

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

402B



REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

DATE

10/29/2012

Tina Grande

Departmental Concurrence

**FROM:** TLMA - Planning Department

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
November 1, 2012

**SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 920** – Foundation-Regular – Applicant: D & J 60 LLC – Engineer/Representative: VSL Engineering - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RUR-RR) (5 Acre Minimum Lot Size) and Rural: Rural Mountainous (RUR:RM) (10 Acre Minimum Lot Size) – Location: Easterly of Anza Road, southerly of Santa Rita Road, and westerly of Los Caballos Road - 59.55 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum Lot Size (R-A-10) and Rural Residential (R-R) (1/2 Acre Minimum Lot Size) – **REQUEST:** This General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Foundation Component of the subject site from Rural to Community Development and to amend the General Plan Land Use designation of the subject site from Rural Residential (RUR-RR) (5 Acre Minimum Lot Size) and Rural Mountainous (RUR-RM) (10 Acre Minimum Lot Size) to Medium Density Residential (CD-MDR)

*Carolyn Sym's Luna*

Carolyn Sym's Luna  
Planning Director

Initials:  
CSL:th

<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 0	In Current Year Budget:	0
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	0
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	0

<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b>	<b>Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Requires 4/5 Vote</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:**

**County Executive Office Signature**

Consent  
 Policy  
  
 Consent  
 Policy

**Prev. Agn. Ref.** September 14, 2010

**District:** Third

**Agenda Number:** 15.5

15.1

(2-5 DU/AC) - APN(s): 966-380-028, 966-380-029, 966-380-030, 966-380-031, 966-380-032

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** The Planning Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors tentatively decline to adopt an order initiating proceedings for the above referenced general plan amendment based on the attached report. The initiation of proceedings by the Board of Supervisors for the amendment of the General Plan, or any element thereof, shall not imply any such amendment will be approved.

**BACKGROUND:** The initiation of proceedings for any General Plan Amendment (GPA) requires the adoption of an order by the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Director is required to prepare a report and recommendation on every GPA application and submit it to the Board of Supervisors. Prior to the submittal to the Board, comments on the application are requested from the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission comments are included in the report to the Board. The Board will either approve or disapprove the initiation of proceedings for the GPA requested in the application. The consideration of the initiation of proceedings by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to this application does not require a noticed public hearing. However, the applicant was notified by mail of the time, date and place when the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors would consider this GPA initiation request.

If the Board of Supervisors adopts an order initiating proceedings pursuant to this application, the proposed amendment will thereafter be processed, heard and decided in accordance with all the procedures applicable to GPA applications, including noticed public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The adoption of an order initiating proceedings does not imply that any amendment will be approved. If the Board of Supervisors declines to adopt an order initiating proceedings, no further proceedings on this application will occur.

The Board of Supervisors established the procedures for initiation of GPA applications with the adoption of Ordinance No. 348.4573 (effective May 8, 2008), which amended Article II of that ordinance.

The proposed amendment is located in the "Rancho California," "Pauba Valley" and "Wolf Valley" communities within the General Plan's Southwest Area Plan. The mountainous and rural nature of these communities provides a distinct character for the area. The subject site is surrounded by the Rural Residential designation to the north, south, east and west with some Rural Mountainous found to the south and currently serves as a rural buffer between higher and lower density areas. Given the current land use designations of the subject parcels along with the existing land use designations of the parcels immediately surrounding the subject site, the current proposal would be inconsistent with the existing development pattern found in the area. There are in fact some occurrences of vacant parcels that are designated CD:MDR in the area near the subject parcels; however, efficient land use would see those vacant CD:MDR parcels develop prior to designating additional parcels as CD:MDR.

The subject parcels also fall within the County's proposed "Wine Country Community Plan." The purpose of the community plan "is to provide a blueprint for future growth that ensures that future development activities will enhance, and not impede, the quality of life for existing and future residents, while providing opportunities for continued preservation and expansion of winery and equestrian operations." The community plan has identified the subject site as being

within the "Wine Country-Winery District," the primary purpose of this district is "to promote the establishment of additional commercial activities that support tourism while ensuring long-term viability of the wine industry." The community plan also proposes a required density of ten acres or more for residential tract and parcel maps. Although the Community Plan had not been adopted at the time this staff report was written, the plan is a direct indication of the County's vision for the area. The current proposal would be inconsistent with the goals of the community plan and subsequently the overall vision for the area. At this time, the applicant is requesting to be removed from the Community Plan.

In addition, a letter in opposition of the proposal, received from the City of Temecula dated August 24, 2010, identified the three western parcels of the subject site as being within the City's General Plan Planning Area and designates the parcels for vineyards and other agricultural uses at a density of 0.1 dwelling units per acre. The City also highlighted that an objective of their General Plan is to "Preserve rural residential densities in the area surrounding the Morgan Hill Specific Plan by promoting only Rural density residential development..." The current land use designations for the subject site are consistent with the City of Temecula's vision for the area as well and the proposed amendment would create further inconsistencies with the vision for the area.

GPA00986 and GPA01026 were both Foundation Component General Plan Amendments directly to the west of the subject site proposing amendments from the Rural Foundation of the County's General Plan to the Community Development Foundation and were tentatively declined for initiation by the County Board of Supervisors on March 24, 2009. These cases were declined for initiation by the Board due to the rural nature of the area and the ability of the subject site to serve as a rural buffer between higher and lower density parcels in the area as well as the lack of infrastructure that currently exists there. GPA00986 was subsequently withdrawn and GPA01026 was moved forward to the Board for final denial on October 5, 2010.

Although staff initially recommended initiation of the proposal, this was prior to the Wine Country Community Plan boundaries being set and prior to receiving input from the City of Temecula. It is also important to note that the attached Planning Commission Staff Report and Director's Report, both dated February 4, 2009, were written prior to the Wine Country Community boundaries being set and receipt of the City of Temecula's letter.