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

803B



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE: April 25, 2012

SUBJECT: AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE CASE NO. 1000, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7659, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 35815 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Foli Family Partnership – Engineer/Representative: VSL Engineering – First Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan – Rural: Rural Mountainous (RM) (10 Acre Minimum) and Santa Rosa Plateau Policy Area (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northwesterly corner of El Calamar Road and Carancho Road – 44.66 Gross Acres – Zoning: Light Agriculture – 20 Acre Minimum (A-1-20) – REQUEST: The Agricultural Preserve Case proposes to diminish the Rancho California Agricultural Preserve No. 18 by 44.66 acres. The Change of Zone proposes to change the current zoning classification from Light Agriculture – 20 Acre Minimum (A-1-20) to Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5). The Tentative Tract Map proposes a Schedule "D" subdivision of 44.66 acres into eight (8) residential parcels with a minimum parcel size of 5 acres. A total of 10.8 acres of this project will be held in conservation on proposed lots 1 through 5, and lot 8.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

1) THE PLANNING DIRECTOR RECOMMENDS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

<u>APPROVAL</u> of AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE CASE NO. 1000, a proposal that proposes to diminish the Rancho California Agricultural Preserve No. 18 by 44.66 acres and cancel the associated land conservation contract as depicted on Map No. 1000, subject to the conditions of approval and based on the findings and conclusions contained in Attachment No. 1 and pending adoption of the resolution for the Tentative

Carolyn Syms Luna
Planning Director

Initials: CSL:ms/hs/dm

(continued on attached pages)

⊠ Policy

Consent

Dep't Recomm.: Per Exec. Ofc.:

ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Prev. Agn. Ref.

District: 1/1

Agenda Number:

16.1

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

Re: AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE CASE NO. 1000, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7659,
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 35815

Page 2 of 2

Certificate of Cancelation; and,

2) AT THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2010 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING, THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDED APPROVAL; and THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDS:

<u>ADOPTION</u> of a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION for ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41950, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

<u>TENTATIVE APPROVAL</u> of CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7659, amending the zoning classification for the subject property from Light Agriculture – 20 Acre Minimum (A-1-20) to Residential Agricultural – 5 Acre Minimum (R-A-5), in accordance with **Exhibit# 3**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report, pending final adoption of the Zoning Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors; and,

<u>APPROVAL</u> of **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 35815**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The Foli Family Trust, is requesting consideration of Agricultural Preserve Case No. 345 (AG01000) proposing to diminish Rancho California Agricultural Preserve No. 18, Map No. 354, and cancel the land conservation contract as it applies to a portion of the Tentative Tract Map (which is the alternate proposed land use). On July 30, 2009 the Comprehensive Agricultural Preserve Technical Advisory Committee (CAPTAC) considered an application to diminish Rancho California Agricultural Preserve No. 18, Map No. 354, as depicted on Map No. 1000.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 51284.1, a copy of the complete application for tentative cancellation was submitted to the State Department of Conservation (SDC) for a mandatory 30-day review and comment period. Staff received no responses. Appraisals are attached to this Form 11.

CAPTAC recommended APPROVAL of the proposed diminishment citing that the cancelation was consistent with the provisions of the Agricultural Land Conservation Act of 1965. The Planning Department concurs with CAPTAC's conclusion.

Lastly, the Environmental Assessment (EA) that went to the Planning Commission did not include a reference to the Agricultural Case on the title page or in the project description. The Agricultural Case is not acted on by the Planning Commission in any way, so the information was essential at that stage. Additionally, the public will have another opportunity to review the document when public notice for the Board hearing is posted. It is important to note, however, that all analysis of environmental impacts were included in the EA. For Board, the EA title page and project description have been revised to include the Agricultural Case and the revised EA has replaced the original EA in the attached Staff Report package.