

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

103B



FROM: TLMA – Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
October 20, 2014

SUBJECT: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Stone Star Riverside, LLC – Engineer/Representative: WJ McKeever, Inc. – Third/Third Supervisorial District – Winchester Zoning Area – Harvest Valley / Winchester Area Plan: Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD: MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units/Acre) – Location: Northerly of Simpson Road, southerly of Grand Avenue, Easterly of Leon Road and westerly of Highway 79 – 39.83 Gross Acres – Zoning: One Family Dwellings (R-1) - **REQUEST:** The **Change of Zone** proposes to change the project site's zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). **Tentative Tract Map No. 32394, Revised Map No. 1** proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a CFD, adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)



Juan C. Perez TLMA Director/
Interim Planning Director

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost:	POLICY/CONSENT (per Exec. Office)
COST	\$	\$	\$	\$	Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/>
NET COUNTY COST	\$	\$	\$	\$	
SOURCE OF FUNDS: Deposit based funds				Budget Adjustment:	
				For Fiscal Year:	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

County Executive Office Signature BY: Tina Grande

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY:  11/17/14
DATE
GREGORY P. PRIAMOS
County Executive Office

- A-30
- 4/5 Vote
- Positions Added
- Change Order

Prev. Agn. Ref.: _____ District: 3/3 Agenda Number: _____

16-1

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FORM 11: Tentative Tract Map No. 32364, Revised Map No. 1 and Change of Zone No. 7789**

DATE: January 27, 2015

PAGE: Page 2 of 2

ADOPT a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42468**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVE **CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789**, amending the zoning classification, for the subject property from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4), in accordance with Exhibit #3; and,

APPROVE **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report, and

ADOPT **ORDINANCE NO. 348.4795** amending the zoning in the Homeland Area shown on Map No. 2.2369 Change of Zone No. 7789 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

BACKGROUND:

The zone change proposes to change the project site's zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). The map revision proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a Community Facilities District (CFD), adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite.

The Planning Commission heard the item on September 17, 2014. There were some general questions regarding park timing. The Commission approved the item with a 5-0 vote.


The project was previously approved with the requirement for a CFD to fund flood control improvements for the area. This revised map proposes to no longer require the CFD and proposes that the project build all required improvements to convey offsite flows through the site and to the nearby Salt Creek Channel. The project site is about 3,700 feet from the channel. The applicant has been working with the property owners to gain permission to construct a channel through their property to convey the flows to the Salt Creek. At this time the applicant has not secured the permission from these property owners, but will continue to attempt to do so. In accordance with Section 3.2.J of Ordinance 460, the Ordinance that governs subdivisions, if the applicant or their successor-in-interest does not obtain the necessary dedication(s), the Planning Department is informing the Board that eminent domain proceedings may need to be instituted and considered by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in a separate future hearing, or the County would need to waive the fulfillment of the condition.

Impact on Citizens and Businesses

The impacts of this project have been evaluated through the environmental review and public hearing process by Planning staff and the Planning Commission.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. **Planning Commission Staff Report**
- B. **Ordinance No. 348.4787**



RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

*Steve Weiss AICP
Planning Director*

DATE: 1/29/15

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Planning Department - Riverside Office

SUBJECT: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1

(Charge your time to these case numbers)

The attached item(s) require the following action(s) by the Board of Supervisors:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Administrative Action (Receive & File; EOT) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Set for Hearing (Legislative Action Required; CZ, GPA, SP, SPA) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Labels provided If Set For Hearing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish in Newspaper: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 20 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 30 day | (3rd Dist) Press Enterprise and The Californian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Consent Calendar | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitigated Negative Declaration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Policy Calendar (Resolutions; Ordinances; PNC) | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Day <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 20 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 30 day |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Place on Section Initiation Proceeding (GPIP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notify Property Owners (app/agencies/property owner labels provided) |
| | Controversial: <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO |

Designate Newspaper used by Planning Department for Notice of Hearing:
(3rd Dist) Press Enterprise and The Californian

No Specific Board Date Needed

Riverside Office · 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, California 92502-1409
(951) 955-3200 · Fax (951) 955-1811

Desert Office · 38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, California 92211
(760) 863-8277 · Fax (760) 863-7555

"Planning Our Future... Preserving Our Past"

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




FROM: TLMA – Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
October 20, 2014

SUBJECT: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Stone Star Riverside, LLC – Engineer/Representative: WJ McKeever, Inc. – Third/Third Supervisorial District – Winchester Zoning Area – Harvest Valley / Winchester Area Plan: Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD: MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units/Acre) – Location: Northerly of Simpson Road, southerly of Grand Avenue, Easterly of Leon Road and westerly of Highway 79 – 39.83 Gross Acres – Zoning: One Family Dwellings (R-1) - **REQUEST:** The **Change of Zone** proposes to change the project site's zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). **Tentative Tract Map No. 32394, Revised Map No. 1** proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a CFD, adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)


 Juan C. Perez TLMA Director/
 Interim Planning Director

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost:	POLICY/CONSENT (per Exec. Office)
COST	\$	\$	\$	\$	Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/>
NET COUNTY COST	\$	\$	\$	\$	
SOURCE OF FUNDS: Deposit based funds				Budget Adjustment:	
				For Fiscal Year:	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- A-30
- Positions Added
- 4/5 Vote
- Change Order

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

District:3/3

Agenda Number:

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
 BY: GREGORY P. PRIAMOS
 DATE: 11/17/14
 Departmental Concurrence

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FORM 11: Tentative Tract Map No. 32364, Revised Map No. 1 and Change of Zone No. 7789**

DATE: January 27, 2015

PAGE: Page 2 of 2

ADOPT a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42468**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVE **CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789**, amending the zoning classification, for the subject property from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4), in accordance with Exhibit #3; and,

APPROVE **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report, and

ADOPT **ORDINANCE NO. 348.4795** amending the zoning in the Homeland Area shown on Map No. 2.2369 Change of Zone No. 7789 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

BACKGROUND:

The zone change proposes to change the project site's zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). The map revision proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a Community Facilities District (CFD), adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite.

The Planning Commission heard the item on September 17, 2014. There were some general questions regarding park timing. The Commission approved the item with a 5-0 vote.

The project was previously approved with the requirement for a CFD to fund flood control improvements for the area. This revised map proposes to no longer require the CFD and proposes that the project build all required improvements to convey offsite flows through the site and to the nearby Salt Creek Channel. The project site is about 3,700 feet from the channel. The applicant has been working with the property owners to gain permission to construct a channel through their property to convey the flows to the Salt Creek. At this time the applicant has not secured the permission from these property owners, but will continue to attempt to do so. In accordance with Section 3.2.J of Ordinance 460, the Ordinance that governs subdivisions, if the applicant or their successor-in-interest does not obtain the necessary dedication(s), the Planning Department is informing the Board that eminent domain proceedings may need to be instituted and considered by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors in a separate future hearing, or the County would need to waive the fulfillment of the condition.

Impact on Citizens and Businesses

The impacts of this project have been evaluated through the environmental review and public hearing process by Planning staff and the Planning Commission.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. **Planning Commission Staff Report**
- B. **Ordinance No. 348.4787**

1 ORDINANCE NO. 348.4795

2 AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

3 AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 348 RELATING TO ZONING

4 The Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside ordains as follows:

5 Section 1. Section 4.1 of Ordinance No. 348, and official Zoning Plan Map No. 2, as
6 amended, are further amended by placing in effect in the Winchester Area, the zone or zones as shown on
7 the map entitled "Change of Official Zoning Plan Amending Ordinance No. 348, Map No. 2.2369,
8 Change of Zone Case No. 7789" which map is made a part of this ordinance.

9 Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect 30 days after its adoption.

10
11 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY
12 OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 By: _____
14 Chairman, Board of Supervisors

15 ATTEST:
16 KECIA HARPER-IHEM
17 Clerk of the Board


18
19 By: _____

20
21 (SEAL)

22
23 APPROVED AS TO FORM
24 November 14, 2014


25 By: 
26 MICHELLE CLACK
27 Deputy County Counsel

WINCHESTER AREA
SEC 29, T5S, R2W, S. B. B. & M.



R-4
PARCEL 8
OF MAP OF SUBDIVISION OF
SECTION 29, T5S, R2W, SBM
BOOK 1 PAGE 11 RECORDS OF SURVEY
GROSS: 39.09 ACRES
NET: 38.18 ACRES


R-4 PLANNED RESIDENTIAL



MAP NO. 2.2369
CHANGE OF OFFICIAL ZONING PLAN
AMENDING
MAP NO. 2, ORDINANCE NO. 348


CHANGE OF ZONE CASE NO. 7789
ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 348.4795

WINCHESTER AREA
SEC 29, T5S, R2W, S. B. B. & M.



R-4
PARCEL 8
OF MAP OF SUBDIVISION OF
SECTION 29, T5S, R2W, SBM
BOOK 1 PAGE 11 RECORDS OF SURVEY
GROSS: 39.09 ACRES
NET: 38.18 ACRES

R-4 PLANNED RESIDENTIAL



MAP NO. 2.2369
CHANGE OF OFFICIAL ZONING PLAN
AMENDING
MAP NO. 2, ORDINANCE NO. 348

CHANGE OF ZONE CASE NO. 7789
ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 348.4795



RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER
SEPTEMBER 17, 2014**

I. AGENDA ITEM 4.3

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO.

1 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Stone Star Riverside, LLC – Engineer/Representative: WJ McKeever, Inc. – Third/Third Supervisorial District – Winchester Zoning Area – Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan: Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD: MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units/Acre) – Location: Northerly of Simpson Road, southerly of Grand Avenue, Easterly of Leon Road and westerly of Highway 79 – 39.83 Gross Acres – Zoning: One Family Dwellings (R-1). (Legislative)

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Change of Zone proposes to change the project site's zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). Tentative Tract Map No. 32394, Revised Map No. 1 proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a CFD, adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features onsite and offsite.

III. MEETING SUMMARY:

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Matt Straite at (951) 955-8631 or email mstraite@rctlma.org.

Spoke in favor of the proposed project:

- Trip Hord, 5029 La Mart Dr., Riverside (951) 684-9615.
- Greg Lansing, 12671 High Bluff, San Diego, (858) 523-0917.

No one spoke in opposition or in a neutral position.

IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES:

None

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

Public Comment: **Closed**

Motion by Commissioner Petty, 2nd by Commissioner Sloman

A vote of 5-0

CD The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Mary Stark, TLMA Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-7436 or email at mcstark@rctlma.org.



RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER
SEPTEMBER 17, 2014**

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

- **ADOPT OF THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**; and,
- **APPROVE OF CHANGE OF ZONE 7789**; and,
- **APPROVE OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1**

CD The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Mary Stark, TLMA Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-7436 or email at mcstark@rctlma.org.

Agenda Item No.:
Area Plan: Harvest Valley/ Winchester
Zoning Area: Winchester
Supervisory District: Third/Third
Project Planner: Matt Straite
Planning Commission: September 17, 2014

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED
MAP NO. 1
Environmental Assessment No. 42468
Applicant: Stone Star Riverside, LLC
Engineer/Representative: WJ McKeever, Inc.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

Change of Zone No. 7789 proposes to change the project site's zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). A development manual is required and has been provided, see attached.

Tentative Tract Map No. 32394 Revised Map No. 1 proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a Community Facilities District (CFD), adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite.

The project is located in the third district, in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, more specifically it is located northerly of Simpson Road, southerly of Grand Avenue, Easterly of Leon Road and westerly of Highway 79.

ISSUES OF POTENTIAL CONCERN:

Increase in unit count

The project is proposing to increase the unit count for the project from 127 residential lots to 166 (a unit count increase of 39 units). The applicant has indicated this is required to offset the cost of the infrastructure required to complete a new drainage facility for the project which will also have regional benefits. See below for more detail.

Design Manual

Based on the proposed unit increase, the project is not consistent with the existing zoning of R-1. The applicant has proposed to revise the zoning from R-1 to R-4 (Planned Residential). The R-4 zoning is unique in that it has a number of specific requirements not seen in other zoning classifications. The idea of R-4 zoning is that the applicant can create smaller lots than most other residential zones permit (down to 3,500 square feet), however, the average lot size must be at least 6,000 square feet. The intent is to have a community with parks and open space that offset the smaller lot sizes. Additionally, the R-4 zoning requires the inclusion of a Design Manual which shows more detail than most subdivisions at the tentative map stage. A copy of the proposed Design Manual is attached for review.

3.2.J Requirements

All subdivisions are administered using Ordinance No. 460, the subdivision ordinance. As a result of Section 3.2.I of Ordinance 460, and in accordance with Section 3.2.J. the applicant has attempted to secure written assurances from the owners of the properties underlying the off-site improvement/alignment (as shown on the Exhibit 3¹) that sufficient right-of-way can and will be provided. In the event the above referenced property owner(s) or their successor(s)-in-interest does/do not

¹ Not GIS Exhibit 3, but the stamped Exhibit 3 provided by Flood control and referenced in their conditions of approval showing offsite flood control requirements.

provide to the Transportation Department and/or Flood Control District the necessary dedication(s), eminent domain proceedings may need to be instituted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

This project requires the use of Section 3.2.J which more specifically requires the applicant to attempt to gain permission from the offsite property owner. The project was previously approved with the requirement for a CFD to fund flood control improvements for the area. This revised version of the map proposes to no longer require the CFD and proposes that the project build all required improvements to convey offsite flows through the site and to the nearby Salt Creek Channel. The project site is about 3,700 feet from the channel. The applicant has been working with the property owners to gain permission to construct a channel through their property to convey the flows to the Salt Creek. At this time the applicant has not secured the permission from these property owners. See Flood conditions 10.Flood.1 through 4.

Highway 79 Policy Area

The proposed project is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area. This policy basically requires that all projects limit development so that the total residential unit count of a project is 9% below the mid point density of the existing General Plan Land Use designation. The previous version of the map was below this threshold. The site is 39.83 acres, in a Medium Density Residential (MDR) Designation, which is 2-5 Dwelling Units per Acre. That makes the midpoint 3.5 D.U./Ac.. At 9% below the midpoint the project would be allowed 126.5 units. However, the project is also conditioned to construct an offsite channel from their site to the Salt Creek Channel. Because the project is required to construct this, and because no residential units can be placed on these improvements after they are constructed (it is an open top channel), the calculation of required right of way is factored into the calculation for purposes of determination of consistency with the Highway 79 Policy Area. The surface area of the channel offsets the 39.5 unit exceedance of the Highway 79 Policy Area.²

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Existing General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): | Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) |
| 2. Surrounding General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): | Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) to the north, south, east and west |
| 3. Proposed Zoning (Ex. #3): | Planned Residential (R-4) |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #2): | One Family Dwelling (R-1) to the north and south, Light Agriculture- 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10) to the east and west |
| 5. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1): | Vacant |
| 6. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1): | Vacant and farmland |
| 7. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 39.83
Total Proposed Lots: 166
Proposed Min. Lot Size: 5,000 |

² The right of way for the offsite channel is an average of 120 feet wide, and generally 4,140 feet long for a total surface area of 414,000 square feet or about 11.5 acres. The project is proposing 166 units and the Policy permits 127.5; a shortage of 39.5 units. 39.5 units divided by 3.185 D.U./Ac (9% below the 3.5 D.U./Ac midpoint) equals about 12 acres. Thus, because the offsite channel will permanently eliminate the development potential of 11.5 acres of MDR property, the loss of the development rights related to that property is being attributed to the project.

Schedule: A

8. Environmental Concerns:

See attached environmental assessment

RECOMMENDATIONS:

THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

ADOPT a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 42468**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789, amending the zoning classification, for the subject property from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4), in accordance with Exhibit #3; and,

APPROVE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

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 Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) on the Harvest Valley/ Winchester Area Plan.
2. The proposed use, residential parcels with a minimum of 3,500 square feet, is permitted use in the Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) designation.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) to the north, south, east and west.
4. The zoning for the subject site is One Family Dwelling (R-1).
5. The proposed zoning for the site is Planned Residential (R-4).
6. The proposed residential use, is consistent with the development standards set forth in the R-4 zone.
7. As a result of Section 3.2.I, and in accordance with Section 3.2.J. of Ordinance No. 460, the applicant has attempted to secure written assurances from the owners of the properties underlying the off-site improvement/alignment (as shown on the Exhibit 3³) that sufficient right-of-way can and will be provided. In the event the above referenced property owner(s) or their successor(s)-in-interest does/do not provide to the Transportation Department and/or Flood Control District the necessary dedication(s), eminent domain proceedings may need to be instituted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

³ Not GIS Exhibit 3, but the stamped Exhibit 3 provided by the Riverside County Flood Control District and referenced in their conditions of approval showing offsite flood control requirements.

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1

Planning Commission Staff Report: September 17, 2014

Page 4 of 5

8. The proposed revisions to the map include increasing the number of lots within approved Tentative Tract Map No. 32394 from 127 residential lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a CFD, adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite.
9. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned One Family Dwelling (R-1) to the north and south, Light Agriculture- 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10) to the east and west.
10. Similar uses have been constructed and are operating in the project vicinity.
11. This project is not located within a Criteria Area of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
12. Environmental Assessment No. 42468 identified the following potentially significant impacts:
 - a. Agriculture & Forest Resources
 - b. Biological Resources
 - c. Cultural Resources
 - d. Geology/ Soils
 - e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - f. Hydrology/ Water Quality
 - g. Noise
 - h. Recreation

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.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Planned Residential (R-4) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
3. The proposed project is consistent with the Schedule A map requirements of Ordinance No. 460, and with other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 460.
4. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.
5. The proposed project is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
6. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
7. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP).

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; or,
 - b. A high fire area.

3. The project site is located within:
 - a. An area of high liquefaction potential;
 - b. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area;
 - c. County Service Area No. 146;
 - d. Area with an approved area drainage plan;
 - e. A 100-year flood plain; and,
 - f. Dam inundation area.

4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 462-020-010.

ms

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\TR32394R1\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\DH-PC\Staff Report.docx

Date Prepared: 01/01/01

Date Revised: 08/19/14

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CZ7789 TR32394R1

VICINITY/POLICY AREAS

Supervisor Stone
District 3



Feet Orthophotos Flown 2/11 (WR, CV) or 4/07 (REMAP, Blythe)

1,340 Printed by mstraito on 6/25/2014

0 335 670

1 inch = 667 feet

The County of Riverside assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Data and information represented on this map is subject to updates, modifications and may not be complete or appropriate for all purposes. County GIS users are encouraged to verify information for the most current information. Do not copy or reuse this map.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT



CZ7789 TR32394R1

EXISTING GENERAL PLAN

N



Supervisor Stone
District 1



Orthophotos Flown 2/11 (WR, CV) or 4/07 (REMAP, Blythe)
Printed by mstrait on 6/25/2014



The County of Riverside assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Data and information represented on this map is subject to updates, modifications and may not be complete or appropriate for all purposes. County GIS and other sources should be queried for the most current information. Do not copy or reuse this map.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT CZ7789 TR32394R1



Supervisor Stone
District 1

LAND USE



Orthophotos Flown 2/11 (WR, CV) or 4/07 (REMAP, Blythe)
Printed by mstrait on 6/25/2014



The County of Riverside assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Data and information represented on this map is subject to updates, modifications and may not be complete or appropriate for all purposes. County GIS and other sources should be queried for the most current information. Do not copy or reuse this map.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CZ7789 TR32394R1

PROPOSED ZONING

N



Supervisor Stone
District 1



Orthophotos Flown 2/11 (WR, CV) or 4/07 (REMAP, Blythe)
Printed by mstrait on 6/25/2014



The County of Riverside assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Data and information represented on this map is subject to updates, modifications and may not be complete or appropriate for all purposes. County GIS and other sources should be queried for the most current information. Do not copy or reuse this map.

RAILROAD



WALL AND FENCE LEGEND




- 7" HIGH PERIMETER BLOCK WALL (ONE SIDED SPLIT FACE BLOCK TANK)
- 7" HIGH VIEW WALL ON TOP OF RETAINING WALL 3' MAX WITH 2 ONE SIDED SPLIT FACE BLOCK TANK AND 4 GLASS
- 6" HIGH PERIMETER BLOCK WALL (ONE SIDED SPLIT FACE BLOCK TANK)
- 5'-6" HIGH VINYL SIDE YARD FENCE (COLOR TO BE WHITE)
- 5'-6" HIGH TUBULAR STEEL VIEW FENCE (COLOR TO BE BLACK)
- BLOCK PLASTER - SEE VARIS (SPLIT FACE BLOCK TANK)

MAINTENANCE LEGEND

- VALLEY WIDE RECREATION



- 1 CASI ALUMINUM POST CAP
- 2 IMPERVED GLASS
- 3 CONCRETE FOR FOUNDATION
- 4 BROWNSH POLE & STANCHION
- 5 SPLIT FACE BLOCK WALL
- 6 SPLIT FACE CAP
- 7 10" CMU BRICK MASONRY WITH CONSTRUCTION AD-EMBE
- 8 RETAINING WALL PER CIVIL



Tract No. 32394 Eucalyptus Grove

Conceptual Design Manual

Riverside County, California

August 29, 2013

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN MANUAL

FOR

Eucalyptus Grove

(TR 32394)

Submitted to

County of Riverside, California

August 29, 2013

APPLICANT/PROPERTY OWNER(S)

Stone Star Riverside, LLC
12671 High Bluff Drive
Suite 150
San Diego, CA 92130
(858) 523-0719

AGENT/ENGINEER

W.J. McKeever Inc.
900 E. Washington Street
Suite 208
Colton, CA 92324
(909) 825-8048

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PURPOSE.....	5
2.0	PROJECT BACKGROUND & DESCRIPTION	5
3.0	EXISTING CONDITIONS.....	6
4.0	RELATIONSHIP TO SURROUNDING PROPERTIES	6
5.0	PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	7
5.1.1	Single Family Residential	7
5.2	Entry Monuments, Walls & Project Theme	8
5.2.1	General Guidelines.....	9
5.3	Front Yard Landscaping	9
5.4	Private Open Space.....	9
6.0	ARCHITECTURE	19
6.1	General Guidelines	19
6.2	Architectural styles	19
6.2.1	California Ranch	20
6.2.2	Craftsman.....	21
6.2.3	Mediterranean	23
6.2.4	Monterey.....	24
7.0	UTILITIES	26
8.0	COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (CC&R'S).....	26

EXHIBITS

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. USGS Topographic Map
- C. FEMA FIRM Map
- D. Riverside County General Plan
- E. Riverside County Existing Zoning
- F. Area Circulation Map
- G. Typical Lot Detail
- H. Conceptual Wall & Entry Plan

FIGURES

- 1. California Ranch Style Architecture
- 2. Craftsman Style Architecture
- 3. Mediterranean Style Architecture
- 4. Monterey Style Architecture

1.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Conceptual Design Manual is to describe the overall design concept for Tentative Tract Map 32394 (Eucalyptus Grove) and outline the design details that will be incorporated into the final design decisions. This manual includes both design standards and guidelines. Variations to either the design standards or guidelines may be considered by the Planning Commission. The guidelines in this document will lay out both functional and aesthetic design concepts as an overall strategy to be followed at the time of development. The primary objective is to establish a consistent theme throughout the project. This document will establish the conceptual architectural styles, overall theme, wall and fence concepts, and pedestrian connectivity to be used in the future build out of this tract. This Conceptual Design Manual is being processed in conformance with Riverside County Zoning Ordinance No. 348, Article VIII, Section 8.95b.

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND & DESCRIPTION

Eucalyptus Grove is located at the Northwest corner of the intersection of Simpson Road and Beeler Road, the BNSF Railroad bounds the project to the north, in the Winchester area of Riverside County (Refer to **Exhibit A – Vicinity Map**). The project proposes to subdivide 39.83 acres into 166 single-family lots. The lots will consist of 5,000 square feet, minimum, single family detached lots.

There is a graded drainage channel that traverses the site from north to south approximately in the middle of the site. This channel is a part of the Winchester Ranch CFD Drainage Study that was approved by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The proposed project is consistent with Riverside County's R-4 Zone, which allows for minimum lot sizes of 3,500 square feet and an average lot size of 6,000 square feet. The Eucalyptus Grove project contains minimum lot sizes of 5,000 square feet and an average lot size of 6,371 square feet. In order to ensure the quality and cohesiveness of projects zoned R-4, Riverside County requires additional design details during planning stages. The requirement for these conceptual design details helps ensure that County design objectives are met. By implementing the following design points, this project meets the County's design objectives for the properties zoned R-4:

- Providing transition and buffer zones to ensure that the project blends into and is sensitive to the surrounding area.
- Ensuring that new homes are constructed in neighborhoods that are interesting and varied in appearance.
- Providing a sense of privacy and personal space for each residential unit.

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The property is currently raw land that is covered with Eucalyptus Trees. There are no easements on the property except road and pipeline easements as part of Simpson Road on the South boundary.

The topography of the site is relatively flat with the exception of a rock outcropping in the northwest corner. The site generally slopes from the North to South at an approximate gradient of 0.8% (see **Exhibit B – USGS Topographic Map**). The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone “X” (areas determined to be outside of the 100-year and 500-year Flood Plain) and the southeast corner of the site is located within Flood Zone “A” (areas determined to be within the 100-year Flood Plain – no base flood elevations determined). Refer to **Exhibit C – FIRM Map** (Map No. 06065C2080G dated August 28, 2008).

Per the RCIP, the property currently has land use designations of Medium Density Residential (MDR) and the site is currently zoned Rural Residential (R-1) (Refer to **Exhibit D – General Plan** for the current land use designation and **Exhibit E – Existing Zoning** for a depiction of the zoning).

Transportation corridors and area circulation will be developed in conformance with the County’s General Plan. Refer to **Exhibit F – Area Circulation Map** for a representation of the major roadways in the areas of the subject site.

4.0 RELATIONSHIP TO SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

The surrounding properties in the area include vacant land and various agricultural operations. Some agricultural uses continue to operate in the area, primarily to the east.

The surrounding General Plan land use designations are as follows:

- North: Medium Density Residential (MDR)
- South: Medium Density Residential (MDR)
- East: Medium Density Residential (MDR)
- West: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

The surrounding zoning districts are as follows:

- North: Single-Family Residential (R-1)
- South: Single-Family Residential (R-1)
- East: Light Agricultural (A1-10)
- West: Light Agricultural (A1-10)

5.0 PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Eucalyptus Grove development is intended as a planned residential community, which includes various residential mixes. In addition the development will include open space and a common community design identity.

The density proposed for the Eucalyptus Grove project is 3.97 units per acre, which conforms to the existing General Plan designation of Medium Density Residential (2-5 dwelling units per acre).

The residential uses within the Eucalyptus Grove development consist of single-family lots. Residential land uses for single-family within Eucalyptus Grove will be subject to the requirements in Ordinance 348, Article VIIIId of the County of Riverside's zoning ordinance.

The Eucalyptus Grove development plan implements one type of housing product, traditional single family lots.

5.1.1 Single Family Residential

The residential area has been planned in a vibrant and sustainable manner to set forth a safe, effective, and attractive pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages connectivity and interaction.

Riverside County Minimum R-4 Standards

R-4 Minimum Yard Requirements	
Minimum Lot Size	3,500 S.F.
Average Lot Size	6,000 S.F.
Minimum Lot Width	40'
Minimum Lot Depth	80'
Maximum Building Height	40'
Minimum Front Yard Setback	20'
Interior Side Yard	5'
Corner Lot Side Yard	10'
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	10'

5.2 Entry Monuments, Walls & Project Theme

Monumentation features and entry landscaping have not been determined for Eucalyptus Grove, but will be planned and designed to establish a theme for this planned residential community. A comprehensive sign plan will be provided for the development. Materials, colors, and construction methods for entry monuments are subject to some variation, so long as the proposed character and theme of the monuments is preserved and per the approval of the Planning Department. The primary entry for the community will be located at the southern end of the project, off Simpson Avenue. (Refer to **Exhibit H – Conceptual Wall & Entry Features**)

Perimeter and other wall materials, designs, and colors, will carry on the project's theme established by the project's monument signage and landscaping. View walls will be used at the discretion of individual builders. Wall and fence heights will be limited to a maximum height of six (6) feet. Decorative pillars and pedestals may extend up to an additional sixteen (16) inches above the maximum wall heights. Materials, colors, and construction methods for theme, view and accent walls are subject to some variation, so long as the proposed character and theme of the walls is preserved and per the approval of the Planning Department.

View walls may be used in areas where noise attenuation is not necessary and view opportunities exist.

5.2.1 General Guidelines

- No fence should exceed six feet in height unless required for noise attenuation
- All walls and fences should end in a pilaster. The design of the pilaster should reflect the shape of the supports used in the entry monuments and use similar materials
- When changes in pad elevation occur, the wall or fence should be stepped in equal vertical intervals. No step should exceed twelve inches (12") in height
- Side yard gates are required on one side of the front yard and shall be constructed of wrought iron, wood, or tubular steel. Side and rear yard fencing shall be masonry, slump stone or other materials of similar appearance, maintenance and structural durability. Chain link fencing is not permitted. All construction must be of good quality and sufficient durability.

5.3 Front Yard Landscaping

Front yard landscaping is required for all homes and unless approved by the Planning Department, will be provided by the developer/home builder. Front yard landscaping provided by the developer/builder or their representative must be installed within one month of closing. The Planning Department may extend installation times for homeowner installed or custom landscaping improvements for individual lots. Front yard landscape packages offered by developers/builders shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Department and must meet the following requirements: a variety of standard and upgraded front yard landscape packages with automatic irrigation systems shall be provided; front yard landscaping designs with berming, river run features, courtyards, lighting, or other creative features shall be offered for standard landscape designs.

5.4 Private Open Space

Private Open Space is land within each residential lot that is available for private use. This private open space is typically considered yard area that is available for private recreation. Each residence must have adequate private outdoor open space that can be an effective extension of the indoor living space and be used for passive outdoor activities such as gardening, reading, eating and barbequing.

EXHIBITS



VICINITY MAP


EUCALYPTUS GROVE

NOT TO SCALE



WJ. MCKEEVER, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERING

EXHIBIT A



USGS MAP

EUCALYPTUS GROVE

12

RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

NOT TO SCALE



W.J. McKEEVER, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERING

EXHIBIT B



NOT TO SCALE



W.J. McKEEVER, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERING




13
RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

FEMA MAP

EUCALYPTUS GROVE

EXHIBIT C



W.J. McKEEVER, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERING




NOT TO SCALE

14
RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

GENERAL PLAN
EUCALYPTUS GROVE

EXHIBIT D




Riverside County TLMA GIS -IVE AVE SP ZONE

ZONING
EUCALYPTUS GROVE

NOT TO SCALE





W.J. McKEEVER, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERING



NOT TO SCALE


EXHIBIT F

CIRCULATION MAP

16
RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA


EUCALYPTUS GROVE

TYPICAL LOT DETAIL




NOT TO SCALE


PERIMETER WALL




VIEW WALL



NEIGHBORHOOD WALL



CONCEPTUAL THEME WALLS



CONCEPTUAL ENTRY MONUMENT

CONCEPTUAL WALL / ENTRY PLAN

EUCALYPTUS GROVE

NOT TO SCALE



6.0 ARCHITECTURE

The architectural guidelines in this manual have been developed to ensure architectural continuity and compatibility throughout the project; to promote a distinctive architectural theme; and to avoid a mundane repetition of too similar architectural design elements. These guidelines will provide a set of basic concepts for development but are not meant to limit future creativity in design.

These styles and concepts should be incorporated to provide a variety of quality housing types.

6.1 General Guidelines

The following general guidelines should be considered in the designing and layout of the project:

- A common set of design style and design elements should be included throughout the project.
- Long unarticulated building facades should be avoided
- Natural building materials should be varied throughout the project, avoiding long stretches of similar street scene
- Offset roof planes, columns, vertical and horizontal articulation or other projecting architectural features shall occur on those facades of the residence that are visible from the street or open space
- The visual impact of garages shall be reduced to the maximum extent practicable

6.2 Architectural styles

Four architectural styles have been set forth in this design manual for the project so as to begin to identify and illustrate the intent and objective of these design guidelines in terms of architectural style and variety. California Ranch, Craftsman, Mediterranean, and Monterey architectural styles are discussed in the following pages and depicted in **Figures 1-4** so as to establish the types and level of architectural detail, which will assist in achieving the project, design objectives. It should be noted that the ultimate builder will be required to come back before the Planning Commission with a detailed Design Manual that will identify the specific design features that will be incorporated into the implementation process. Discussions of each of these styles as well as illustrations of typical elevations and features are located on the following pages.

It should also be noted that these design guidelines can be modified during the formal minor permit review process initiated by the builder, at the discretion of the Planning Department.

6.2.1 California Ranch

The general of California Ranch style is derived from the Mediterranean, Bungalow, and 1940's Ranch styles. It consists of one and two story volumes with hip and gable roofs. Roof pitches vary from 4:12 to 5:12 with moderate to broad roof overhangs or eaves. Typical exterior wall cladding includes clapboard (horizontal boards), board and batten (vertical boards), shingles and stucco. Indoor-outdoor relationships are accentuated by such elements as: large areas of glass, sheltered porches, greenhouse rooms and corner windows. Exposed beam ends and deep fascias are used with columns and piers to create strong shadow patterns. Private gardens, patios and pot shelves are typical.

Figure 1 - California Ranch



Features typical of the California Ranch style include:

- Louvered shutters at windows
- Arched patios
- Low pitched roof line
- Often contains a variation of materials on façade (wood siding, brick or stone)

6.2.2 Craftsman

The Craftsman style of the early twentieth century residential architecture was very popular. This popularity can be attributed to the Craftsman design on the harmony of indoor and outdoor life. Influenced by the earlier Mission aesthetic, the Arts & Crafts architects designed homes which were well-crafted and used materials left as close as possible to their natural state such as cobblestones and rough hewn beams. Wherever possible, aesthetic and functional interiors are integrated in simple living spaces. These asymmetrical, gabled and stuccoed works of art are a large part of Southern California's architectural heritage.

The primary wall form relies on a simple "box" orientation adorned with detailing such as wall articulation, unique window locations, large eave overhangs and porches. Typical building materials include wood, stone and stucco. The limitless combinations of these elements can enhance the street scene and create a unique residential identity. Creative use of these design features will promote a varied yet unified architectural "feel" to the neighborhood while avoiding the "cookie-cutter" approach where virtually all residences appear the same without any individual identity.

The Craftsman idea is broad enough to include all types and uses of buildings. However the Craftsman bungalow style of dwelling has received more attention than any other. Southern California is ideally suited for the bungalow. The mild climate permits a thorough integration of a house with its immediate surroundings. For example, living space may open onto a screened or open air porch, which may adjoin a blooming garden.

Figure 2 - Craftsman



Features typical of the Craftsman style include:

- Thick tapered porch posts
- Exposed roof rafters
- Recessed porches
- Natural materials such as stone and wood
- Varied textures
- Exterior use of stone or stone veneer

6.2.3 Mediterranean

The Mediterranean architectural style is typically characterized by the use of stuccoed walls, heavy arches, deep-set windows and S-tile roof materials. This style is generally characterized by two story homes, occasionally including a courtyard, with low pitched roofs. Long narrow porches and balconies and stuccoed chimney tops are common accents. Exposed beams, balconies with wrought iron railing are also an important



Figure 3 - Mediterranean

Features typical of the Mediterranean style include:

- Typically light body color with dark or contrasting trim
- Arched windows and entries
- Wrought iron accents

- Heavy wood doors
- Stucco siding

6.2.4 Monterey

During the early colonization of the Southwest, the Spaniards built simple homes with low roofs, thick walls and small windows. Later, in the mid 19th century, homes took on more of the characteristics of the English Colonials' homes. Their houses became more complex, two-storied structures with narrow second floor balconies. The Spanish heritage was jealously preserved in many Southwestern communities.

Santa Barbara, California is one example that can be observed of this effect. After an earthquake destroyed a large number of the structures in the city in 1925, the city planning commission that was subsequently appointed required that all new structures be Spanish in design. In Santa Fe, New Mexico, a city ordinance mandated that all new buildings in the historic area of town be constructed in the Pueblo Style. In each of the above mentioned circumstances, a unique style developed that took on the names of their respective cities. Therefore, today you will find homes called Santa Barbara style, or Santa Fe style respectively.

Monterey Style homes built in California in the 1920s are another example of unique styles that evolved from previous examples. Monterey, California made this style famous, with their two-story Spanish homes that featured a porch tacked on the front. One could also find porches on the main floor tucked under the roof, reminiscent of the French Creole style homes.



Figure 4 - Monterey

Features typical of the Monterey style include:

- Tiled or wooden shake roofs
- Porches on the second floor, often spanning the entire width of the house
- Single-hung windows
- Symmetrical design
- Shutters on the windows
- Recessed first floor porches

7.0 UTILITIES


Currently the site is undeveloped and, the site does contain some existing perimeter overhead electrical lines as well as water and sewer lines located in Leon Rd. All existing and new onsite utilities that will serve the subject site will be placed underground except as approved by Public Works. Operation and maintenance of all utilities and facilities will be managed by the appropriate operating entity upon approval and completion of construction. Sewer facilities, water facilities, street lights, and fire hydrants will be provided according to the appropriate agency's guidelines, per the recommendations of Public Works and Riverside County Fire Departments and other governmental regulations applicable to the construction of various facilities.

Utility Providers

Services	Provider	Location
Electrical	Southern California Edison	At site
Telephone	Verizon	TBD
Cable	Time Warner Cable	TBD
Natural Gas	Southern California Gas Company	TBD
Water	Eastern Municipal Water District	At site
Sanitary Sewer	Eastern Municipal Water District	4,000' +/- South
Fire & Emergency	County of Riverside Fire District	TBD

8.0 COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS (CC&R'S)

Common areas within Eucalyptus Grove will be maintenance by County Service Area #146. However, perimeter landscaping and common areas within the individual units in Planning Area 3, will require maintenance by a Home Owners Association (HOA). The HOA will be established in conjunction with development of Planning Area 3. CC&R's for Eucalyptus Grove that include language for the establishment of a HOA and provision for creation of liens in conjunction with the HOA for maintenance funding will be provided prior to recordation of the final map.



NOTES

- 1 SEE EXHIBIT 2-1 & 2-2 FOR DRAINAGE AREA BOUNDARIES
- 2 ROUTINGS OF DETENTION BASINS AND DOWNSTREAM MAINLINE ARE BASED ON UNIT HYDROGRAPH, WHILE DS FOR LATERAL DESIGN ARE BASED ON THE RATIONAL METHOD.
- 3 FOR LAT A-10, AND A-11, THE ULTIMATE Q100 AND INTERIM Q100 ARE SHOWN, THE LARGER Q WAS SELECTED FOR THE DESIGN OF STORM DRAINS.
- 4 DESIGN REACH Qs CONSERVATIVELY ASSUMED THAT DRAINAGE AREAS ARE INTERCEPTED BY MAINLINE AT THE UPPER END OF DRAINAGE AREA.
- 5 AT THE FINAL DESIGN, THE MAINLINE SIZE CAN BE REEVALUATED AND REDUCED FOR THE EXACT INTERCEPTION LOCATIONS.
- 6 THE DEBRIS STRUCTURE SIZE WILL BE DECIDED AT THE FINAL DESIGN.
- 7 FACILITY TYPE AND SIZE OF LINE D (MNDP) ARE FROM WINCHESTER MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN. IN FINAL DESIGN, FACILITY TYPE AND SIZE CAN BE REEVALUATED AND RESIZED.
- 8 MAINLINE D (843 CFS) AND LINE D-3 (859 CFS) ALONG NORTH SIMPSON ROAD ARE SIZED TO BE ABLE TO COLLECT Qs FROM NORTH OF INTERSECTION OF RAILROAD AND BRIGGS ROAD AT ANY POINT. THE FACILITY SIZE CAN BE REEVALUATED WHEN CONNECTION FROM NORTH IS FIXED.

CASE: TR32394R1
 EXHIBIT 3
 DATE: 2/21/14
 PLANNER: M STRAITE



LEGEND

- STORM DRAIN SYSTEM BY CFD
- - - STORM DRAIN SYSTEM OUTSIDE CFD BOUNDARY
- LOCAL STORM DRAIN SYSTEM (NOT BY CFD)
- EXIST STORM DRAIN SYSTEM
- ← DRAIN DIRECTION
- 750 CFS Q100
- (150 CFS) Q100 INTERIM CONDITION
- ((250 CFS)) Q100 MITIGATED WITH DETENTION BASIN D SEE PLAN & PROFILE FOR SIZES
- CFD PROPERTY

**WINCHESTER HILLS CFD
 STORM DRAIN FACILITIES**

WEBB ENGINEERING
 5705 BIRCH STREET, BIRMINGHAM, AL 35206
 TEL: (205) 988-1800 FAX: (205) 988-1800
 APPROVED BY: [Signature]
 R.E. NO. [] EXP. DATE: []

EXHIBIT 3

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 42468

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7789 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 32394, REVISED MAP NO. 1

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

Contact Person: Matt Straite

Telephone Number: 951-955-8631

Applicant's Name: Stone Star Riverside LLC

Applicant's Address: 12671 High Bluff Crive Suite 150 San Diego CA 92130

Engineer's Name: WJ McKeever Inc

Engineer's Address: 900 East Washington Street Suite 208 Colton CA 92324

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: The **Change of Zone** proposes to change the project sites zoning from One Family Dwelling (R-1) to Planned Residential (R-4). **Tentative Tract Map No. 32394 Revised Map No. 1** proposes to revise TR32394, a Schedule A subdivision of 39.83 acres into 127 residential lots, previously approved in 2006, by increasing the number of lots to 166 residential lots, removing the requirement to participate in a CFD, adding two basins, and adding additional drainage/open space features on-site and offsite. The project will require construction of an offsite drainage channel that will be about 4,000 feet in length and about 120 feet wide. See Exhibit 3 for details.

B. Background: Tentative Tract Map No. 32394 was approved in 2006 for 127 residential lots. The project was processed with Environmental Assessment No. 39812 which concluded that a Mitigated Negative Declaration was appropriate as all impacts were mitigated to a level of less than significant with mitigation added. Areas that required mitigation included Aesthetics, Biological resources, Cultural resources, Geology/Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise and Recreation. The current proposal to revise the map includes an increase in residential lot count from 127 lots to 166 lots. As a result this Environmental Assessment uses the previous EA39812 however this EA specifically addresses the increase in unit count and offsite impacts.

Additionally, the offsite requirements are being modified through this revision. The project is now being conditioned to construct a portion of the flood control infrastructure identified in a master plan created by Webb and Associates in 2006. However, the master plan was never adopted. CEQA document EA39938 was prepared for the master plan, and this EA for the revised map uses analysis contained in the master plan and the CEQA for the master plan. The CEQA documents for both TR32394 and the Webb master plan are available for review at the County Planning department. For purposes of this review, the term "project" includes the offsite channel construction.

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

D. Total Project Area: 39.83

Residential Acres: 39.83

Lots: 166

Units: 166

Projected No. of Residents: 424.96

E. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 462-020-010

F. Street References: The project is located in the third district, in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, more specifically it is located northerly of Simpson Road, southerly of Grand Avenue, Easterly of Leon Road and westerly of Highway 79.

G. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Section 29, Township 5 South, Range 2 West

H. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is relatively flat with a rocky outcropping in the northwest corner of the site. The project site is currently vacant with the majority of the site covered with a non-native eucalyptus grove. Surrounding land uses include vacant undeveloped land to the north and east and rural residences to the west and south. A rail line borders the project on the site to the north. This rail line is the planned alignment for the Metrolink line to Hemet. Several other Tentative Maps are in process in the surrounding area which would change the land uses to primarily medium density residential for the area.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

- 1. Land Use:** The proposed project is consistent with the Highway 79 Policy Area Requirements of the General Plan. The proposed project meets the requirements for the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation and all other applicable land use policies.
- 2. Circulation:** The project will add overall trips to the area. The proposed project provides greater opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle use and therefore reduces the reliance on automobiles for transportation. Adequate circulation facilities exist and are proposed to serve the proposed project. The proposed project meets with all other applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
- 3. Multipurpose Open Space:** A 2.53-acre park for public access has been provided in the design of this project. No natural open space land was required to be preserved within the boundaries of this project. The proposed project meets all other applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
- 4. Safety:** The proposed project is located entirely within a FEMA designated 100-year flood zone. The proposed project is not located within any other special hazard zone (including 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. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Safety element policies.
- 5. Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area has been provided for in the design of the project. The proposed project meets with 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 has been designed to promote pedestrian and bicycle use and limit the use of automobiles for transportation, thereby

reducing air pollution. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Air Quality Element policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Harvest Valley/Winchester

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Medium Density Residential (MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units per Acre)

E. Overlay(s), if any: N/A

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Highway 79 Policy Area

G. Adjacent and Surrounding

1. **Area Plan(s):** Harvest Valley/Winchester

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Medium Density Residential (MDR) (2-5 dwelling units per acre)

4. **Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s):** Highway 79 Policy Area

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** N/A

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** N/A

I. Existing Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R)

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: One Family Dwelling (R-1)

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) and Light Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10)

III. 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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | |

IV. 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.



4/18/14

Signature

Date

Matt Straite

For Juan C Perez, TLMA Agency Director/
Interim Planning Director

Printed Name

V. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure C-7 "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is located on the northwest corner of Simpson Road and Beeler Road. The GENERAL PLAN indicates that the project is not located within a designated scenic corridor. Development of the project site, and offsite channel construction, will not affect any scenic resources, as adjacent lands are vacant or have rural residential developments and are planned for similar residential development. The design of the proposed residential development will be compatible with the existing setting in the surrounding area and will, therefore, have a less than significant impact as a result of its implementation.

b) The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features, or obstruct a prominent scenic vista or view open to the public, as these features do not exist on the project site. Additionally, the project will not result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The project will be developed pursuant to the Countywide Design Standards and Guidelines and therefore will not create an aesthetically offensive project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the GENERAL PLAN, the project site is located within the designated 45-mile (Zone B) Special Lighting Area that surrounds the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 contains approved materials and methods of installation, definition, general requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. The offsite channel will have no lighting. The construction of the channel may require lighting for construction, however, all lighting would be temporary in nature and therefore less than significant. With the incorporation of project lighting requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed project, this impact will be reduced to a less than significant impact. This is required by ordinance, and therefore not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The project will not create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, or expose residential property to unacceptable levels of light or glare. The offsite channel will be soft bottom and not create any glare. While the adjacent properties are vacant, residential development is planned for the adjacent properties which would be fitting for the amount of ambient light this project would create. The project proposes a single-family residential development and is in the immediate proximity of planned uses and would therefore not generate any unacceptable light levels.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project, including the channel, is located within the boundaries of land designated as prime and statewide important farmland (designated farmland)-as designated by the most recent version of the Important Farmland Map (as prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program). The project will contribute to the cumulative loss of farmland in the County. The project is not located within an agricultural preserve. The General Plan determined that the loss of prime, unique, and statewide important farmland remains a significant unavoidable impact of implementing the adopted General Plan. The Board of Supervisors found that there were no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could have satisfied the loss of prime Farmland designated for statewide importance. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors adopted findings of overriding considerations on October 7, 2003.

b) The project is not located within an Agricultural Preserve and will have no impacts on any preserves. The closest preserve is over a mile away from the site and the channel.

c) The project is partially located within 300 feet of existing agriculturally zoned property, but will not conflict with any existing agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. This subdivision will be required to notify all future occupants that such property resides within the 300-foot boundary of an agricultural zone. Conditions of approval have been added to assure proper notification is required pursuant to Ordinance No. 625. With this mitigation, the impacts are less than significant. However, all property surrounding the site features a General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) which will require all agriculturally zoned property surrounding the site to change eventually to a more residential zoning classification.

d) There are no other agricultural changes that will impact farmland. The channel construction may result in the continued development of the area, however, as explained in "a" these impacts were already considered.

Mitigation: A note shall appear on an Environmental Constraints Sheet for this property that makes notification to all appropriate future owners that this property is located within 300-feet of agriculturally zoned property. (COA 50.PLANNING.13, 50.PLANNING.27)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3 "Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas," and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project will not conflict with any zoning related to forest land, the County has no such zoning.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

6. Air Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Eucalyptus Grove- Tract 32394 Greenhouse Gas Impact Study, Unincorporated County of Riverside, by RK Engineering Group, Inc. dated July 24, 2013.

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) establishes the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) to achieve national and state air quality standards. Since the AQMP control measures and emission reduction programs are based on emission projections for a future development scenario, conformance with the AQMP is determined by the project's compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan requirements and thus determined to be in compliance with the AQMP, impacts are considered less than significant.

All construction and development activities and land uses within the SCAB, including the proposed project, are required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations. The proposed project is obligated, by law, to comply with these rules and regulations and will do so. For these reasons, it is appropriate to conclude that the proposed project is in compliance with the AQMP. The project will be required to comply with existing SCAQMD rules for the reduction of fugitive dust emissions. SCAQMD Rule 403 establishes these procedures. Compliance with this rule is achieved through application of standard best management practices in construction and operation activities, such as application of water or chemical stabilizers to disturbed soils, The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans. The project, proposing 127 single family residential units, will not have a significant impact to air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. According to the SCAQMD Handbook, the project falls below the potentially significant air quality impact threshold.

This project will be required to reduce all foreseeable impacts to air quality including standard dust control and grading mitigation issued by the Department of Building and Safety-Grading Division as conditions of approval. Pre-construction and construction activities are considered to be short term and will not have significant effect on the environment. These short-term effects do not violate any existing air quality standards and will not exceed any current air quality standards of Riverside County. COA (10.BS GRADE.08)

b) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality standard. The project, proposing 166 single family residential units, will not have a significant impact to air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. According to the SCAQMD Handbook, the project falls below the potentially significant air quality impact threshold.

c) In evaluating the cumulative effects of the project, Section 21100(e) of CEQA states that "previously approved land use documents including, but not limited to, general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans, may be used in cumulative impact analysis." In addressing cumulative effects for air quality, the AQMP utilizes approved general plans and, therefore, is the most appropriate document to use to evaluate cumulative impacts of the subject project. This is because the AQMP evaluated air quality emissions for the entire region using a future development scenario based on general plan land use designations and set forth a comprehensive program that would lead the region, including the project area, into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. Since the proposed project is in conformance with the AQMP it is appropriate to conclude that the project's incremental contribution to criteria pollutant emissions is not cumulatively significant.

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

d-f) The project is not located within 1 mile of any sensitive receptors with the exception of a few single family homes. Further, the project will not be considered a point source emitter. There will be no impacts. The project will not emit any odors that will be objectionable.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, GIS database, WRCMSHCP and/or CVMSHCP, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

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

a-g) 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 previous version of the project (TR32394) required a general biological study to be prepared and a focused survey for various narrow endemic plant species. The studies concluded that no sensitive species exist on site. Upon submittal of the revised map, County biological staff visited the site to do an inspection/ survey in order to assure the previous studies was still accurate. They concluded that no sensitive species were on site. The project will not result in adverse impacts on MSHCP-listed plant or animal species. Natural watercourses are not present on the site. U.S Army Corps or Engineers and CDFG jurisdictional waters of the US wetlands and streambeds are not present. The proposed project is not located within any MSHCP criteria cells identified for conservation.

Regarding the offsite channel required for the project, the EA created for the master infrastructure plan explained the following:

The project alignment is not located within the Criteria Area Species Survey Area for Plants or the Amphibian Species Survey Area. However a large portion of the project alignment is located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area. All required habitat assessments and focused surveys pursuant to these specific sections of the MSHCP were conducted for the proposed CFD alignments and facilities.

The Salt Creek channel [which the proposed channel will drain into] is designated as Public/Quasi-Public Conserved Lands in the MSHCP Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan. Covered activities under the MSHCP in Public/Quasi- Public Conserved Lands include future facilities such as water, sewer, electrical, gas and solid waste facilities, subject to a finding of equivalent conservation. As outlined in the MSHCP, impacts to habitats within existing Public/Quasi-Public Lands shall be compensated by purchase and dedication into the MSHCP Conservation Area of land at not less than a ratio of 1:1. The applicant will provide a finding of equivalent conservation as well as mitigate for any impacts to habitat resulting from construction of facilities located in Public/Quasi-Public Lands. Implementation of the proposed CFD facilities is required to comply with the MSHCP. As the required studies have already been completed for the project, project construction will not conflict with the MSHCP...potential impacts to biological resources are considered less than significant.

In addition to the MSHCP the CFD project area is also located in the Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County, California (SKR HCP). The CFD project area is located within the fee area but not located within a core reserve, as outlined in the plan. The proposed project must comply with Ordinance 663.10, An Ordinance of the County of Riverside Amending Ordinance No. 633 Establishing the Riverside County Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, Plan Fee Assessment Area and Setting Mitigation Fees. The proposed project will not conflict with the SKR HCP, potential impacts are less than significant.

No suitable habitat was found for any of the sensitive plant species. Long- and short-term impacts to wildlife species will occur as a result of construction activities and the conversion of the proposed project site to residential development. No species of animal or plant listed as endangered or threatened was observed or is expected on-site; however, given the large number of eucalyptus trees on site, the applicant is required to perform a nesting bird survey prior to any grading activity. With this mitigation, there will be no impacts related to sensitive wildlife species are anticipated.

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

Mitigation: One week prior to grading, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted if grading occurs between February 1 and August 15. (COA 60.PLANNING.1)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Environmental Programs Department and the Building and Safety Department.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

8. Historic Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Archeological Study PD-A-4754 prepared by Archeological Associates dated July 8, 2012 (updating the original 2005 study for the site)

Findings of Fact:

a & b) On-site surveys, conducted in January 2005 did not result in any historic resources to be located on site. An update to the study was reviewed by the County Archeologist. The site is currently vacant and does not contain any structures or other features that could be deemed significant historic resources. Regarding the offsite channel, a study was done for the master drainage plan that found there to be no impacts for the area of the offsite channel. All identified archeological sites will be avoided. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

9. Archaeological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Project Application Materials, Archeological Study PD-A-4754 prepared by Archeological Associates dated July 8, 2012 (updating the original 2005 study for the site)

Findings of Fact: The pedestrian survey, conducted January 2005, and the update done in 2012, resulted in the discovery of an archeological resource. This site consisted of a bedrock milling feature. This type of resource is non-unique and is not considered a significant archaeological resource. Although the milling station may be destroyed as a result of the proposed project, a visual

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

and statistical record of each feature has been preserved for future researchers. Regarding the offsite channel, a study was done for the master drainage plan that found there to be no impacts for the area of the offsite channel. All identified archeological sites will be avoided. With incorporation of the following mitigation measures, impacts to archaeological resources will be less than significant. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5.

Mitigation: Prior to grading, the project proponent shall retain a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor for consultation and monitoring during grading activities. If archaeological resources are detected during grading activities, such activities shall be halted until the significance of the resources has been evaluated. (COA 10.PLANNING.1, 60.PLANNING.1)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department and Building and Safety Department.

10. Paleontological Resources

a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity"

Findings of Fact:

A) The project, including the offsite portions, site is located within a High B (Hb) paleontologically sensitive area which suggests that the potential for unearthing paleontological resources is moderate to high.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to retain a qualified paleontologist prior to grading consultation during grading activities (COA 60.PLANNING.04). Additionally the final map must include a note explaining the high liquefaction potential (COA 50.PLANNING.16).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be done by the Planning Department and the Building and Safety Department.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

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

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?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments

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

Findings of Fact:

a & b) The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The Riverside County Geologist has reviewed the project proposal and has determined that it will protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

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?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction," Geotechnical Update Report, (GEO 1400), Eucalyptus Grove - Tentative Tract 32394, Winchester Area of Riverside County, California, dated August 14, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 1400 update from 2013 was prepared for TR32394R1. These update reports confirmed that the conclusions and recommendations contained in the previous Leighton reports (10/27/04 and 3/24/05) remain generally valid and applicable for the new Tract Map (TR32394R1) except where superseded by current County ordinances and recommendations included in the August 14, 2013 report. The report concluded that the potential for liquefaction could occur in subsoils in the southeast portion of the site. The report recommended removal and recompaction, combined with the additional planned fill thickness.

Mitigation: A note shall be placed on the Environmental Constraints Sheet indicating that there is a potential for liquefaction at this site and that potential liquefaction shall be mitigated with the recommendations made in CGR No. 1400 update. (COA 10.PLANNING.18)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted through the Building and Safety Plan Check Process.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Geotechnical Update Report, (GEO 1400), Eucalyptus Grove - Tentative Tract 32394, Winchester Area of Riverside County, California, dated August 14, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site or off sites and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that has the potential to affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several

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

major active or potentially active faults in southern 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 residential development they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope" Geotechnical Update Report, (GEO 1400), Eucalyptus Grove - Tentative Tract 32394, Winchester Area of Riverside County, California, dated August 14, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) Due to the relatively level terrain in the area, the project site and all required off site improvements are not subject to landslide, collapse, or rockfall hazards. In addition, the project site is not located within an area subject to unstable geologic units or soil.

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

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas Map" Geotechnical Update Report, (GEO 1400), Eucalyptus Grove - Tentative Tract 32394, Winchester Area of Riverside County, California, dated August 14, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located in an area susceptible to subsidence but not located near any documented areas of subsidence. 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 residential development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Geotechnical Update Report, (GEO 1400), Eucalyptus Grove - Tentative Tract 32394, Winchester Area of Riverside County, California, dated August 14, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a) The update to GEO No. 1400 did not identify any other geologic hazards such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard on the project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project area is relatively flat with a rocky outcropping in the northwest corner of the project site and will not require an extensive amount of grading. Grading will not negate or affect the subsurface sewage disposal systems. The open channel required offsite will not change the topography, or create any fill slopes, nor will the channel disrupt any sewer systems. The channel was master planned within a larger regional framework to work with other infrastructure requirements including sewer. Because the infrastructure was all master planned, they do not impact each other. Furthermore, the design and safety of proposed slopes has been reviewed by the Building and Safety – Grading Division, Riverside County Geologist and the Riverside County Planning Department. These agencies have deemed the project proposal to be designed to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Standard conditions of approval have been issued regarding slopes that will further ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare upon final engineering of the project and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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.

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

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The Riverside County Geologist and the Building and Safety Department – Grading Division have deemed the project proposal to be designed to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. All of the soil groups in the project site and the offsite areas have a low potential for shrink/swell. Expansive soils by definition contain significant amounts of clay which take in water causing them to shrink or swell. All soil groups identified within the project area sandy loams and loamy sands, which are not expected to have expansive qualities. Therefore, expansion potential as defined in the California Building Code is considered low. The proposed project would not result in substantial risks to life or property from hazards due to expansive soil. Standard conditions of approval have been issued regarding soils that will further ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare upon final engineering of the project and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. These include the requirement for storm water pollution prevention plans (SWPPS), Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP), and National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination Systems (NDPES) requirements.

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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys

Findings of Fact:

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

a-b) The Riverside County Flood Control department has reviewed and deemed the project proposal to be designed to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The offsite channel will improve the erosion potential for the area by channelizing the flows to the Salt Creek Channel. Riverside County Flood Control has provided standard conditions of approval to ensure erosion impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels upon final engineering and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site lies within a moderate area of wind erosion. The project will decrease the amount of exposed dirt, which is subject to wind erosion, with the incorporation of concrete, asphalt, and landscaping. A condition has been placed on the project to control dust created during grading activities. (COA 10.BS GRADE.8)

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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Eucalyptus Grove- Tract 32394 Greenhouse Gas Impact Study, Unincorporated County of Riverside, by RK Engineering Group, Inc. dated July 24, 2013.

Findings of Fact:

a & b) According to the Green House Gas study provided for the project, with the implementation of the required mitigation measures the project emissions, both construction and operation, will be below

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

the SCAQMD's 3,000 MT CO₂e Threshold. Riverside County has not adopted an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, the significance of the project's consistency with applicable plans shall be determined by demonstration whether or not the project would reduce GHG emissions by 30 percent or more below a business as usual (BAU) standard. The 30% target is based on the estimated reductions California Air Resources Board (CARB) projected for Year 2020 emissions, extrapolated using Years 2002 through 2004 data, in order to meet the 1990 level emissions, as required by AB 32. The project will promote the goals of AB 32. All offsite construction will be required to adhere to all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, including the need to obtain construction permits from AQMD. There will be no operational emissions from the channel. Compliance with SCAQMD rules, in conjunction with the measures implemented of the project site itself, will assure that the construction of the channel is below the thresholds. The project site location is positioned within the County's planned growth urban footprint. With the implementation of energy efficient programs, and state and federal vehicle emission reduction programs, the proposed Project would be consistent with the goals of AB 32.

Mitigation: The GHG study proposes three mitigation measures, one of which is to include a pedestrian network within the design of the tract. That has been addressed in the design. The other two proposed mitigation measures have been added to the project as conditions of approval. Condition of Approval 90.PLANNING.14 requires that the applicant provide proof that Title 24 has been exceeded by 25% and provide proof that a water conservation strategy that will obtain a 30% reduction for indoor/outdoor water use has been implemented prior to the final inspection.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be administered through the Building and Safety Plan check process.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Project Application Materials

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

Findings of Fact:

a-e) The proposed subdivision and off site channel will not create or require transportation of hazardous materials. However, it may result in the use and disposal of substances such as household and commercial cleaning products, fertilizers, pesticides, automotive fluids, etc, but the nature and volume of such substances associated with residential use would not present the potential to create a significant public or environmental hazard. The project will also not interfere with adopted emergency plans as it is consistent with the Land Use designation from the General Plan, and the roadways will be built to the standards outlined in the General Plan. No dangerous curves or other dangerous designs have been added. Therefore, hazard material impacts are less than significant.

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 Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport.

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

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is not located within a high fire area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

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?

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

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)?

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?

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?

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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)?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition.

Findings of Fact:

a-b, e-h) The proposed project will substantially alter the drainage for the area. A railroad embankment with tracks runs along the north side of the tract. Tract 32394 is a single family residential development approved in 2008 which was provided protection from storm runoff with the construction of major drainage facility infrastructure. The construction of these facilities was a Condition of Approval for Tract 32394. A Community Facilities District (CFD) was being developed which would finance the construction of the major drainage infrastructure shown on Exhibit 3 of the

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

Winchester Hills CFD Storm Drain Facility Plan. The formation of this CFD did not occur and the drainage facilities were not constructed. This revised map is a proposal to develop the site without the drainage infrastructure proposed by the CFD.

A drainage area of approximately 140-acres is tributary to the northerly boundary of the site. There are no streams or rivers crossing the site. The railroad embankment cannot provide protection from these flows so runoff that spills over the embankment is spread out along the complete length of the northern property line. A concrete collector channel along the north boundary is proposed which will capture these flows. Storm runoff from this collector channel will convey flows to an unlined open channel located through the central portion of the site.

This unlined open channel will convey flows southerly and discharge flows into Salt Creek Channel (District Project No. 4-0-00110) located approximately 0.7 miles to the south. This channel will follow the alignment proposed in the Winchester Hills CFD Storm Drain Facility Plan, as previously explained. While this drainage plan is not a County adopted master drainage plan, the District is using this drainage plan as a guide for the location of drainage facilities for development in this area.

Tract 32394R1 will construct the open channel, to District standards, which is capable of conveying the 100-year flow from the collector channel at the north boundary to a reinforced concrete box culvert at Simpson Road. This culvert, also constructed as part of this project, will also have the capacity to convey the 100-year flow to the south side of Simpson Road. Downstream of Simpson Road, an open channel that is capable of conveying this 100-year flow from the culvert at Simpson Road to Salt Creek Channel. Salt Creek Channel is considered an adequate outlet for storm runoff from this development and therefore no increased runoff mitigation is required except for the Hydrological Conditions of Concern (HCOC) required in the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). Conditions of approval require the applicant to obtain rights of way for the offsite channel.

Culverts at Olive Avenue and into Salt Creek Channel shall also be constructed. These culverts shall be capable of conveying the project's 100-year flow rate.

A preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) was submitted for this project. The exhibit proposes vegetated swales which are not an acceptable BMP. The final WQMP for this development shall use infiltration trenches or other acceptable BMP's. The final WQMP must comply with the latest MS4 permit WQMP Guidance Manual and Template for the Santa Ana River Watershed. The WQMP shall comply with the latest WQMP and Low Impact Design (LID) provisions by incorporating LID principles and the prioritized/tier selection of mitigation or structural site design.

The project is located within the boundaries of the Winchester/North Hemet sub-watershed of the Salt Creek Channel Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for which fees have been established by the Board of Supervisors.

c) The project is proposing to utilize water form EMWD, facilities for which are already within the vicinity of the site. There will be no wells. EMWD has issues a will serve letter for the site. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation:

10.FLOOD RI.1 requires the applicant to secure the full right of way width necessary for the ultimate channel from Simpson Road to Salt Creek Channel. 10.FLOOD RI.2 requires construction of the channel. 10.FLOOD RI. 4 requires construction of culverts under roadways. 90.FLOOD RI.4 requires

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

that all offsite and onsite facilities be constructed and operational prior to the issuance of the final inspection for the residential structures.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, 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

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The project will alter the existing pattern of drainage on the site at a less than significant level and will direct onsite flow into drainage facilities (see section 25). The project will increase the amount of impermeable surfaces, which will decrease the absorption rates of the site, however, the increase will result in a less than significant determination with the implementation of standard conditions of approval, including the requirement for SWPPS, WQMP and NPDES requirements. Because these are standard conditions of approval, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes. The project area is not located within a dam inundation area. The project will affect the amount of surface water in the flood control facilities served by this project due to the expedited flow of water off the site, but at a less than significant level (see section 25).

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed use is compliant with the current land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) in the Harvest Valley / Winchester Area Plan. The project is not located within a city sphere of influence.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

28. Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a & d) The previous map approval included a zone change from Rural Residential (R-R) to One Family Dwelling (R-1) will make the tentative tract map consistent with the GENERAL PLAN land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR). The new design of the map increases the unit count to offset the cost of the off site flood control channel. This increase necessitates a change in the zoning to a Planned Residential (R-4) designation, which is included as part of the project. The R-4 designation is consistent with the MDR General Plan classification. The project site is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area, which dictates that the proposed residential projects must have a reduced density of 9% less than the midpoint of the allowable density range. The previous version of the map was below this threshold. The site is 39.83 acres, in a Medium Density Residential (MDR) Designation, which is 2-5 Dwelling Units per acre. That makes the midpoint 3.5 du/ac. At 9% below the midpoint the project would be allowed 126.5 units. However, the project is also conditioned to construct an offsite channel from their site to the Salt Creek Channel. Because the project is required to construct this, and because no residential units can be placed on these improvements after they are constructed (it is an open top channel), the calculation of required right of way is factored into the calculation for purposes of determination of consistency with the Highway 79 Policy Area. The

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

surface area of the channel offsets the 39.5 unit exceedance of the Highway 79 Policy Area. There will be no impacts.

b & e) The surrounding area is currently vacant and will be occupied by similar residential development in the near future. The project site is not adjacent to any established community.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. Mineral Resources

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The project, including the offsite channel, is located in an area where the available geologic information indicates that the mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. No abandoned, existing, or proposed quarries or mines are within the immediate project vicinity. According to the General Plan, the project is not designated for mineral uses or mining activities. The project site is designated for residential land uses, which preclude mining activities.

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	<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) 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 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

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

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact:

a-b) 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; or 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

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

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad line passes near the northern boundary of the tract. According to Mark Milakovich of BNSF, the railroad is used 2 to 3 times a week during the months they harvest potatoes and travels at 5 miles per hour due to the poor condition of the track. Due to the infrequency of use, the exterior noise level does not exceed 65 Ldn and therefore has a less than significant impact to the proposed project. This line is also the planned alignment for the future extension of Metrolink to Hemet. At this time adequate information is not available for accurate acoustical studies to be prepared to evaluate the impacts of this planned line and adequate mitigation measures that would need to be incorporated into the project design.

Mitigation: The project has been required to submit an acoustical study prior to building permit issuance to evaluate impacts of the planned Metrolink line and to propose adequate mitigation measures. (COA 80.PLANNING.19)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department, Environmental Health Department, and Building and Safety Department.

32. Highway Noise

<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
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

NA A B C D

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or near any highways.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

33. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Project Application Materials, GIS database

Findings of Fact: No other noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to this project.

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?

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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?

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-d) 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. All noise generated during project construction and the operation of the site must comply with the County's noise standards, which restricts construction

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

(Short-term) and operational (long-term) noise levels. The project will not expose any person to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

35. Housing

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?

e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

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)?

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

a-f) There are no existing habitable residences on the site, thus the project will not displace existing housing. The site is not located in a County Redevelopment Area. The project could encourage additional residential development in the area, but the development would have to be consistent with the land uses designated with the General Plan; therefore, the project would not cumulatively exceed regional or local population projections.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact: The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Fire Department. Any significant affects 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 physically altered facilities. 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 County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation. (COA 10.PLANNING.11)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

37. Sheriff Services

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: 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. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. 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. This project has been conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to sheriff services. This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation. (COA 10.PLANNING.11)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38. Schools

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Hemet 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 Hemet 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 to school services. This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation. (COA 80.PLANNING.11)

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.

39. Libraries

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: Library services for existing residences on the project site are provided by the Riverside County Public Library System. Development fees are required by the Riverside County Public Library System. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. Development fees required by the Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 may be used at the County’s discretion to provide additional library facilities. 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 County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to library services. This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation. (COA 10.PLANNING.11)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

40. Health Services

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: The use of the proposed 39.88-acre parcel 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 presence of medical communities generally corresponds with the increase in population associated with the new development. 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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, 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

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The proposed project design incorporates a wide channel with 4:1 slopes and a grass area that will be considered a park. The open space channel will also be usable as park space and will not be fenced. A Valley Wide park site already exists about ½ a mile from the site and features ball fields, restrooms and playground equipment. The park is adequately sized to accommodate the future population of this project. In addition the proposed subdivision is located within the Sphere of Influence of the Valley Wide Recreation and Park District, which is responsible for the collection of Quimby fees. The developer shall be required to annex into the District for maintenance of public parks, open space, multi-use trails, and detention basin lots (50.PLANNING.7). The project is conditioned to pay Quimby fees, however, this is a standard condition of approval and not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes (50.PLANNING.8 and 90.PLANNING.4). The project will not have a significant impact on parks or recreational facilities. The offsite channel will have no impacts on recreation features.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

42. Recreational Trails

Source: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riv. Co. 800-Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

Findings of Fact:

The Park Department has requested that trail be added to Simpson Road, on the north side of the street. The exhibit does not currently show the trail. Condition 20.Planning.1 requires that the map be revised to reflect the trail within 10 days of approval. 10.PLANNING.5, and 50.PLANNING.10 requires that the applicant find a maintenance entity for the trail. 50.PLANNING.9 requires that the trail be offered for dedication. The offsite channel will have no impacts on recreation features.

Mitigation: Condition 20.Planning.1 requires that the map be revised to reflect the trail within 10 days of approval. 10.PLANNING.5, and 50.PLANNING.10 requires that the applicant find a maintenance entity for the trail. 50.PLANNING.9 requires that the trail be offered for dedication.

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

Monitoring: Conditions of approval will be administered through the Building and Safety Plan Check process.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
43. Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: Environmental Assessment No. 39938, Environmental Assessment No. 39812, Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

a-i) The project will generate traffic to the area and regional transportation system. There may be temporary traffic delays during street improvements for Simpson Road and Beeler Road, but the delays will cease upon completion of construction. The project is not anticipated to have any significant traffic or circulation impacts. The project has been conditioned for dedication and improvements to Simpson Road and Beeler Road, which are standard to all schedule "A" tract maps as established by Ordinance 460. These standard requirements are not considered mitigation for