.PP23642.docx

Date Revised: 03/01/11

DM

Agenda Item No.: 2.7
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisorial District: Third
Project Planner: Damaris Abraham
Director's Hearing: February 28, 2011

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642
VARIANCE NO. 1875
Environmental Assessment No. 42016
Applicant: T-Mobile West
Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM STAFF REPORT

1. The following conditions of approval have been revised as a result of the February 28, 2011 Director's Hearing:
 10. EVERY.1 USE - PROJECT DESCRIPTION and 10.PLANNING.7 USE - MAX HEIGHT – modified to show the height of the monopalm as 58' in order to accommodate the extension of the palm fronds.
 80. PLANNING.6 USE - PALM FRONDS and 90. PLANNING.9 USE - PALM FRONDS – modified to indicate that the palm fronds will be extending 3 feet beyond the antennas.
2. The following changes were made to the conditions of approval by the Transportation Department:
 - 10.TRANS.4 "Use STD INTRO 3 (ORD 460/461)" was revised.
 - 60.TRANS.1 "Use – Transportation Clearance" was deleted.
 - 10.TRANS.5 "Use – County Web Site" was added.

Agenda Item No.: 2.7
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisorial District: Third
Project Planner: Damaris Abraham
Directors Hearing: February 28, 2011

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642
VARIANCE NO. 1875
E.A. No: 42016
Applicant: T-Mobile West
Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 55' high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30' high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area.

The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 55 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 5 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 55 feet to rear 19 feet from the property line, an encroachment of 36 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

The project site is located northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 East Benton Road.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Existing General Plan Land Use: | Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) |
| 2. Surrounding General Plan Land Use: | Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) to the north, south, east and west |
| 3. Existing Zoning: | Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning: | Rural Residential (R-R) to the north
Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) to the south, east and west |
| 5. Existing Land Use: | Single family residence |
| 6. Surrounding Land Use: | Scattered single family residences to the north, south east, and west |
| 7. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 4.41 Acres
Lease Area: 390 square feet |
| 8. Environmental Concerns: | See attached environmental assessment |

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42016**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVAL of **VARIANCE NO. 1875**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

D.M.

APPROVAL of **PLOT PLAN NO. 23642**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
3. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.
4. The proposed project is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
5. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
6. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

FINDINGS: The following findings are in addition to those incorporated in the summary of findings and in the attached environmental assessment, which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) on the Southwest Area Plan.
2. The proposed use, a wireless communication facility disguised as a 55 foot high palm tree, is permitted use in the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) designation.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acres Minimum) to the north, south, east and west.
4. The zoning for the subject site is Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5), and the proposed use, a disguised wireless communication facility is a permitted use, subject to approval of a plot plan and a variance in the zone.
5. The proposed project as designed is consistent with the development standards set forth in the Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) zone.
6. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Rural Residential (R-R) to the north and Residential Agricultural - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) to the south, east, and west.
7. Ordinance No. 348 section 18.27 (a) states that variances may be granted when, because of special circumstances applicable to a parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of Ordinance No. 348 deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification.

The current placement and height of the facility is most viable due to the topography and the location of the project site. The proposed project is located in an area that has unique characteristics of rolling hills which create a coverage gap within certain areas. The project site is very hilly with the parcel sloping downward to the south. The site also has a steep slope to the north with the property line being at the top of the slope. Adhering to the maximum height allowed by the zone will prevent the wireless facility from reaching the minimum coverage needed for the area and will deprive the applicant of the subject application the coverage that other properties in the vicinity will normally enjoy.

8. The variance proposing to reduce the setback requirements can be supported for the following reasons. The project site is very hilly with the parcel sloping downward to the south. The site also has a steep slope to the north with the property line being at the top of the slope. In addition, the project site is characterized by several rock outcroppings located on the parcel and restricts the project to its proposed location. Therefore, the current placement of the facility is viable due to the topography of the site.
9. The reduced setback will not limit public health, safety, or welfare, as the setback from adjacent structures is greater than the height of the proposed facility. Also, the structure is being placed at a higher grade than adjacent properties.
10. This project is not located within a Criteria Area of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
11. Environmental Assessment No. 42016 identified the following potentially significant impacts:

- a. Aesthetics

These listed impacts will be fully mitigated by the measures indicated in the environmental assessment, conditions of approval, and attached letters. No other significant impacts were identified.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. As of this writing, no letters, in support or opposition have been received.
2. The project site is not located within:
 - a. A city sphere of influence.
 - b. A Flood Zone.
 - c. A Fault Zone.
 - d. A Liquefaction Area.
 - e. A Subsidence Area.
 - f. A County Service Area.
 - g. An Airport Influence Area.
 - h. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area.
3. The project site is located within:
 - a. The boundaries of the Temecula Valley Unified School District.
 - b. A High Fire Area

4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 924-110-011.
5. This project was filed with the Planning Department on 8/5/08.
6. This project was reviewed by the Land Development Committee one (1) time on the following date 9/18/08.
7. Deposit Based Fees charged for this project, as of the time of staff report preparation, total \$16,751.96

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PP23642 VAR01875
VICINITY/POLICY AREAS**


Supervisor Stone
District 3

Date Drawn: 4/07/11
Vicinity Map



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 9

Assessors Bk. Pg. 924-11
Thomas Bros. Pg. 930 J3
Edition 2009




DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951) 955-2000 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.ltr.ca.gov/riverside>.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PP23642 VAR01875
EXISTING GENERAL PLAN

Supervisor Stone
District: 3

Date Drawn: 4/07/11
Exhibit 5



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 9

Assessors Bk. Pg. 924-11
Thomas Bros. Pg. 930 J3
Edition 2009



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/index.html>


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PP23642 VAR01875

EXISTING ZONING

Supervisor Stone
District 3

Date Drawn: 4/07/11
Exhibit 2



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 9

Assessors Bk. Pg. 924-11
Thomas Bros. Pg. 930 J3
Edition 2009



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/index.html>

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PP23642 VAR01875

LAND USE

Supervisor Stone
District 3


Date Drawn: 4/07/11

Exhibit 1



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 9

Assessors Bk. Pg. 924-11
Thomas Bros. Pg. 930 J3
Edition 2009





DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.ltrm.ca.us/index.html>

AT&T Mobile

IE04176 WAYNES WORLD
38920 EAST BENTON ROAD TEMECULA, CA 92592

AVILA INC

VIEW FROM BENTON





The proposed installation is an artistic representation of a tree, and not intended to be an exact reproduction of an actual living tree. The final installation will have cables, cable ports, and various attachments, such as antennas, nuts, and bolts. While every effort will be made to disguise these components, they will not be readily apparent to the casual observer or passerby. However, upon close scrutiny, the true nature of the installation will be apparent.

Mobile

1E04176 WAYNES WORLD
38920 EAST BENTON ROAD TEMECULA, CA 92592

AVILA INC

VIEW FROM NEIGHBORS DRIVEWAY



The proposed installation is an artistic representation of a tree, and not intended to be an exact reproduction of an actual living tree. The final installation will have cables, cable ports, and various attachments, such as antennas, nuts, and bolts. While every effort will be made to disguise these components, they will not be readily apparent to the casual observer or passerby. However, upon close scrutiny, the true nature of the installation will be apparent.

COUNTY CASE #PP23642

T-Mobile®

SITE NUMBER: IE04176 **CITY:** TEMECULA
SITE NAME: WAYNES WORLD **COUNTY:** RIVERSIDE
SITE TYPE: MONOPALM **JURISDICTION:** COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

PROJECT SUMMARY

SITE ADDRESS:
 14011 E. BENTON ROAD, SUITE 200
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592

PROPERTY OWNER/CONTACT:
 WAYNES WORLD
 WAYNES WORLD TRUST
 14011 E. BENTON ROAD, SUITE 200
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592
 PHONE: (951) 302-5450

ZONING MANAGER: DENIS DOMARCO
DEVELOPMENT MANAGER: JENIFER CANNY

APR. 924-110-011
 ZONING: R-A-5

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
 THE INSTALLATION / OPERATION OF ANTENNAS & ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT CABINETS FOR T-MOBILE, PROVIDED BY THE INSTALLATION OF A 50' HIGH MONOPALM DISCRETE PAULI CABINETS ON A BASED CONCRETE PLATFORM, INSTALLATION OF 6 5'-0" MONOPALM TOWERS AROUND THE BASE AREA. AN ELECTRICAL UTILITY WILL BE INSTALLED WITHIN THE BASE AREA.

BUILDING SUMMARY:
 UNMANNED TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY
 CLASSIFICATION: V-9
 BUILDING TYPE: S-2

CONSULTING TEAM

ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING:
 IMSA ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING
 300 E. DE ANZA AVENUE, SUITE 200
 SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78215
 PHONE: (214) 251-1177
 FAX: (214) 251-1120

SHEET INDEX


SHEET	DESCRIPTION
T1	TITLE SHEET
G1	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
A1	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
A2	ENLARGED SITE PLAN
A3	EQUIPMENT & ANTENNA LAYOUT PLANS
A4	ELEVATIONS
A5	ELEVATIONS
L1	LANDSCAPE PLAN
L2	IRRIGATION PLAN
G1	GRADING PLAN
G2	GRADING DETAILS & NOTES

APPROVALS

THE FOLLOWING TABLES MUST BE APPROVED AND ACCEPTED. THESE DOCUMENTS AND HEREIN, ALL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY THE LOCAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND ANY CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS THEY MAY IMPOSE.

AGENT NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE
LANDLORD		
DEVELOP. MGR		
CONST. MGR		
PROJECT MGR		
SR. RF ENGINEER		
RF ENGINEER		
OPERATIONS		
SAC REP.		
UTILITIES		

VICINITY MAP:



DIRECTIONS FROM NEAREST OFFICE:
 FROM T-MOBILE OFFICE TAKE THE 15 FWY. SOUTH TOWARD THE RIVERSIDE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY. TURN RIGHT ON ALLEN AVENUE, TURN LEFT ON DE ANZA RD, TURN LEFT ON DE PORTERA RD, TURN LEFT ON E BENTON RD, ARRIVE AT 38925 E BENTON RD.

APPLICABLE CODES:

- CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (CALIFORNIA TITLE 24 & 29)
- LOCAL BUILDING CODES (RIVERSIDE COUNTY TITLE CODE 2010)
- CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODES 2010
- CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE 2010
- CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODES 2010
- ANSI / AIA-222 EBF

POWER AND TELCO UTILITY CONTACTS:

POWER:
 COMPANY: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA Edison
 COMPANY ABBY

TELCO:
 COMPANY: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA Edison

T-Mobile®
 Get more from life™
 3759 EAST CLAYTON ROAD, SUITE 200
 CHANDLER, CALIFORNIA 91711

PROJECT INFORMATION:
 WAYNES WORLD
 IE04176
 14011 E. BENTON ROAD
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
 12-14-10

ISSUED FOR:
 ZONING APPROVAL

REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
A	12-14-10	REVISED ZDS	LN
A	11-10-10	REVISED ZDS	JG
A	08-25-10	REVISED ZDS	RC
A	08-18-10	REVISED ZDS	RC
A	03-08-10	REVISED ZDS	LN
A	03-03-10	REVISED ZDS	LN
A	05-05-09	REVISED ZDS	LN
A	01-13-09	REVISED ZDS	RC

PLANS PREPARED BY:
IMSA
 Architecture & Planning
 300 E. De Anza Avenue, Suite 200
 San Antonio, TX 78215
 Phone: (214) 251-1177
 Fax: (214) 251-1120

CONSULTANTS:

DRAWN BY: RM
CHECKED BY: UHC
APPROVED BY: MAS

SHEET TITLE:
 TITLE SHEET

SHEET NUMBER:
 T1

REVISION:
 11

T-Mobile
Get more from life!
3337 EAST CLAYTON ROAD SUITE 230
CERRITOS, CALIFORNIA 94515


PROJECT INFORMATION:
WAYNE'S WORLD
IE-04-176
ADDRESS
TIBURCONIA CA

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
11/29/08

ISSUED FOR:
PRELIM SUBMITTAL

REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
0	11/29/08	PRELIM SUBMITTAL LPP

PLANS PREPARED BY:
MSA
Architecture & Planning
3100 S. DEER CANYON RD. SUITE 100
CERRITOS, CA 94515
TEL: 925-254-9999 FAX: 925-254-9998



CONSULTANT:
LPP
CHK: [Signature]
APV: [Signature]
ES: [Signature]
ES: [Signature]

DRAWN BY:
LPP

SHEET TITLE:
TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY

SHEET NUMBER:
C-1



T-Mobile
Get more from life

3750 GUADALUPE BLVD. SUITE 200
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78241

PROJECT INFORMATION:

WAYNES WORLD
1E04776

38920 E. BENTON ROAD
TAMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:

12-14-10

ISSUED FOR:

ZONING APPROVAL

REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
AA	12-14-10	REVISED ZDS LON
AA	11-10-10	REVISED ZDS JG
AA	09-28-10	REVISED ZDS RC
AA	08-18-10	REVISED ZDS RC
AA	03-08-10	REVISED ZDS LON
AA	03-03-10	REVISED ZDS LON
AA	03-06-09	REVISED ZDS LON
AA	01-13-09	REVISED ZDS RC

PLANS PREPARED BY:

MSA
Architecture & Planning
3800 E. BENTON ROAD
SUITE 110
TAMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592
(760) 743-1177
www.msa.com

CONSULTANT:

DRAWN BY: RM
CHECKED BY: LHC
DATE: 12-14-10

LICENSURE: MS

SHEET TITLE:

OVERALL SITE PLAN


SHEET NUMBER:

A1

REVISION:

11

DATE:



(P) "T-MOBILE" PROJECT LOCATION.
SEE ENLARGED PLAN, SHEET A-2

(P) U/G. T-MOBILE TELCO RUN

(E) TEMPORARY POLE AND EQUIPMENT CABINET TO BE REMOVED

(P) INTERCEPT (E) U/G. T-MOBILE TELCO LINE TO NEW EQUIPMENT LOCATION

(E) U.S. T-MOBILE TELCO CABINET TO TEMPORARY MOBILE EQUIPMENT CABINET

(P) U/G POWER TRENCHING APPROX. 400'±

(E) BRUILER TO PROTECT IN PLACE, TYP.

(E) OAK TREE TO PROTECT IN PLACE

(P) METER PEDestal

(E) POLE #227056 & (P) T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C.

(E) U.S. TELCO RUN TO TEMPORARY T-MOBILE EQUIPMENT CABINET

(E) T-MOBILE TELCO CABINET ON H-FRAME. CIRCUIT #81002570936

(E) TELCO PEDestal #12822 & (E) TELCO P.O.C.

(E) OAK TREE

(E) METER PEDestal

(E) POLE #227056 & (P) T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C.

(E) BRUILER TO PROTECT IN PLACE, TYP.

(E) OAK TREE TO PROTECT IN PLACE

(P) METER PEDestal

(E) POLE #227056 & (P) T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C.

(E) U.S. TELCO RUN TO TEMPORARY T-MOBILE EQUIPMENT CABINET

(E) T-MOBILE TELCO CABINET ON H-FRAME. CIRCUIT #81002570936

(E) TELCO PEDestal #12822 & (E) TELCO P.O.C.

(E) OAK TREE

(E) METER PEDestal

(E) POLE #227056 & (P) T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C.

(E) BRUILER TO PROTECT IN PLACE, TYP.

(E) OAK TREE TO PROTECT IN PLACE

(P) METER PEDestal

(E) POLE #227056 & (P) T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C.

(E) U.S. TELCO RUN TO TEMPORARY T-MOBILE EQUIPMENT CABINET

(E) T-MOBILE TELCO CABINET ON H-FRAME. CIRCUIT #81002570936

(E) TELCO PEDestal #12822 & (E) TELCO P.O.C.

(E) OAK TREE

(E) METER PEDestal

(E) POLE #227056 & (P) T-MOBILE POWER P.O.C.

OVERALL SITE PLAN



SCALE: 1" = 40'

N

0 10 20 40 60 80

FEET

T-Mobile
Get more from life[™]

PROJECT INFORMATION:
WAYNES WORLD
IE04176
38920 E. BENTON ROAD
TEACUCA, CALIFORNIA 92352

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
12-14-10

ISSUED FOR: ZONING APPROVAL


REV. NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
12-14-10		REVISED ZONING	JG
11-10-10		REVISED ZONING	RC
08-26-10		REVISED ZONING	RC
08-18-10		REVISED ZONING	LOA
03-09-10		REVISED ZONING	LOA
03-03-10		REVISED ZONING	LOA
05-06-09		REVISED ZONING	LOA
10-13-09		REVISED ZONING	RC

PLANS PREPARED BY:
MSA
Architecture & Planning
1800 E. DANA AVENUE
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92705
REGISTRY NO. 02241100
REGISTRATION STATE: CA
SANTA ANA, CA
CONSULTANT:

DRAWN BY: _____
CHECKED BY: _____
DATE: _____

LICENSE NO.: _____
SHEET TITLE: ENLARGED SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER: **A2** 11
REVISION: 11
E0176



ENLARGED SITE PLAN

T-Mobile
Get more from life
1827 EAST CASH ROAD SUITE 200
DUBLINO, CALIFORNIA 94568

WAYNES WORLD
ED0476
39920 E. BENTON ROAD
TREVCOLO, CALIFORNIA 92252

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
12-14-10
ISSUED FOR:

ZONING APPROVAL

REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
12-14-10		REVISED ZONING	LN
11-10-10		REVISED ZONING	JG
08-26-10		REVISED ZONING	RG
08-19-10		REVISED ZONING	RG
03-09-10		REVISED ZONING	LN
03-03-10		REVISED ZONING	LN
05-06-09		REVISED ZONING	LN
01-13-09		REVISED ZONING	RG

PLANS PREPARED BY:

MSA
Architecture & Planning
1900 E. Duane Avenue
San Jose, California 95131
Tel: 408.444.1900
Fax: 408.444.1905
www.msa.com
San Jose • San Diego • San Francisco



CONSULTANT:
DRAWN BY: _____ CHK: _____ APPR: _____
DATE: _____

ENCLOSURE:
SCALE:
SHEET TITLE:

EQUIPMENT AND ANTENNA LAYOUT PLANS

SHEET NUMBER: **A3**
REVISION: **11**
E04176

NOTE: MONOPOLY FRONTS AND EQUIPMENT BELOW ARE NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY.



ANTENNA LAYOUT

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

3 EQUIPMENT LAYOUT PLAN

NOT USED

T-Mobile
Get more from life
38920 EAST QUINN ROAD SUITE 200
TAMECUCA, CALIFORNIA 92392

PROJECT INFORMATION:
WAYNES WORLD
1E04176
38920 E. QUINN ROAD
TAMECUCA, CALIFORNIA 92392

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
12-14-10

ISSUED FOR:
ZONING APPROVAL

REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
1	12-14-10	REVISED ZDs	LON
2	11-10-10	REVISED ZDs	JO
3	08-26-10	REVISED ZDs	RC
4	08-18-10	REVISED ZDs	RC
5	03-08-10	REVISED ZDs	JDH
6	03-03-10	REVISED ZDs	LON
7	03-06-09	REVISED ZDs	LON
8	01-13-09	REVISED ZDs	RC


PLANS PREPARED BY:
JMSA
Architecture & Planning
10000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 200
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Tel: 949.211.1100
San Diego • San Francisco

CONSULTANT:
RUI LHC MJS


DRAWN BY:
LHC MJS

SHEET TITLE:
ELEVATIONS

SHEET NUMBER:
A4 11
REVISION:
E04176



NORTH ELEVATION



SOUTH ELEVATION

T-Mobile
Get more from life
357 EAST BUSH ROAD SUITE 200
DUBLINO, CALIFORNIA 94568

WAYNES WORLD
IED4176
16925 E. BAYVIEW BOULEVARD
TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
12-14-10

ZONING APPROVAL

REV. NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
A	12-14-10	REVISED ZDs	LQ
A	11-10-10	REVISED ZDs	JC
A	08-26-10	REVISED ZDs	RC
A	08-18-10	REVISED ZDs	RC
A	03-08-10	REVISED ZDs	LQ
A	03-03-10	REVISED ZDs	LQ
A	05-06-09	REVISED ZDs	LQ
A	01-13-09	REVISED ZDs	RC



JMSA
Architecture & Planning
2000 E. Orange Avenue, Suite 200
94231107
San Jose, CA 95128
Tel: 408.251.1100
Fax: 408.251.1100
www.jmsa.com
San Diego, CA Office

PLANS PREPARED BY:
DRAWN BY: RM
CHECKED BY: LUC
APPROVED BY: MJS

LICENSE NO.:
SHEET TITLE:
ELEVATIONS

SHEET NUMBER: **A5**
REVISION: **11**

604176



Mobile-
Get more from life
397 007 0001 ROAD SUITE 300
DUBLIN, CALIFORNIA 94568

PROJECT INFORMATION:
WAYNES WORLD
1E0476
39220 E. BENTON ROAD
TENCUELLA, CALIFORNIA 92532

CURRENT ISSUE DATE:
12-14-10

ZONING APPROVAL




REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
1	12-14-10	REVISED ZDs	LON
2	11-10-10	REVISED ZDs	JG
3	08-28-10	REVISED ZDs	RC
4	08-18-10	REVISED ZDs	RC
5	03-08-10	REVISED ZDs	LON
6	03-03-10	REVISED ZDs	LON
7	05-05-09	REVISED ZDs	LON
8	01-13-09	REVISED ZDs	RC

PLANS PREPARED BY:
MSA
Architecture & Planning
10000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1000
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
TEL: 310.206.1000
FAX: 310.206.1001
WWW.MSA-ARCH.COM
San Diego • San Francisco

CONSULTANT:
DRAWN BY: _____
CHECKED BY: _____
APPROVED BY: _____
DATE: _____
LHC
M/S

LICENSE NUMBER:
SHEET TITLE:
PLANTING PLAN

SHEET NUMBER:
L1 11
REVISION:
EQ476



PLANTING SPECIFICATIONS

SCOPE OF WORK
1. THE WORK INCLUDED IN THESE SPECIFICATIONS SHALL CONSIST OF ALL LABOR, TOOLS, MATERIALS, PERMITS, TAXES, AND ALL OTHER COSTS, FORESEEABLE AND UNFORESEEABLE AT THE TIME OF COMMENCING, NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF THE LANDSCAPE AS TOBEN SPECIFIED ON THE ACCOMPANYING DRAWINGS.

GENERAL CONDITIONS
1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND INSURANCE COVERAGE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CARRY ALL NECESSARY WORKERS COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY INSURANCE TO COVER HIS WORKMEN AND WORK TO FULLY PROTECT THE OWNER FROM ANY POSSIBLE SUIT OR LITIGATION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND INSURANCE COVERAGE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CARRY ALL NECESSARY WORKERS COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY INSURANCE TO COVER HIS WORKMEN AND WORK TO FULLY PROTECT THE OWNER FROM ANY POSSIBLE SUIT OR LITIGATION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND INSURANCE COVERAGE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CARRY ALL NECESSARY WORKERS COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY INSURANCE TO COVER HIS WORKMEN AND WORK TO FULLY PROTECT THE OWNER FROM ANY POSSIBLE SUIT OR LITIGATION.

1. MATERIAL PER 10 CU YD
2. 1/2\"/>




PLANTING
1. ALL PLANTS SHALL BE PLANTED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PLANTER BOXES. PLANTS SHALL BE PLANTED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PLANTER BOXES. PLANTS SHALL BE PLANTED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PLANTER BOXES. PLANTS SHALL BE PLANTED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PLANTER BOXES. PLANTS SHALL BE PLANTED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PLANTER BOXES.


CLEAN UP
1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING UP ALL DEBRIS FROM THE SITE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING UP ALL DEBRIS FROM THE SITE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING UP ALL DEBRIS FROM THE SITE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING UP ALL DEBRIS FROM THE SITE.




DMLA
Landscape Architecture, Inc.

PLANTING PLAN





327 E. GARDEN RD., SUITE 200
CHANDLER, AZ 85226



CONNELL DESIGN GROUP, LLC
1445 MACARTHUR BLVD., SUITE 100, YUCCA VALLEY, CA 92284
PHONE: 760.893.0111 FAX: 760.893.0112
CDS# 10-8618

AVILA INC.
6254 Avila Rd.
Yucca Valley, CA 92284
(760) 228-1556


NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
1	09/05/10	SIZE GRADING	JPC

WAYNES WORLD
IE04176
3380 E. BENTLEY RD.
TEMECULA, CA 92692


SEAL:

SHEET TITLE:
GRADING PLAN

SHEET NUMBER:
G-1



LEGEND:
 - PROPOSED
 - EXISTING
 - LINE OF CONCRETE
 - FOUNDATION
 - FOUNDATION
 - FOUNDATION
 - FOUNDATION









SCALE:
1/16" = 1'-0"
1

GRADING PLAN

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
1	09/05/10	POC GRADING	JPC

EROSION CONTROL PLAN NOTES

1. ALL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION (OCTOBER 15 TO APRIL 15). NECESSARY MATERIALS SHALL BE AVAILABLE ON SITE AND STOCKPILED AT DESIGNATED LOCATIONS TO FACILITATE RAINFALL CONSTRUCTION OF EROSION CONTROL MEASURES WITHIN 48 HOURS OF PRECIPITATION.
2. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
3. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
4. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
5. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
6. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.



DRAINAGE NOTES:
A. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
B. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
C. STOCKPILE EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL BE REMOVED UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 42016
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Plot Plan No. 23642/Variance No. 1875
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
Contact Person: Damaris Abraham
Telephone Number: (951) 955-5719
Applicant's Name: T-Mobile West
Applicant's Address: 3257 E. Guasti Rd., Suite 200, Ontario, CA 91761
Engineer's Name: Barbara Saito
Engineer's Address: 418 N. Cloverdale Lane, Walnut, CA 91789

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58' high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50'. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30' high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

B. Type of Project: Site Specific ; Countywide ; Community ; Policy .

C. Total Project Area: 390 square feet on a 4.4 acre parcel

Residential Acres:	Lots: 1	Units:	Projected No. of Residents:
Commercial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other: 390 square foot lease area			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 924-110-011

E. Street References: Northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Township 7 South, Range 1 West, Section 9

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: This project site is being utilized as a single family residence and it is surrounded by scattered single family residences to the north, south, east, and west.

I. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The project implements Policy LU 4.1, requiring new developments to be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade, the character of the surrounding area. The proposed project is consistent with the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) land use designation and other applicable land use policies within the General Plan.
2. **Circulation:** The project has adequate circulation to the site and is therefore consistent with the Circulation Element of the General Plan. The proposed project meets all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** No natural open space land was required to be preserved within the boundaries of this project. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed project is not located within any special hazard zone (including FEMA flood zone, fault zone, high fire hazard area, dam inundation zone, area with high liquefaction potential, etc.). The proposed project has allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the future residents of this project through the project design and payment of development impact fees. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Safety element policies.
5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area have been provided for in the design of the project. The project will not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or noise ordinance. The project meets all other applicable Noise Element Policies.
6. **Housing:** The proposed project meets all applicable Housing Element Policies.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed project meets all other applicable Air Quality element policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Southwest

C. Foundation Component(s): Rural (R)

D. Land Use Designation(s): Rural Residential (RR)

E. Overlay(s), if any: Not Applicable

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Not Applicable

G. Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any: The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) to the north, south, east, and west.

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Not Applicable

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** Not Applicable

I. Existing Zoning: Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: Not Applicable

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Rural Residential (R-R) to the north and Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) to the south, east and west.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | |

III. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and

will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

David Mares For

Signature

January 11, 2011

Date

Damaris Abraham

Printed Name

For Carolyn Syms Luna, Director

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the project. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9 "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact:

a) The General Plan indicates that the project is not located within a designated scenic corridor; therefore the project will have no impact.

b) The site is not anticipated to obstruct any prominent scenic vistas, views open to the public, or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. Additionally, the project has been designed to be disguised as a palm tree and two live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. In addition, the equipment cabinets have also been designed to blend in with the surrounding setting and will be screened by the proposed landscaping to minimize the visual impact of the telecommunication facility. Impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: Prior to building permit issuance, the developer/permit holder shall provide a palm frond design that is consistent with the approved plot plan and that covers all antennas. (COA 80.PLANNING.6) and the developer/permit holder shall ensure that the palm fronds are designed and placed in such a manner that covers all of the antennas (COA 90.PLANNING.9).

Monitoring: Mitigation monitoring will occur through the Building and Safety Plan Check process.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory				
a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located 16.53 miles away from the Mt. Palomar Observatory; which is within the designated 45-mile (ZONE B) Special Lighting Area that surrounds the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 requires methods of installation, definition, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. With incorporation of project lighting requirements of the Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed project, this impact will be reduced to a less than significant impact. All proposed outdoor lighting shall comply with Ordinance No. 655, which includes the use of low pressure sodium vapor lighting or overhead high pressure sodium vapor lighting with shields or luminaries. (COA 10.PLANNING.16) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

3. Other Lighting Issues

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed telecommunication facility may provide a service light to be used at the time of servicing the facility. However, it will not create new sources of light or glare in the area and will not expose residential property to unacceptable light levels. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?				
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) According to GIS database, the project is located in an area designated as other lands. Therefore, the proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

b) According to GIS database, the project is not located within an Agriculture Preserve or under a Williamson Act contract; therefore, no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.

c) The project site is not surrounded by agriculturally zoned land. Therefore, the project will not cause development of a non-agricultural use within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property.

d) The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

5. Forest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?				
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3 "Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas," and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is not located within the boundaries of a forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g)). Therefore, the proposed project will not impact land designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

b) According to General Plan, the project is not located within forest land and will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; therefore, no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.

c) The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

6. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

Findings of Fact: Appendix G of the current State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project will significantly impact air quality if the project violates any ambient air quality standard, contributes substantially to an existing air quality violation, or exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

a) The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Governing Board adopted its most recent Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB on August 1, 2003. The AQMP is a plan for the regional improvement of air quality. As part of adoption of the County's General Plan in 2003, the General Plan EIR (SCH No. 2002051143) analyzed the General Plan growth projections for consistency with the AQMP and

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

concluded that the General Plan is consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP. The project is consistent with the County General Plan and would therefore be consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP.

b-c) The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is in a non-attainment status for federal ozone standards, federal carbon monoxide standards, and state and federal particulate matter standards. Any development in the SCAB, including the proposed Project, would cumulatively contribute to these pollutant violations.

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the Southwest Area Plan land use designations. The General Plan (2003) is a policy document that reflects the County's vision for the future of Riverside County. The General Plan is organized into eight separate elements, including an Air Quality Element. The purpose of the Air Quality Element is to protect County residents from the harmful effects of poor air quality. The Air Quality Element identifies goals, policies, and programs that are meant to balance actions regarding land use, circulation, and other issues with their potential effects on air quality. The Air Quality Element, in conjunction with local and regional air quality planning efforts, addresses ambient air quality standards set forth by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Potential air quality impacts resulting from the proposed Project would not exceed emissions projected by the Air Quality Element. The County is charged with implementing the policies in the General Plan Air Quality Element, which are focused on reducing concentrations of criteria pollutants, reducing negative impacts to sensitive receptors, reducing mobile and stationary pollutant sources, increasing energy conservation and efficiency, improving the jobs to housing balance, and facilitating multi-jurisdictional coordination for the improvement of air quality.

Implementation of the project would not impact air quality beyond the levels documented in EIR No. 441 prepared for the General Plan. The project would impact air quality in the short-term during construction and in the long-term through operation. In accordance with standard county requirements, dust control measures and maintenance of construction equipment shall be utilized on the property to limit the amount of particulate matter generated. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

The proposed project would primarily impact air quality through increased automotive emissions. Single projects typically do not generate enough traffic and associated air pollutants to violate clean air standards or contribute enough air pollutants to be considered a cumulatively considerable significant impact. Operational impacts associated with the project would be expected to result in emissions of VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, PM2.5 and SOX. Operational emissions would result from vehicle emissions, fugitive dust associated with vehicle travel, combustion emissions associated with natural gas use, emission related to electricity generation, and landscape equipment maintenance emissions. In the long term, emissions of VOC, NOX, CO, PM10 and PM2.5 and could exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds (in pounds per day). However, with compliance with standard requirements for use of low VOC paints and compliance with California Energy Commission Title 24 requirements for building energy efficiency, direct and cumulative air quality impacts would be reduced to a level below significance. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. Surrounding land uses include residential, which is considered a sensitive receptor, however, an unmanned telecommunications facility is not considered a substantial point source emitter or a sensitive receptor.

e) Surrounding land uses do not include significant localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants, or odors. An unmanned telecommunications facility is not considered a substantial point source emitter or a sensitive receptor.

f) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

policy or ordinance?

Source: GIS database, WRC-MSHCP and/or CV-MSHCP, Site Visit by Environmental Programs Department (EPD) on 09/16/08

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. The project site is not located within an MSHCP Criteria Area or cell. Therefore, there is no impact.
- b) No endangered or threatened species were identified on the project site during the Environmental Programs Department site visit. Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) Per the EPD site visit on September 16, 2008, the area where the cell tower is to be located is already disturbed and there is no sensitive habitat proximal to this location. Therefore, there is no impact.
- d) The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, there is no impact.
- e-f) There are no riverine/riparian resources present onsite and soils are too coarse and slopes are too steep for vernal pool formation. Therefore, there is no impact.
- g) The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

8. Historic Resources

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The site is fully disturbed with an existing single family residence on site. And project does not propose the disturbance of a historic site or the demolishing of historic structures. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. The project will have no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

9. Archaeological Resources

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Site disturbance has already occurred from grading for the use of the single family residence existing on site. The project site does not contain an archaeological site. Therefore, the project will not alter or destroy an archaeological site.

b) The proposed project is not expected to impact archaeological resources. If, however, during ground disturbing activities, unique cultural resources are discovered, all ground disturbances shall halt until a meeting is held between the developer, archaeologist, and Native American representative to discuss the significance of the find. (COA 10.PLANNING.2) Therefore, the project will not alter or destroy an archaeological site or cause a substantive adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

c) There may be a possibility that ground disturbing activities will expose human remains. The project is subject to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if human remains are discovered during ground disturbing activities. (COA 10.PLANNING.1) This is a standard condition and not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) The project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

10. Paleontological Resources

a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: GIS database, County Geologist review

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) According to GIS database, this site has been mapped as having a low potential for paleontological resources. The project is not likely to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature. The impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

GEOLGY AND SOILS Would the project

11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?

b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, County Geologist review

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to residential development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all commercial development they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no known fault lines are present on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, there is a low potential for rupture of a known fault. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", GIS Database, County Geologist review

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) According to GIS database, the project site is not located within an area subject to liquefaction. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), County Geologist review

Findings of Fact:

There are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in Southern California. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

14. Landslide Risk

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope"

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

15. Ground Subsidence

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable,

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

Source: GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas"

Findings of Fact:

a) According to GIS, the project site is not located in an area susceptible to subsidence. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials

a) The project site is not located near any large bodies of water or in a known volcanic area; therefore, the project site is not subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials, Building and Safety – Grading Review

Findings of Fact:

a-c) Standard conditions of approval have been added stating that a grading permit is required prior to construction grading. These conditions are not considered unique mitigation and are not required for CEQA implementation purposes. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan figure S-6 "Engineering Geologic Materials Map", Project Application Materials, Building and Safety Grading review

a) The development of the site could result in the loss of topsoil from grading activities, but not in a manner that would result in significant amounts of soil erosion. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce the impact to below a level of significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project may be located on expansive soil; however, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

c) The project is for the installation of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and will not require the use of sewers or septic tanks. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

19. Erosion				
a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Flood Control District review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Implementation of the proposed project will involve grading and various construction activities. Standard construction procedures, and federal, state and local regulations implemented in conjunction with the site's storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and its Best Management Practices (BMPs) required under the National Pollution Discharge System (NPDES) general construction permit, will minimize potential for erosion during construction. These practices will keep substantial

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

amounts of soil material from eroding from the project site and prevent deposition within receiving waters located downstream.

b) The potential for on-site erosion will increase due to grading and excavating activities during the construction phase. However, BMPs will be implemented for maintaining water quality and reducing erosion.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The site is located in an area of Moderate Wind Erodibility rating. The RCIP, Safety Element Policy for Wind Erosion requires buildings and structures to be designed to resist wind loads which are covered by the Universal Building Code. With such compliance, the project will not result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project

21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Source: Project application materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is for the installation of a 58 foot high monopalm within a 390 square foot lease area. The installation of the monopalm will involve small-scale construction activities that will not involve an extensive amount of heavy duty equipment or labor. Therefore, greenhouse gas emissions generated during construction phase are minimal. In addition, the powering of the cell tower will not require an extensive amount of electricity. Therefore, project is not anticipated to generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-e) The project does not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. It will also not impair the implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The project will have no impact on emitting, or handling hazardous waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

23. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Commission?

c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database

a) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore, the project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan.

b) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore will not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission.

c) The project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

d) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

24. Hazardous Fire Area

a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) According to GIS database, the project site is located in a high fire area. However, the project has been reviewed and cleared by the Riverside County Fire Department. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
25. Water Quality Impacts				
a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition.

Findings of Fact:

- a) Due to the small size and limited development of the project site, the site shall not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.
- b) Due to the small size and limited development of the project site, the project is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- c) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. Therefore, the impact is no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Due to the amount of impervious surfaces within the project site, this proposal will not increase flow rates on downstream property owners. Therefore, no new flood control facilities or water quality mitigation will be required. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant

e) The project site is not located within a 100 year flood zone. Therefore, the project shall not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

f) The project site is not located within a 100 year flood zone. Therefore, the project shall not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

g) The project is not anticipated to otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The project has been conditioned to provide to the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement and to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) prior to issuance of any grading or construction permit (COA 60. BS GRADE.9). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

h) The project does not include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors). Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

26. Floodplains

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition the property is impacted by approximately 10 acres of tributary drainage area from the north, however the tower is located on a high ground at the northwest corner of the property. As such, except for nuisance nature local runoff that may transverse portions of the site, the project is considered free from ordinary storm flood hazard. In addition, because of the small size and limited development of the project site, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.

b) According to the Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition the property is impacted by approximately 10 acres of tributary drainage area from the north, however the tower is located on a high ground at the northwest corner of the property. As such, except for nuisance nature local runoff that may transverse portions of the site, the project is considered free from ordinary storm flood hazard. In addition, because of the small size and limited development of the project site, the project will not result in changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff within a floodplain. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.

c) According to the Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition the property is impacted by approximately 10 acres of tributary drainage area from the north, however the tower is located on a high ground at the northwest corner of the property. As such, except for nuisance nature local runoff that may transverse portions of the site, the project is considered free from ordinary storm flood hazard. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area). Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.

d) Because of the small size and limited development of the project site, the project will not cause changes in the amount of surface water in any water body. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

27. Land Use

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) The proposed use is in compliance with the current land use of Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) in the Southwest Area Plan. The project will have a less than significant impact as it likely will not result in the substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area.

b) The project is not located within a city sphere of influence. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

28. Planning

a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will be consistent with the site's existing zoning of Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5). The project proposes a height over the maximum height specified in the zone; however, a variance application was submitted to address the increase in height. The project will have a less than significant impact.

b-c) The proposed cell tower will be designed as a 58 foot high monopalm. Due to the topography of the project's location, the proposed facility's height was increased beyond the maximum height of the zone. A variance application was submitted to address the increase in height. As a result, the project will be compatible with existing surrounding zoning and with existing and planned surrounding land uses. The project will have a less than significant impact.

d-e) The project is consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. Mineral Resources

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

a) The project site is within MRZ-3, which is defined as areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The RCIP identifies policies that encourage protection for existing mining operations and for appropriate management of mineral extraction. A significant impact that would constitute a loss of availability of a known mineral resource would include unmanaged extraction or encroach on existing extraction. No existing or abandoned quarries or mines exist in the area surrounding the project site. The project does not propose any mineral extraction on the project site. Any mineral resources on the project site will be unavailable for the life of the project; however, the project will not result in the permanent loss of significant mineral resources.

b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

c) The project will not be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine.

d) The project will not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

30. Airport Noise

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

area to excessive noise levels?

NA A B C D

b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

b) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

31. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: There are no railroad tracks in the vicinity of this project site. The project has no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

32. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project is not directly adjacent to any Highway. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

33. Other Noise

NA <input type="checkbox"/>	A <input type="checkbox"/>	B <input type="checkbox"/>	C <input type="checkbox"/>	D <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact: No additional noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to the project. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

34. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Although the project will increase the ambient noise level in the immediate vicinity during construction, and the general ambient noise level will increase slightly after project completion, the impacts are not considered significant.

b) All noise generated during project construction and the operation of the site must comply with the County's noise standards, which restricts construction (short-term) and operational (long-term) noise levels. The project will have a less than significant impact.

c-d) The project would not expose persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies or expose persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. The project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project				
35. Housing				
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is a 58 foot high monopalm with six (6) equipment cabinets in a 390 square foot lease area. The scope of the development is not substantial enough to displace a number of houses, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project will have no impact.
- b) The project will not create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income. The project will have no impact.
- c) The project will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project will have no impact.
- d) The project is not located within a Redevelopment Area. Therefore, the project will not affect a County Redevelopment Project Area. The project will have no impact.
- e) The project will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. The project will have no impact.
- f) The project could potentially encourage additional residential development in the area since there will be better wireless phone coverage, but the development would have to be consistent with the land uses designated by the General Plan. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

36. Fire Services

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Fire Department. Any potential significant effects will be mitigated by the payment of standard fees to the County of Riverside. The project will not directly physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. (COA 90.PLANNING.4) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

37. Sheriff Services

Source: RCIP

The proposed area is serviced by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The proposed project would not have an incremental effect on the level of sheriff services provided in the vicinity of the project area. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to sheriff services. (COA 90.PLANNING.4) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38. Schools

Source: Temecula Valley Unified School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The proposed project is located within the Temecula Valley Unified School District. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. This project has been conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

to school services. (COA 80.PLANNING.3) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

39. Libraries

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: RCIP

The proposed project will not create a significant incremental demand for library services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. This project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to library services. (COA 90.PLANNING.4) This is a standard Condition of Approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

40. Health Services

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: RCIP

The use of the proposed lease area would not cause an impact on health services. The site is located within the service parameters of County health centers. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The project will have no impact. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

RECREATION

41. Parks and Recreation

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Com-

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

a) The project proposes a 58 foot high monopalm and six (6) equipment cabinet within a 390 square foot lease area. The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project will have no impact.

b) The project would not include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The project will have no impact.

c) The project is not located within a county service area. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

42. Recreational Trails

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: According to the RCIP, no regional or community trails will be affected by the project area. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

43. Circulation

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will generate minimal traffic to the area and regional transportation system. The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The impact is less than significant.

b) The project will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. The project will have no impact.

c-d) The project does not propose any design issues that would cause a change in air traffic patterns, alter waterborne, or rail and air traffic. The project will have no impact.

e-f) The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or cause an effect upon a need for new or altered maintenance of roads. The project will have no impact.

g) The project site will cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction; however, impacts are considered less than significant.

h) The project will not cause inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project will have no impact.

i) The project site will not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

44. Bike Trails

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact: According to the RCIP, no bike trails will be affected by the project area. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

45. Water

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

46. Sewer

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

47. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project will be served by Riverside County Waste Management Department. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new landfill facilities, including the expansion of existing facilities. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

48. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?

b) Natural gas?

c) Communications systems?

d) Storm water drainage?

e) Street lighting?

f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

g) Other governmental services?

Source: RCIP

Findings of Fact:

a-g) No letters have been received eliciting responses that the proposed project would require substantial new facilities or expand facilities. The project will have no impact.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

49. Energy Conservation

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

Source:

a-b) The proposed project will not project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

50. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

51. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

52. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

- SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook
- RCIP: Riverside County Integrated Project.
- RCLIS: Riverside County Land Information System

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review:

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

PLOT PLAN: TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 USE - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RECOMMND

The use hereby permitted is for a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58' high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50'. The 390 square foot lease area surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30' high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which there by raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the property line due to the topography of the project's location.

(MODIFIED PER DIRECTOR'S HEARING ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011)

10. EVERY. 2 USE - HOLD HARMLESS

RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside or its agents, officers, and employees (COUNTY) from the following:

(a) any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the PLOT PLAN; and,

(b) any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void or annul any other decision made by the COUNTY concerning the PLOT PLAN, including, but not limited to, decisions made in response to California Public Records Act requests.

The COUNTY shall promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the COUNTY.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 2 USE - HOLD HARMLESS (cont.) RECOMMND

The obligations imposed by this condition include, but are not limited to, the following: the applicant/permittee shall pay all legal services expenses the COUNTY incurs in connection with any such claim, action or proceeding, whether it incurs such expenses directly, whether it is ordered by a court to pay such expenses, or whether it incurs such expenses by providing legal services through its Office of County Counsel.

10. EVERY. 3 USE - DEFINITIONS RECOMMND

The words identified in the following list that appear in all capitals in the attached conditions of Plot Plan No. 23642 shall be henceforth defined as follows:

APPROVED EXHIBIT A = Plot Plan No. 23642, Exhibit A (Sheets 1-9), dated December 21, 2010.

APPROVED EXHIBIT L = Plot Plan No. 23642, Exhibit L (Sheets 1 and 2), dated December 21, 2010.

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

10.BS GRADE. 1 USE - GENERAL INTRODUCTION RECOMMND

Improvements such as grading, filling, over excavation and recompaction, and base or paving which require a grading permit are subject to the included Building and Safety Department Grading Division conditions of approval.

10.BS GRADE. 3 USE - OBEY ALL GDG REGS RECOMMND

All grading shall conform to the California Building Code, Ordinance 457, and all other relevant laws, rules, and regulations governing grading in Riverside County and prior to commencing any grading which includes 50 or more cubic yards, the applicant shall obtain a grading permit from the Building and Safety Department.

10.BS GRADE. 4 USE - DISTURBS NEED G/PMT RECOMMND

Ordinance 457 requires a grading permit prior to clearing, grubbing, or any top soil disturbances related to construction grading.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 11 USE - DRAINAGE & TERRACING RECOMMND

Provide drainage facilities and terracing in conformance with the California Building Code's chapter on "EXCAVATION & GRADING".

10.BS GRADE. 12 USE - SLOPE SETBACKS RECOMMND

Observe slope setbacks from buildings & property lines per the California Building Code as amended by Ordinance 457.

10.BS GRADE. 13 USE - OFFST. PAVED PKG RECOMMND

All offstreet parking areas which are conditioned to be paved shall conform to Ordinance 457 base and paving design and inspection requirements.

10.BS GRADE. 14 USE-G.3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the property owner shall obtain a grading permit and/or approval to construct from the Grading Division of the Building and Safety Department.

10.BS GRADE. 15 USE - RETAINING WALLS RECOMMND

Lots which propose retaining walls will require separate permits. They shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any other building permits - unless otherwise approved by the Building and Safety Director. The walls shall be designed by a Registered Civil Engineer - unless they conform to the County Standard Retaining Wall designs shown on the Building and Safety Department form 284-197.

10.BS GRADE. 17 USE - MANUFACTURED SLOPES RECOMMND

Plant and irrigate all manufactured slopes equal to or greater than 3 feet in vertical height with drought tolerant grass or ground cover; slopes 15 feet or greater in vertical height shall also be planted with drought tolerant shrubs or trees in accordance with the requirements of Ordinance 457.

10.BS GRADE. 18 USE-G4.3PAVING INSPECTIONS RECOMMND

The developer/applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the paving inspections required by Ordinance 457.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

10.E HEALTH. 1 USE - GENERAL COMMENTS

RECOMMND

Based on the information provided to the Department of Environmental Health (DEH), no further information is required at this time. However, DEH reserves the right to regulate in accordance with County Ordinances should further information indicate the requirements.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

10.FLOOD RI. 1 USE- FLOOD HAZARD REPORT

RECOMMND

Plot Plan No. 23642 proposes a T-Mobile wireless facility disguised as a 55' monopalm. The 4.57 acre site is located in the Southwest Area Plan north of East Benton Road and west of Portola Road. An existing residence is also located on the site.

While the property is impacted by approximately 10 acres of tributary drainage area from the north, the tower is located on a high ground at the northwest corner of the property. As such, except for nuisance nature local runoff that may traverse portions of the site, the project is considered free from ordinary storm flood hazard. However, a storm of unusual magnitude could cause some damage. New construction should comply with Section 1B of Ordinance 457, by elevating the finished floor a minimum of one foot above the adjacent ground, measured at the upstream edge of the structure. The District does not object to this proposal. It should be noted that the existing residence does not appear to have been reviewed for flood control issues and may be subject to damage during a storm event.

This project is located in the Murrieta Creek/Santa Gertrudis Valley Area Drainage Plan. Normally, a mitigation fee is charged to development based upon the fee structures set for having a comparable anticipated impermeable surface area. The increase in impervious area of this project is insignificant and, therefore, no mitigation fee will be charged with this proposal. However, should additional development be proposed, the mitigation fee will be levied at that time.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 1 MAP - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND

RECOMMND

If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a resonable timeframe. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "most likely descendant." The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation concerning threatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

10.PLANNING. 2 MAP - INADVERTENT ARCHAEO FIND

RECOMMND

If during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environemntal assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. Unique cultural resources are defined, for this condition, as being multiple artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to its sacred or cultural importance.

1. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

2. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal representative and the archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 2 MAP - INADVERTENT ARCHAEO FIND (cont.) RECOMMND

3. Grading of further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate mitigation.

10.PLANNING. 3 USE - COMPLY WITH ORD./CODES RECOMMND

The development of these premises shall comply with the standards of Ordinance No. 348 and all other applicable Riverside County ordinances and State and Federal codes.

The development of the premises shall conform substantially with that as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A, unless otherwise amended by these conditions of approval.

10.PLANNING. 4 USE - FEES FOR REVIEW RECOMMND

Any subsequent submittals required by these conditions of approval, including but not limited to grading plan, building plan or mitigation monitoring review, shall be reviewed on an hourly basis (research fee), or other such review fee as may be in effect at the time of submittal, as required by Ordinance No. 671. Each submittal shall be accompanied with a letter clearly indicating which condition or conditions the submittal is intended to comply with.

10.PLANNING. 5 USE - LIGHTING HOODED/DIRECTED RECOMMND

Any outside lighting shall be hooded and directed so as not to shine directly upon adjoining property or public rights-of-way.

10.PLANNING. 6 USE - CEASED OPERATIONS RECOMMND

In the event the use hereby permitted ceases operation for a period of one (1) year or more, this approval shall become null and void.

10.PLANNING. 7 USE - MAX HEIGHT RECOMMND

The monopalm located within the property shall not exceed a height of 58 feet and the antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50 feet.

(MODIFIED PER DIRECTOR'S HEARING ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011)

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 8 USE - CO-LOCATION RECOMMND

The applicant/operator of the facility shall agree to allow the co-location of equipment of other wireless telecommunications providers at this site when applications are received by the County and it is considered feasible, subject to an agreement between the applicant/operator, the other proposed wireless telecommunications provider, and the property owner.

10.PLANNING. 9 USE - FUTURE INTERFERENCE RECOMMND

If the operation of the facilities authorized by this approved plot plan generates electronic interference with or otherwise impairs the operation of Riverside County communication facilities, the applicant shall consult with Riverside County Information Technology staff and implement mitigation measures acceptable to the Riverside County Department of Information Technology.

10.PLANNING. 12 USE - NO USE PROPOSED LIMIT CT RECOMMND

The balance of the subject property, APN: 924-110-011 (excluding the lease area and access easement), shall hereby be designated as "NO USE PROPOSED", and shall require approval of an appropriate land use application prior to utilization of any additional land uses subject to the requirements of County Ordinance No. 348.

10.PLANNING. 13 USE - EQUIPMENT/BLDG COLOR CT RECOMMND

The equipment cabinet color shall be grey or in earthtones, which will blend with the surrounding setting.

The color of the monopalm (trunk) shall be light to dark brown, and the color of the antenna array shall be dark green, in order to minimize visual impacts.

Changes in the above listed colors shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to installation of the structures, or prior to repainting of the structures.

10.PLANNING. 14 USE - SITE MAINTENANCE CT RECOMMND

The project site shall be kept in good repair. Graffiti shall be removed from any structures within one week of observation and/or notification. The project site and a

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 14 USE - SITE MAINTENANCE CT (cont.) RECOMMND

minimum area of 10 feet around the project site shall be kept free of weeds and other obtrusive vegetation for fire prevention purposes.

10.PLANNING. 15 USE - BUSINESS LICENSING RECOMMND

Every person conducting a business within the unincorporated area of Riverside County, as defined in Riverside County Ordinance No. 857, shall obtain a business license. For more information regarding business registration, contact the Business Registration and License Program Office of the Building and Safety Department at www.rctlma.org.buslic.

10.PLANNING. 16 USE - MT PALOMAR LIGHTING AREA RECOMMND

Within the Mt. Palomar Special Lighting Area, as defined in Ordinance No. 655, low pressure sodium vapor lighting or overhead high pressure sodium vapor lighting with shields or cutoff luminaires, shall be utilized.

10.PLANNING. 17 USE -LC RECLAIMED WATER RECOMMND

The permit holder shall connect to a reclaimed water supply for landscape watering purposes when secondary or reclaimed water is made available to the site.

10.PLANNING. 18 USE- LC VIABLE LANDSCAPE RECOMMND

All plant materials within landscaped areas shall be maintained in a viable growth condition throughout the life of this permit. To ensure that this occurs, the Planning Department shall require inspections in accordance with the Planning Department's Milestone 90 condition entitled "USE - LANDSCAPE/IRRIGATION INSTALLATION INSPECTIONS."

10.PLANNING. 19 USE- LC LANDSCAPE SPECIES RECOMMND

The developer/ permit holder/landowner shall use the County of Riverside's California Friendly Plant List when making plant selections. The list can be found at the following web site <http://www.rctlma.org/planning/content/devproc/landscpe/landscape.html> . Use of plant material with a "low" or "very low" water use designation is strongly encouraged.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 20 USE- LC LANDSCAPE SCREENING RECOMMND

Landscape screening located from 3 to 6 shall be designed to ensure full, opaque, coverage up to a minimum height of 4 feet at maturity except that planting within ten feet of an entry or exit driveway shall not be permitted to grow higher than thirty (30) inches and no trees shall be planted within ten (10) feet of driveways, alleys, or street intersections.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

10.TRANS. 1 USE - TS/EXEMPT RECOMMND

The Transportation Department has not required a traffic study for the subject project. The Transportation Department has determined that the project is exempt from traffic study requirements.

10.TRANS. 2 USE - NO ADD'L ON-SITE R-O-W RECOMMND

No additional on-site right-of-way shall be required on East Benton Road since adequate right-of-way exists, per PM 99/64-65.

10.TRANS. 3 USE - NO ADD'L ROAD IMPRVMENTS RECOMMND

No additional road improvements will be required at this time along East Benton Road due to existing improvements.

10.TRANS. 4 USE - STD INTRO 3(ORD 460/461) RECOMMND

With respect to the conditions of approval for the referenced tentative exhibit, it is understood that the exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerline elevations, all existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses with appropriate Q's, and that their omission or unacceptability may require the exhibit to be resubmitted for further consideration. These Ordinances and all conditions of approval are essential parts and a requirement occurring in ONE is as binding as though occurring in all. All questions regarding the true meaning of the conditions shall be referred to the Transportation Department.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 5 USE - COUNTY WEB SITE

RECOMMND

Additional information, standards, ordinances, policies, and design guidelines can be obtained from the Transportation Department Web site:
<http://rctlma.org/trans/>. If you have questions, please call the Plan Check Section at (951) 955-6527.

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

20.PLANNING. 1 USE - EXPIRATION DATE-PP

RECOMMND

This approval shall be used within two (2) years of approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void and of no effect whatsoever. By use is meant the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within a two (2) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or of the actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use.

Prior to the expiration of the two year period, the permittee may request a one (1) year extension of time request in which to use this plot plan. A maximum of three one-year extension of time requests shall be permitted. Should the time period established by any of the extension of time requests lapse, or should all three one-year extensions be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this plot plan be initiated within five (5) years of the effective date of the issuance of this plot plan, this plot plan shall become null and void.

20.PLANNING. 2 USE - LIFE OF PERMIT

RECOMMND

A wireless communication facility shall have an initial approval period (life) of ten (10) years that may be extended if a revised permit application is made and approved by the Planning Director or the Planning Commission, whichever was the original approving officer or body. Such extensions, if approved, shall be in increments of ten (10) years. The determination as to the appropriateness of such extensions shall be made, in part, on adherence to the original conditions of approval and the number of complaints, if any, received by the County. In the case of co-located facilities, the permits of all co-locaters shall automatically be extended until the last

04/06/11
12:56

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 12

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 2 USE - LIFE OF PERMIT (cont.)

RECOMMND

co-locater's permit expires.

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

60.BS GRADE. 1 USE-G2.1 GRADING BONDS

RECOMMND

Grading in excess of 199 cubic yards will require performance security to be posted with the Building and Safety Department. Single Family Dwelling units graded one lot per permit and proposing to grade less than 5,000 cubic yards are exempt.

60.BS GRADE. 3 USE-G2.4GEOTECH/SOILS RPTS

RECOMMND

Geotechnical soils reports, required in order to obtain a grading permit, shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Department's Grading Division for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit.

All grading shall be in conformance with the recommendations of the geotechnical/soils reports as approved by Riverside County.*

*The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports will be reviewed in accordance with the RIVERSIDE COUNTY GEOTECHNICAL GUIDELINES. FOR REVIEW OF GEOTECHNICAL AND GEOLOGIC REPORTS.

60.BS GRADE. 4 USE-G2.7DRNAGE DESIGN Q100

RECOMMND

All grading and drainage shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's conditions of approval regarding this application. If not specifically addressed in their conditions, drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100 year storm flows.

Additionally, the Building and Safety Department's conditional approval of this application includes an expectation that the conceptual grading plan reviewed and approved for it complies or can comply with any WQMP (water Quality Management Plan) required by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 6 USE-G2.14OFFSITE GDG ONUS

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, it shall be the sole responsibility of the owner/applicant to obtain any and all proposed or required easements and/or permissions necessary to perform the grading herein proposed.

60.BS GRADE. 7 USE-G2.15NOTRD OFFSITE LTR

RECOMMND

A notarized letter of permission, from the affected property owners or easement holders, is required for any proposed off site grading.

60.BS GRADE. 8 USE-G2.16REC'D ESMT REQ'D

RECOMMND

A recorded easement is required for off site drainage facilities.

60.BS GRADE. 9 USE-G1.4 NPDES/SWPPP

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits - whichever comes first - the applicant shall provide the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the following: "Effective March 10, 2003 owner operators of grading or construction projects are required to comply with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner operator can comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. For additional information and to obtain a copy of the NPDES State Construction Permit contact the SWRCB at (916) 657-1146.

Additionally, at the time the county adopts, as part of any ordinance, regulations specific to the N.P.D.E.S., this project (or subdivision) shall comply with them.

60.BS GRADE. 10 USE IMPORT/EXPORT

RECOMMND

In instances where a grading plan involves import or export, prior to obtaining a grading permit, the applicant shall have obtained approval for the import/export location from the Building and Safety department. If an

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 10 USE IMPORT/EXPORT (cont.)

RECOMMND

Environmental Assessment, prior to issuing a grading permit, did not previously approve either location, a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Planning Director and the Environmental Programs Director for review and comment and to the Building and Safety Department Director for approval. Additionally, if the movement of import/export occurs using county roads, review and approval of the haul routes by the Transportation Department will be required.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

60.PLANNING. 1 USE - GRADING PLANS

RECOMMND

If grading is proposed, the project must comply with the following:

a. The developer shall submit one print of a comprehensive grading plan to the Department of Building and Safety which complies with the Uniform Building Code, Chapter 70, as amended by Ordinance No. 457 and as may be additionally provided for in these conditions.

b. A grading permit shall be obtained from the Department of Building and Safety prior to commencement of any grading outside of a County maintained road right-of-way.

c. Graded but undeveloped land shall be planted with interim landscaping or provided with other erosion control measures as approved by the Director of Building and Safety.

d. Graded areas shall be revegetated or landscaped with native species which are fire resistant, drought tolerant, low water using and erosion controlling.

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

80.BS GRADE. 1 USE* -G3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any building permit, the property owner shall obtain a grading permit and/or approval to construct from the Grading Division of the Building and

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.BS GRADE. 1 USE* -G3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT (cont.) RECOMMND

Safety Department.

80.BS GRADE. 2 USE - ROUGH GRADE APPROVAL RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall obtain rough grade approval and/or approval to construct from the Building and Safety Department. The Building and Safety Department must approve the completed grading of your project before a building permit can be issued. Rough Grade approval can be accomplished by complying with the following:

1.Submitting a "Wet Signed" copy of the Soils Compaction Report containing substantiating data from the Soils Engineer (registered geologist or certified geologist, civil engineer or geotechnical engineer as appropriate) for his/her certification of the project.

2.Submitting a "Wet Signed" copy of the Rough Grade certification from a Registered Civil Engineer certifying that the grading was completed in conformance with the approved grading plan.

3.Submitting a Contractors Statement of Conformance form (284-259).

4.Requesting a Rough Grade Inspection and obtaining rough grade approval from a Riverside County inspector.

5.Rough Grade Only Permits: In addition to obtaining all required inspections and approval of all final reports, all sites permitted for rough grade only shall provide 100 percent vegetative coverage to stabilize the site prior to receiving a rough grade permit final.

Prior to release for building permit, the applicant shall have met all rough grade requirements to obtain Building and Safety Department clearance.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

80.PLANNING. 1 USE - ELEVATIONS & MATERIALS RECOMMND

Building and structure elevations shall be in substantial conformance with that shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT A, dated December 21, 2010.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 2 USE - LIGHTING PLANS CT RECOMMND

Any proposed outdoor lighting must be shown on electrical plans submitted to the Department of Building and Safety for plan check approval and shall comply with the requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 and the Riverside County General Plan.

80.PLANNING. 3 USE - SCHOOL MITIGATION RECOMMND

Impacts to the Temecula Valley Unified School District shall be mitigated in accordance with California State law.

80.PLANNING. 4 USE - LC LANDSCAPE SECURITIES RECOMMND

Performance securities, in amounts to be determined by the Director of Building and Safety to guarantee the installation of plantings, irrigation system, walls and/or fences, in accordance with the approved plan, shall be filed with the Department of Building and Safety. Securities may require review by County Counsel and other staff. Permit holder is encouraged to allow adequate time to ensure that securities are in place. The performance security may be released one year after structural final, inspection report, and the One-Year Post Establishment report confirms that the plantings and irrigation components have been adequately installed and maintained. A cash security shall be required when the estimated cost is \$2,500.00 or less.

80.PLANNING. 5 USE- LC SPECIMEN TREES REQUIRE RECOMMND

Landscaping plans shall incorporate the use of specimen (24" box or greater) canopy trees. All trees and shrubs shall be drawn to reflect the average specimen size at 15 years of age. All trees shall be double-staked and secured rewith non-wire ties. Trees larger then 24" box may require guying.

80.PLANNING. 6 USE - PALM FRONDS RECOMMND

Prior to building permit issuance, the developer/permit holder shall provide a palm frond design, consistent with the approved plot plan, that covers all antennas and shall extend 3 feet beyond the antennas. After reviewing the building plans, the Planning Department shall clear this condition upon determination of compliance.

PLOT PLAN: TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 6 USE - PALM FRONDS (cont.)

RECOMMND

(MODIFIED PER DIRECTOR'S HEARING ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011)

TRANS DEPARTMENT

80.TRANS. 1 USE - EVIDENCE/LEGAL ACCESS

RECOMMND

Provide evidence of legal access.

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

90.BS GRADE. 2 USE - REQ'D GRADING INSP'S

RECOMMND

The developer / applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the following inspections required by Ordinance 457.

1. Precise grade inspection of entire permit area.

a. Precise Grade Inspection

b. Inspection of onsite drainage facilities

90.BS GRADE. 3 USE - PRECISE GRDG APPROVAL

RECOMMND

Prior to final building inspection, the applicant shall obtain precise grade approval and/or clearance from the Building and Safety Department. The Building and Safety Department must approve the precise grading of your project before a building final can be obtained. Precise Grade approval can be accomplished by complying with the following:

1. Requesting and obtaining approval of all required grading inspections.

2. Submitting a "Wet Signed" copy of the Precise (Final) Grade Certification for the entire site from a Registered Civil Engineer certifying that the precise grading was completed in conformance with the approved grading plan.

Prior to release for building final, the applicant shall have met all precise grade requirements to obtain Building and Safety Department clearance.

PLOT PLAN: TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

90.PLANNING. 1 USE - UTILITIES UNDERGROUND

RECOMMND

All utilities, except electrical lines rated 33 kV or greater, shall be installed underground. If the permittee provides to the Department of Building and Safety and the Planning Department a definitive statement from the utility provider refusing to allow underground installation of the utilities they provide, this condition shall be null and void with respect to that utility.

90.PLANNING. 2 USE - WALL & FENCE LOCATIONS

RECOMMND

Wall and/or fence locations shall be in conformance with APPROVED EXHIBIT A.

90.PLANNING. 4 USE - ORD NO. 659 (DIF)

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities and the acquisition of open space and habitat necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development project described and defined in this Ordinance, and it establishes the authorized uses of the fees collected.

The amount of the fee for commercial or industrial development shall be calculated on the basis of the "Project Area," as defined in the Ordinance, which shall mean the net area, measured in acres, from the adjacent road right-of-way to the limits of the project development. The Project Area for Plot Plan No. 23642 has been calculated to be 0.009 net acres.

In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 5 USE - SIGNAGE REQUIREMENT

RECOMMND

Prior to final inspection of any building permit, the permit holder, developer or successor-in-interest shall install a sign no smaller than 12 inches by 12 inches upon an exterior wall or fence that surrounds the lease area that provides the following contact information:

- Address of wireless communications facility and any internal site identification number or code;
- Name(s) of company who operates the wireless communications facility;
- Full company address, including mailing address and division name that will address problems;
- Telephone number of wireless communications facility company.

If a co-located facility (additional antennas and/or equipment shelters or cabinets) are added to an existing facility, an additional sign, including the above described information, shall be installed on said shelter or cabinet stating the name of the company who operates the primary wireless communications facility and the name of the company that operates the co-located facility.

90.PLANNING. 6 USE - LC LNDSCP INSPECT DEPOST

RECOMMND

Prior to building permit final inspection, the developer/permit holder shall file an Inspection Request Form and deposit sufficient funds to cover the costs of Installation, Six Month Establishment, and One Year Post-Establishment inspections. In the event that an open landscape case is not available, then the applicant shall open a FEE ONLY case to conduct inspections. The deposit required for landscape inspections shall be determined by the Riverside County Landscape Division. The Planning Department shall clear this condition upon determination of compliance.

90.PLANNING. 7 USE - LC COMPLY W/ LNDSCP/ IRR

RECOMMND

The developer/permit holder shall coordinate with their designated landscape representative and the Riverside County Planning Department's landscape inspector to ensure all landscape planting and irrigation systems have been installed in accordance with APPROVED EXHIBITS, landscaping, irrigation, and shading plans. The Planning Department will ensure that all landscaping is healthy,

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 7 USE - LC COMPLY W/ LNDSACP/ IRR (cont.) RECOMMND

free of weeds, disease and pests; and, irrigation systems are properly constructed and determined to be in good working order. The developer/permit holder's designated landscape representative and the Riverside County Planning Department's landscape inspector shall determine compliance with this condition and execute a Landscape Certificate of Completion. Upon determination of compliance, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

90.PLANNING. 8 USE- LC LNDSACP/IRR INSTALL RECOMMND

The permit holder's landscape architect responsible for preparing the Landscaping and Irrigation Plans shall arrange for an Installation Inspection with the Planning Department at least fifteen (15) working days prior to final Inspection of the structure or issuance of occupancy permit, whichever occurs first. Upon successful completion of the Installation Inspection and compliance with the Planning Department's Milestone 80 conditions entitled "USE-LANDSCAPING SECURITIES and LANDSCAPE INSPECTION DEPOS," both the County Planning Department's Landscape Inspector and the permit holder's landscape architect shall execute a Certificate of Completion that shall be submitted to the Planning Department and the Department of Building and Safety.

90.PLANNING. 9 USE - PALM FRONDS RECOMMND

Prior to final inspection, the developer/permit holder shall ensure that the palm fronds are designed and placed in such a manner that cover all of the antennas and are extending 3 feet beyond the antennas. The Planning Department shall clear this condition upon determination of compliance.

(MODIFIED PER DIRECTOR'S HEARING ON FEBRUARY 28, 2011)

TRANS DEPARTMENT

90.TRANS. 1 USE - WRCOG TUMF RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the project proponent shall pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of issuance, pursuant to Ordinance No. 824.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23642

Parcel: 924-110-011

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.TRANS. 2 USE - UTILITY PLAN CELL TOWER

RECOMMND

Proposed electrical power lines below 33.6 KV within public right-of-way for this cell tower site shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Ordinance 460 and 461, or as approved by the Transportation Department. The applicant is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on the site plan. A written proof for initiating the design and/or application of the relocation issued by the utility company shall be submitted to the Transportation Department for verification purposes.

90.TRANS. 3 USE-UTILITY INSTALL CELL TOWER

RECOMMND

Proposed electrical power lines below 33.6 KV within public right-of-way for this cell tower site shall be underground in accordance with Ordinance 460 and 461, or as approved by the Transportation Department.

A certificate should be obtained from the pertinent utility company and submitted to the Department of Transportation as proof of completion.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

CHECK ONE AS APPROPRIATE:

- PLOT PLAN
 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
 TEMPORARY USE PERMIT
 REVISED PERMIT
 PUBLIC USE PERMIT
 VARIANCE

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: PP 23642 / VAR 01875 DATE SUBMITTED: 9/2/10

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: T-Mobile West, dba T-Mobile E-Mail: _____

Mailing Address: Zoning Manager IE24889, 3257 E. Guasti Road, Suite 200
Ontario Street CA 91789
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (____) _____ Fax No: (____) _____

Engineer/Representative's Name: Barbara Saito for Avila Inc E-Mail: barbara.saito1@verizon.net

Mailing Address: 418 N. Cloverdale Lane
Walnut Street CA 91789
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (909) 723-6152 Fax No: (____) _____

Property Owner's Name: Melvin W & JK Millner Trust E-Mail: _____

Mailing Address: 38920 E Benton Road
Temecula Street CA 92592
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (____) _____ Fax No: (____) _____

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary. Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of your application, you will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be NO refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

Barbara Sarti [Signature]
PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

on file w/ [Signature] [Signature]
PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S) SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S) SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

See attached sheet(s) for other property owners signatures.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 924-110-011

Section: _____ Township: _____ Range: _____

Approximate Gross Acreage: _____

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of E. Benson, South of La Terraza Road, East of De Portola, West of Green Meadow

Thomas Brothers map, edition year, page number, and coordinates: 2004 931-955 A3

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

Proposal (describe project, indicate the number of proposed lots/parcels, units, and the schedule of the subdivision, Vesting Map, PRD):

Installation of a wireless telecommunication facility designed to resemble a palm tree plus radio equipment cabinets. Please see attached project description

PP 23642 variance for overall height to 55' and reduced setback to tower

Related cases filed in conjunction with this request:

Is there a previous development application filed on the same site: Yes No

If yes, provide Case No(s). _____ (Parcel Map, Zone Change, etc.)

E.A. No. (if known) _____ E.I.R. No. (if applicable): _____

Have any special studies or reports, such as a traffic study, biological report, archaeological report, geological or geotechnical reports, been prepared for the subject property? Yes No

If yes, indicate the type of report(s) and provide a copy: _____

Is water service available at the project site: Yes No

If "No," how far must the water line(s) be extended to provide service? (No. of feet/miles) _____

Will the proposal eventually require landscaping either on-site or as part of a road improvement or other common area improvements? Yes No

Is sewer service available at the site? Yes No

If "No," how far must the sewer line(s) be extended to provide service? (No. of feet/miles) n/a

Will the proposal result in cut or fill slopes steeper than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet? Yes No

How much grading is proposed for the project site?

Estimated amount of cut = cubic yards: _____

Estimated amount of fill = cubic yards _____

Does the project need to import or export dirt? Yes No

Import _____ Export _____ Neither _____

BARBARA SAITO for AVILA Inc.
418 N. Cloverdale Lane, Walnut, CA 91789
Cell: (909) 723-6152 Email: barbara.saito1@verizon.net

August 25, 2010 revised September 27, 2010

Authorized Agent for **T-Mobile**
T-Mobile Project Number: **IE904176**
T-Mobile Project Name: **Wayne's World**

County of Riverside
Application for a Plot Plan Review and Variance
Project Information and Justification

T-Mobile West Corporation (T-Mobile) is requesting approval of a Plot Plan Review and Variance for the construction and operation of a unmanned wireless telecommunications facility (cell site), and presents the following project information for your consideration.

Project Location

Address 38920 Benton Road
APN 924-110-011
Zoning RA5

Project Representative

Barbara Saito
418 N. Cloverdale Lane, Walnut, CA 91789
909-723-6152

T-Mobile Contact

Linda Paul, Real Estate and Zoning Manager
3257 E. Guasti Rd. #200
Ontario, CA 91761
909-975-3698

Project Description

The installation of a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of twelve panel antennas, 6 TMAs, and 2 gps antennas installed on a pole designed to resemble a palm tree and radio equipment enclosed within a block surround. This design meets the County requirements for a disguised facility. A variance is being requested due to the overall height and reduced setback of the proposed facility.

Project Objectives

There are several reasons why a wireless carrier requires the installation of a cell site within a specified area:

Coverage – No service, or insufficient service, currently existing in the vicinity

Capacity – Service exists, but is currently overloaded or approaching overload, preventing successful call completion during times of high usage.

Quality – Service exists, but signal strength is inadequate or inconsistent.

E911 – Effective site geometry within the overall network is needed to achieve accurate location information for mobile users through triangulation with active cell sites. (Half of all 911 calls are made using mobile phones.)

Enhanced Voice and Data services – Current service does not provide adequate radio-support for advanced services.

All constitute a significant gap in the coverage or quality of service provided. In this specific case, this location was selected because T-Mobile's radio-frequency engineers (RF) have identified the objective of

this site is to provide coverage for the Residential communities near Benton and DePortola, where there is currently little to no coverage. This candidate would meet the objective primarily due to the higher terrain elevation and the designed antenna center of 48 feet.

Alternative Site Analysis

The following locations were evaluated and the reasons why they were not selected for this project are addressed:

The subject site was initially approved for a 70 foot wireless communication facility but the zoning permit and building permits expired. For this application, no other candidates were reviewed.

Findings/Burden of Proof

The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape.

The parcel is of a size to meet all the required setbacks. Additionally it has existing vegetation that helps to screen the proposed facility.

The proposed location has sufficient access to streets and highways that are adequate in width and pavement type to carry the quantity and quality of traffic generated by the proposed use.

The existing property takes its access from Benton Avenue. There will be no traffic generated by this proposal.

The proposed use will not have an adverse effect upon adjacent or abutting properties.

The design of the proposed facility meets the planning objective of disguised facilities by designing the antenna structure to resemble a palm tree and the equipment enclosure to be a covered enclosure. The hilly terrain also effectively screens the proposed facility.

The proposed use is deemed essential and desirable to the public convenience or welfare.

Wireless communication has been deemed essential and desirable to public convenience and welfare based on consumer demand and the FCC mandated connection to 911 services.

Variance

A variance is being requested to allow 5 feet over the required limit of 50 feet for wireless telecommunication facilities on residentially zoned parcels. The top of the antennas and pole structure are 50 feet. To assist in the stealthing of the facility, palm fronds have been added for an overall height of 55 feet to make the facility more "tree-like." The fronds are non-structural. A variance is also being requested from the development standard of 200% of the height (110 feet) from the property line. The variance is necessary for the following reasons:

- The subject property has a steep slope with the property line being at the top of slope. If the proposed facility were moved away from the property line or reduced in height, the radio transmission would be blocked.
- Meeting both the development standards will lessen the transmission and cause a reduced level of service for the residents and businesses in the local area. Such reduction will cause the need for additional sites to fill the potential loss of coverage..

Why is the height necessary

Certain uses by their very nature require height to be effective. Examples include silos, chimneys and water towers, which have practical as well as safety reasons that require them to be of greater height than allowed by the zoning regulations. Silos are designed to store dry materials. The height not only allows for more storage in a small area, but also helps to keep the dry goods dry. Chimneys have increased height to guide smoke away from the occupied area. Water towers utilize height to create the necessary water pressure to provide for domestic uses as well as fire protection. Restricting on these types of facilities would certainly reduce their effectiveness, and possibly render them useless.

Just as the water tanks utilize physics to create water pressure, so radio transmission utilizes physics to provide communication. Limiting a transmission facility to a certain height does not recognize the physical needs of the facility, and can render the facility useless.

The subject antennas must be able to send out signals to, and receive signals from mobile radios. These radios are either installed in motor vehicles or are portable. A mobile radio and a portable radio operate at different power levels. The transmission signals must be stronger for a portable radio to receive them.

As implied, these radios move around from place to place. They are sometimes in the path of the signal, sometimes out of the path. While they are in the path of a signal, they can receive and transmit to the base antennas, and communicate with the world. While out of the path, they cannot transmit or receive the base signal, therefore cannot communicate with anyone. In a shadow area, the signal is sometimes strong enough to be received by the mobile radio, but not by the portable. This point is of great significance when the users of the portable radio are emergency personnel.

The subject property is in an area with a very changing topography. It is very hilly and the streets wind throughout the area. A forty-one foot tall water tank reservoir is located on the property along with a steep uphill slope to the east and a tree row to the south. The radio signal, while moving in a straight path, must navigate its way through all this. Shadows are caused by those hills that do not totally block the signal. By increasing the height of the subject antennas, the blockages and shadows can be reduced and eliminated entirely, thereby allowing communication to occur.

The subject property has a dramatic change in elevation. The location of the proposed facility is near the highest part of the property. If the overall height were reduced, the coverage would be lessened, necessitating more sites to meet the coverage objective. Attached are the coverage plots for the proposed height and the reduced height which indicate the loss of coverage. The Coverage Improvement Comparison Table indicates the coverage area and percentage difference between allowing the top of the antennas to be 50 feet high and requesting a variance and reducing the overall height of the proposed facility to 50 feet. Although the difference does not appear great, the modeling does not take vegetation into consideration. The taller height will make for a better handover between sites and allow the system as a whole to perform better.

Meeting the setback requirement of 110 feet (200% of 55 feet) would reduce the amsl height considerably and render the site nearly useless due to the steepness of the slope. The proposed facility does meet the standard development setback and height limitations of the R-A zone. The size of the abutting properties are large with most of the homes being "down slope". Additionally, this would cause the facility to encroach into the residential setback.

What impact will this facility make on the neighborhood

There is a minor impact that the antennas will make on the neighborhood. This is the visual impact.

There will be little impact to the adjacent residential properties due to the hilly terrain. Most of the views of the surrounding residents are towards the valley, not the subject property. Passers-by would be more inclined to see the rock outcroppings, trees and other vegetation.

Are there other alternatives to increasing the height

There are no viable alternatives to increasing the height. The attached coverage plots indicate the coverage objective and how the proposed facility meets the objective at the submitted height. Additional coverage plots are included to show how much less coverage would be achieved if the proposed facility is limited to the zoning height.

T-Mobile Company Information

T-Mobile is one of the fastest growing nationwide service providers offering all digital voice, messaging and high-speed data services to nearly 30 million customers in the United States.

T-Mobile is a "telephone corporation", licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to operate in the 1950.2-1964.8, 1965.2-1969.8 MHz and 1870.2-1884.8-1889.8 MHz frequencies, and a state-regulated Public Utility subject to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The CPUC has established that the term "telephone corporation" can be extended to wireless carriers, even though they transmit signals without the use of telephone lines.

T-Mobile will operate this facility in full compliance with the regulations and licensing requirements of the FCC, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the CPUC, as governed by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and other applicable laws.

The enclosed application is presented for your consideration. T-Mobile requests a favorable determination and approval of a Minor Design Review to build the proposed facility. Please contact me at 909-723-6152 for any questions or requests for additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Saito
Authorized Agent for T-Mobile

**Zoning RF Map Summary
IE04176A**


T

stick together™

Confidential and Proprietary Information of T-Mobile USA

Predicted Coverage w/o the Proposed Site


T-Mobile Site IE04176A



stick together

Predicted Coverage with the Proposed Site @ 50' TOA

T-Mobile Site IE04176A




T stick together™

Confidential and Proprietary Information of T-Mobile USA

Predicted Coverage with the Proposed Site @ 45' TOA

T-Mobile Site IE04176A




stick together™

Confidential and Proprietary Information of T-Mobile USA

T

Predicted Coverage with the Proposed Site @ 20' TOA

T-Mobile Site IE04176A




stick together™



Confidential and Proprietary Information of T-Mobile USA

Predicted Coverage with the Proposed Site Only @ 50' TOA

T-Mobile Site IE04176A




stick together™



Predicted Coverage with the Proposed Site Only @ 45' TOA

T-Mobile Site IE04176A




stick together™



Predicted Coverage with the Proposed Site Only @ 20' TOA

T-Mobile Site IE04176A



T stick together™

Coverage Improvement Comparison Table

Overall Coverage Improvement comparison		
Coverage Gap	10.20	Sq miles
Coverage Gap Improvement from	Area (sq miles)	% improvement on the coverage Gap(Overall)
Primary Site @50' TOA	8.48	83.09
Primary Site @45' TOA	8.39	82.25
Primary Site @20' TOA	7.94	77.84

Indoor only Coverage Improvement comparison		
Coverage Gap	10.20	Sq miles
Coverage Gap Improvement from	Area (sq miles)	% improvement on the coverage Gap(Overall)
Primary Site @50' TOA	4.67	45.74
Primary Site @45' TOA	4.52	44.31
Primary Site @20' TOA	3.92	38.40

stick together™

Confidential and Proprietary Information of T-Mobile USA

7124

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Planning Department
Ron Goldman · Planning Director

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

CHECK ONE AS APPROPRIATE:

- PLOT PLAN
- REVISED PERMIT
- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
- PUBLIC USE PERMIT
- TEMPORARY USE PERMIT
- VARIANCE

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: PP2 3642 DATE SUBMITTED: 8-5-08

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: T-Mobile E-Mail: Anthony.Serpa@T-Mobile.com

Mailing Address: 3257 E. Guasti Road, Suite 200
Ontario, CA 91761
Street City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: () _____ Fax No: () _____

Engineer/Representative's Name: JDS Planning, Dale Stubblefield E-Mail: dale@jdsplanning.com

Mailing Address: 1227 De Anza Drive
San Jacinto, CA 92582
Street City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 880-3381 Fax No: (951) 654-6819

Property Owner's Name: Melvin MILNER E-Mail: _____

Mailing Address: 38920 E. Benton Road
Temecula, CA 92592
Street City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 302-5450 Fax No: () _____

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.

Ea 42016

CFG 05365

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary. Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of your application, you will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be NO refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Dale Stubblefield
PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT

Dale Stubblefield
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

See Attached letter of Authorization
PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

See Attached letter of Authorization
SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

See attached sheet(s) for other property owners signatures.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 924-110-011

Section: 9 Township: 2S Range: 1W

Approximate Gross Acreage: 4.57

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Benton Road, South of Berlie Street, East of ---, West of De Portola Road.

Thomas Brothers map, edition year, page number, and coordinates: Page 409 E1 Edition 2001

LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
INITIAL CASE TRANSMITTAL
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

DATE: October 27, 2009

TO:

3rd District Supervisor
3rd District Planning Commissioner
Transportation Dept.
Environmental Health Dept.
Flood Control District
Fire Department

Dept. of Bldg. & Safety (Grading)
Regional Parks & Open Space Dist.
Co. Geologist
Environmental Programs Dept.
P.D. Trails Coordinator – J. Jolliffe
P.D. Landscape Architects – Ron Dyo

P.D. Archaeologist
Riv. Co. I.T. – John Sarkasian
Riv. Co. Waste Resources Management
County Service Area No. 152 c/o EDA
Riv. Co. Airport Land Use – John Guerin

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642 - EA42016 – Applicant: T-Mobile – Engineer/Representative: JDS Planning - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (R-RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road - 4.57 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture - 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5) - REQUEST: This plot plan proposes a T-Mobile wireless facility disguised as a 50' monopine with twelve (12) panel antennas and 2 GPS antennas, located on 3 sectors. This proposal also consists of a 413 square foot lease area with 6 equipment cabinets. - APN: 924-110-011

Please review the attached map(s) and/or exhibit(s) for the above-described project. This case is scheduled for a **LDC meeting on September 18, 2008**. All LDC Members please have draft conditions in the Land Management System on or before the above date. If it is determined that the attached map(s) and/or exhibit(s) are not acceptable, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing on or before the above date. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing.

All other transmitted entities, please have your comments, questions and recommendations to the Planning Department on or before the above date. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this project, please do not hesitate to contact **Kinika Hesterly**, Planner IV, at **(951) 955-0869** or email at khesterl@rctlma.org / **MAILSTOP# 1070**.

DATE: _____ SIGNATURE: _____

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

If you do not include this transmittal in your response, please include a reference to the case number and project planner's name. Thank you.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
and
INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A PUBLIC HEARING has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** to consider the project shown below:

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642/VARIANCE NO. 1875 - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: T-Mobile West – Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (R-RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 E. Benton Road – 4.57 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 5 Acres Minimum (R-A-5) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58 foot high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50 feet. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30 foot high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location. (Quasi-judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter.
DATE OF HEARING: May 18, 2011
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER
BOARD CHAMBERS, 1ST FLOOR
4080 LEMON STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Project Planner, Damaris Abraham, at 951-955-5719 or email dabraham@rctlma.org, or go to the County Planning Department's Planning Commission agenda web page at http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/pc/current_pc.html.

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a mitigated negative declaration. The Planning Commission will consider the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on a proposed project may do so, in writing, between the date of this notice and the public hearing or appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Commission may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands, within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Attn: Damaris Abraham
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
and
INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A **PUBLIC HEARING** has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY DIRECTOR'S HEARING** to consider the project shown below:

PLOT PLAN NO. 23642/VARIANCE NO. 1875 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: T-Mobile West – Engineer/Representative: Barbara Saito - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (R-RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 E. Benton Road – 4.57 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 5 Acres Minimum (R-A-5) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 55' high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The 390 square foot lease area surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30' high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance 348 Section 19.410 to 55 feet, which there by raises the maximum height allowed by 5 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 50 feet to 19 feet from the property line due to the topography of the project's location. - APN: 924-110-011 (Quasi-judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 1:30 p.m. or as soon as possible thereafter.
DATE OF HEARING: FEBRUARY 28, 2011
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
4080 LEMON STREET
1ST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM 2A
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Damaris Abraham at 951-955-5719 or e-mail dabraham@rctlma.org, or go to the County Planning Department's Director's Hearing agenda web page at http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/dh/current_dh.html

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a mitigated negative declaration. The Planning Director will consider the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., (with the exception of Noon-1:00 p.m. and holidays) at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on a proposed project may do so, in writing, between the date of this notice and the public hearing or appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Director, and the Planning Director will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Director at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Director may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands, within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Attn: Damaris Abraham
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

PROPERTY OWNERS CERTIFICATION FORM

I, VINNIE NGUYEN, certify that on 12/29/2010.

The attached property owners list was prepared by Riverside County GIS,

APN (s) or case numbers PP 23642 For

Company or Individual's Name Planning Department,

Distance buffered 1000'.

Pursuant to application requirements furnished by the Riverside County Planning Department, Said list is a complete and true compilation of the owners of the subject property and all other property owners within 600 feet of the property involved, or if that area yields less than 25 different owners, all property owners within a notification area expanded to yield a minimum of 25 different owners, to a maximum notification area of 2,400 feet from the project boundaries, based upon the latest equalized assessment rolls. If the project is a subdivision with identified off-site access/improvements, said list includes a complete and true compilation of the names and mailing addresses of the owners of all property that is adjacent to the proposed off-site improvement/alignment.

I further certify that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that incorrect or incomplete information may be grounds for rejection or denial of the application.

NAME: Vinnie Nguyen

V. Calderon

TITLE GIS Analyst


AP: 6.29.2011

ADDRESS: 4080 Lemon Street 2nd Floor

Riverside, Ca. 92502


TELEPHONE NUMBER (8 a.m. – 5 p.m.): (951) 955-8158

1000 feet buffer



Selected Parcels

924-090-007	915-430-016	915-430-019	915-430-010	924-090-002	924-090-021	915-430-021	915-430-022	915-120-041	915-120-039
915-430-009	924-130-015	924-130-014	915-430-008	924-110-025	915-430-020	924-140-027	924-110-013	924-110-014	915-430-017
924-110-011	915-120-027	924-110-015	924-090-001	915-420-006	924-110-023	924-110-024	924-110-022	924-110-020	915-420-024
924-110-021	915-430-007	924-110-010	924-110-019	924-110-016	924-110-012	915-120-042			



Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

APN: 924090007, ASMT: 924090007
ANAHI MANTOYA
37131 MESA RD
TEMECULA CA. 92590

APN: 915120041, ASMT: 915120041
ESTELLA O MARTINEZ
12127 EMERY ST
EL MONTE CA 91732

APN: 915430016, ASMT: 915430016
BELINDA MORRIS
P O BOX 890931
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 915120039, ASMT: 915120039
FEDERAL NATL MORTGAGE ASSN
C/O RECONTRUST CO
1800 TAPO CANYON SV2202
SIMI VALLEY CA 93063

APN: 915430019, ASMT: 915430019
CHARLES WHITAKER, ETAL
37341 GREEN MEADOW RD
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915430009, ASMT: 915430009
FREDERICK JAY YAFFE
38999 BERLIE ST
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915430010, ASMT: 915430010
CHRIS S STINNER, ETAL
38995 MAIZ LN
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 924130014, ASMT: 924130014
HARRIETT H SWEENEY
5512 W 119TH ST
INGLEWOOD CA 90304

APN: 924090002, ASMT: 924090002
DANIEL A KREHBIEL, ETAL
38805 E BENTON RD
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915430008, ASMT: 915430008
ILIJA SANTIC, ETAL
1073 TERRACE DR
LONG BEACH CA 90807

APN: 924090021, ASMT: 924090021
DANIEL REYNOSO
800 W 220TH ST
TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 924110025, ASMT: 924110025
JAMES G POSEY, ETAL
36815 MESA RD
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915430022, ASMT: 915430022
ERNIE B MIKUS, ETAL
22227 SERENADE RIDGE
MURRIETA CA 92562

APN: 915430020, ASMT: 915430020
JAMES P DAVIS
33083 EMBASSY AVE
TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 924140027, ASMT: 924140027
 JANYCE GRACIANO
 39370 MESA RD
 TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915420006, ASMT: 915420006
 ROBERT BECK
 38525 MAIZ LN
 TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 924110014, ASMT: 924110014
 LARRY SCHEETZ
 3603 WOODPECKER ST
 BREA CA 92823

APN: 924110023, ASMT: 924110023
 ROBERT NEAL FABRICANT, ETAL
 2315 PACIFIC DR
 CORONA DEL MAR CA 92625

APN: 915430017, ASMT: 915430017
 LILYAN PATTERSON
 38320 GREEN MEADOW
 TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 924110024, ASMT: 924110024
 ROBERT NEAL FABRICANT, ETAL
 555 N 13TH AVE
 UPLAND CA 91786

APN: 924110011, ASMT: 924110011
 MALVIN W MILNER, ETAL
 38920 E BENTON RD
 TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 924110020, ASMT: 924110020
 ROBERT NEAL FABRICANT, ETAL
 2315 PACIFIC DR
 CORONA DEL MAR CA 92625

APN: 915120027, ASMT: 915120027
 NOSH SINISTAJ, ETAL
 1695 BALSAM WAY
 MILFORD MI 48381

APN: 915420024, ASMT: 915420024
 ROBERT P BECK
 38525 MAIZ LN
 TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 924110015, ASMT: 924110015
 PATRICK J MUNDY
 5448 ARTURO CT
 LAS VEGAS NV 89120

APN: 924110021, ASMT: 924110021
 RONALD WALD
 38935 E BENTO RD
 TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 924090001, ASMT: 924090001
 PAUL PALUMBO, ETAL
 38765 BENTON RD
 TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915430007, ASMT: 915430007
 RUBEN A GARCIA, ETAL
 20550 ENTRADERO AVE
 TORRANCE CA 90503



APN: 924110010, ASMT: 924110010
SAMUEL C SERRANO, ETAL
13219 ABANA PL
CERRITOS CA 90703

APN: 924110019, ASMT: 924110019
STUART M HOYT, ETAL
36775 MESA RD
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 924110016, ASMT: 924110016
WALTER D STEELE, ETAL
36875 MESA RD
TEMECULA CA. 92590

APN: 924110012, ASMT: 924110012
WAYNE ANDERSON, ETAL
38950 BENTON RD
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 915120042, ASMT: 915120042
WELLS FARGO BANK
C/O WACHOVIA MORTGAGE
4101 WISEMAN BLV
SAN ANTONIO TX 78251



T Mobile
3257 E Guasti Rd. Ste. 200
Ontario, CA 91761
applicant

Milner Melvin
38920 E Benton Rd.
Temecula, CA 92592
owner


Barbara Saito
418 N Cloverdale Lane
Walnut, CA 91789
engineer

T Mobile
3257 E Guasti Rd. Ste. 200
Ontario, CA 91761
Applicant

Milner Melvin
38920 E Benton Rd.
Temecula, CA 92592
owner

Barbara Saito
418 N Cloverdale Lane
Walnut, CA 91789
engineer





RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Carolyn Syms Luna
Director

TO: Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044
 County of Riverside County Clerk

FROM: Riverside County Planning Department
 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
P. O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, California 92211

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code.

EA42016/Plot Plan No. 23642/Variance No. 1875
Project Title/Case Numbers

Damaris Abraham
County Contact Person

951-955-5719
Phone Number

N/A

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to the State Clearinghouse)

T-Mobile West
Project Applicant

3257 E. Guasti Rd., Suite 200, Ontario, CA 91761
Address

The project site is located in the Southwest Area Plan, northerly of East Benton Road and westerly of De Portola Road, more specifically 38920 East Benton Road.

Project Location

The plot plan proposes a wireless communication facility, for T-Mobile, disguised as a 58' high palm tree with twelve (12) panel antennas located on three (3) sectors. The antennas and the pole shall not exceed a height of 50'. The 390 square foot lease area, surrounded by a split face block wall enclosure and landscaping will contain six (6) equipment cabinets and two (2) GPS antennas. Two 30' high live palm trees are also proposed to be planted within the project area. The variance proposes to increase the height of the wireless communication facility from 50 feet allowed by Ordinance No. 348 Section 19.410 to 58 feet, which thereby raises the maximum height allowed by 8 feet and to reduce the setback requirements from 58 feet to 19 feet from the rear property line, an encroachment of 39 feet due to the topography of the project's location.

Project Description

This is to advise that the Riverside County Planning Commission, as the lead agency, has approved the above-referenced project on May 18, 2011, and has made the following determinations regarding that project:

1. The project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (\$2,044 + \$64.00).
3. Mitigation measures WERE made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan/Program WAS adopted.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations WAS NOT adopted for the project.

This is to certify that the Mitigated Negative Declaration, with comments, responses, and record of project approval is available to the general public at: Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.

Damaris Abraham

Signature

Project Planner

Title

April 6, 2011


Date

Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR: _____

DM/j
Revised 8/25/2009
Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP23642\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\NOD.PP23642 Form.docx

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA42016 ZCFG05365 \$.2,108

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY



RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Carolyn Syms Luna
Director

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project/Case Number: Plot Plan No. 23642/Variance No. 1875

Based on the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project, subject to the proposed mitigation measures, will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES REQUIRED TO AVOID POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. (see Environmental Assessment and Conditions of Approval)

COMPLETED/REVIEWED BY:

By: Damaris Abraham Title: Project Planner Date: October 26, 2010

Applicant/Project Sponsor: T-Mobile West Date Submitted: August 5, 2008

ADOPTED BY: Planning Commission

Person Verifying Adoption: Damaris Abraham Date: May 18, 2011

The Mitigated Negative Declaration may be examined, along with documents referenced in the initial study, if any, at:

Riverside County Planning Department 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501

For additional information, please contact Damaris Abraham at (951) 955-5719.

Revised: 10/16/07

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP23642\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\Mitigated Negative Declaration.PP23642.docx

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA42016 ZCFG05365 \$2,108

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

N* REPRINTED * R0808082

4080 Lemon Street
Second Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road
Suite A
Murrieta, CA 92563
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd
Indio, CA 92211
(760) 863-8271

Received from: T-MOBILE \$64.00
paid by: CK 1214293 & 1153
CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME FOR EA42016
paid towards: CFG05365 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
at parcel: 38920 E BENTON RD TEM
appl type: CFG3

By _____ Aug 05, 2008 09:06
MBRASWEL posting date Aug 05, 2008

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST: RECORD FEES	\$64.00

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

N* REPRINTED * R1001167

4080 Lemon Street
Second Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road
Suite A
Murrieta, CA 92563
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd
Indio, CA 92211
(760) 863-8271

Received from: T-MOBILE
paid by: CK 1672542
CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME FOR EA42016
paid towards: CFG05365 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
at parcel: 38920 E BENTON RD TEM
appl type: CFG3

\$2,010.25

By _____ Feb 02, 2010 15:17
SBROSTRO posting date Feb 02, 2010

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST	\$2,010.25

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

J* REPRINTED * R1100231

4080 Lemon Street
Second Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road
Suite A
Murrieta, CA 92563
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd
Indio, CA 92211
(760) 863-8271

Received from: T-MOBILE \$33.75
paid by: VI 066463
CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME FOR EA42016
paid towards: CFG05365 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
at parcel: 38920 E BENTON RD TEM
appl type: CFG3

By _____ Jan 11, 2011 10:16
MGARDNER posting date Jan 11, 2011

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST	\$33.75

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!