

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

4023



FROM: TLMA – Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
December 15, 2015

SUBJECT: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829, ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687 – Consider an Addendum to Certified EIR No. 374 – Applicant: Keith Gardner – Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan – Location: Northerly of Safflower Street, southerly of Koon Street, easterly of Winchester Road, and westerly of Woodshire Drive – 1,656 Gross Acres (20.3 Acres for the Tentative Tract Map) - Zoning: Specific Plan (SP No. 286 [Winchester 1800]) – REQUEST: The Substantial Conformance to the Specific Plan proposes to reduce the amount of acres within Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres by designating a larger area to Planning Area 2A (which is designated Open Space: Conservation Drainage). The land use designation for Planning Area 7 will remain as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The Change of Zone proposes to modify the existing Specific Plan zoning ordinance text to allow for 75 units in Planning Area 7 with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. The number of units previously allowed was 85 units and it is being reduced to 75. The change of zone will also formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7. The Tentative Tract Map is a Schedule A subdivision of 20.27 acres into 71 residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. and 14 open space lots. Deposit based funds 100%

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: GREGORY P. PRAMOS
DATE: 1/16/16
Departmental Concurrence

Steve Weiss

Steve Weiss, AICP
Planning Director

(Continued on next page)

Juan C. Perez

Juan C. Perez
TLMA Director

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost:	POLICY/CONSENT (per Exec. Office)
COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NET COUNTY COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	

SOURCE OF FUNDS: Deposit based funds

Budget Adjustment: N/A

For Fiscal Year: N/A

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY:

Tina Grande
Tina Grande

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Washington, seconded by Supervisor Ashley and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended and that Ordinance 348.4822 is adopted with waiver of the reading.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Washington, Ashley and Benoit
Nays: None
Absent: None
Date: February 2, 2016
xc: Planning, Co.Co., MC, COB

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By: *Kecia Harper-Ihem*
Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

District: 3

Agenda Number:

16-4

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

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FORM 11: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3, CHANGE OF ZONE NO.
7829, ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687**

DATE: December 15, 2015

PAGE: Page 2 of 3

RECOMMENDED MOTION: The Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

CONSIDER an **ADDENDUM** to **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 374**, based on the findings and conclusions in Environmental Assessment No. 42686; and,

APPROVE SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829, to revise the Specific Plan zoning ordinance and to formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7, in accordance with Exhibit 3, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822 amending the zoning in the Rancho California Area shown on Map No. 2.2386 Change of Zone No. 7829 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and,

APPROVE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

Summary:

Specific Plan No. 286, Substantial Conformance No. 3 proposes to reduce the amount of acres within Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres by designating a larger area to Planning Area 2A (which is designated Open Space: Conservation Drainage). The land use designation for Planning Area 7 will remain as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The project also proposes to increase the acreage for Planning Area 8 from 29.1 to 32.7 (an increase of 3.6 acres) and proposes to reduce the acreage for Planning Area 9 from 29.7 to 19.9. As a result of these changes Planning Area 2A would increase from 15.6 acres to 27.4 acres. The total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan will decrease from 4,720 to 4,710.

Change of Zone No. 7829 proposes to modify the existing Specific Plan zoning ordinance text to allow for 75 units in Planning Area 7 with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. The number of units previously allowed was 85 units and it is being reduced to 75. The change of zone will also formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7.

Tentative Tract Map No. 36687 is a Schedule A subdivision of 20.27 acres into 71 residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. and 14 open space lots. The Tentative Tract Map covers Planning Areas 7 and a portion of 2A. The project includes off-site improvements that include grading and drainage easement.

The Winchester 1800 Specific Plan (Specific Plan No. 286) with Certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) No. 374 was adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on April 29, 1997. There have been six major amendments to the Specific Plan that reduced the land use intensity of the Specific Plan area. As a result of these prior amendments, the total number of dwelling units was reduced from 5,806 to 4,720. Although only 4,720 homes are allowed in Specific Plan No. 286 (SP 286), EIR No. 374 evaluated a "worst case" scenario by assuming future development with up to 5,806 dwelling units.

To date, Specific Plan No. 286 largely has been built-out, with exception of lands north of the existing drainage channel within Planning Area 2C. In this northern portion of the Specific Plan a 5.5-acre park site has been constructed, and Planning Areas 5A, 5B, and 12A have been developed with residential uses; the remainder of the area northerly of Planning Area 2C is undeveloped or used for agricultural production. Planning Area 7 is currently vacant.

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FORM 11: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3, CHANGE OF ZONE NO.
7829, ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687**

DATE: December 15, 2015

PAGE: Page 3 of 3

Changes to the Specific Plan contained in Substantial Conformance No. 3 include: increasing the amount of acres associated with Planning Area 2A from 15.6 to 27.4 acres; reducing acreage from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres for Planning Area 7; increasing acreage from 29.1 to 32.7 for Planning Area 8; and reducing the acreage from 29.7 to 19.9 for Planning area 9.

As such, the overall acreages within the specific plan for the land use designations Open Space – Conservation Drainage, Commercial Retail, Medium High Density Residential, and Medium Density Residential are being modified by Substantial Conformance No. 3. These changes include:

- Open Space – Conservation Drainage increases from 71.3 to 83.1
- Commercial Retail increases acreages from 54.9 to 58
- Medium Density Residential decreases acreages from 878.3 to 872.6 and decreases the amount of allowable units within this category from 2,875 to 2,865
- Medium High Density Residential decreases acreage from 214.1 to 204.3

Although the commercial retail land use designation is slightly increasing (an increase of 3.6 acres), the Open Space: Conservation Drainage is increasing by 11.8 acres and the medium High Density Residential designation is decreasing by 9.8 acres and the total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan are decreasing from 4,720 to 4,710.

On September 30, 2015, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the project to the Board of Supervisors by a vote of 5-0.

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. **ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822**
- B. **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**
- C. **PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 348 RELATING TO ZONING

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside Ordains as Follows:

Section 1. Section 4.1 of Ordinance No. 348 and Official Zoning Plan Map No.2, as amended, are further amended by placing in effect in the Rancho California Area the zone or zones as shown on the map entitled, "Change of Official Zoning Plan Amending Ordinance No. 348., Map No.2.2386, Change of Zone Case No. 7829," which is made a part of this ordinance.

Section 2. Article XVIIa Section 17.76 of Ordinance No. 348 is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 17.76 SP ZONE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286.

a. Planning Areas 1, 3 and 6.

(1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 1, 3 and 6 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except that uses permitted pursuant to Sections 6.1.b.(1) and (3); and d. shall not be permitted.

(2) The development standards for Planning Areas 1, 3 and 6 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those permitted in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance No. 348, except that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.b., c., d. and e. (1), (2), (3) and (4) shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

A. The minimum front yard setback to a habitable portion of the main building shall be fifteen feet (15') measured from the right of way.

B. The minimum front yard setback for garages shall be twenty feet (20') measured from the right of way.

- 1 C. Lot area shall be not less than five thousand (5,000) square feet. The minimum lot
2 area shall be determined by excluding that portion of a lot that is used solely for
3 access to the portion of a lot used as a building site.
- 4 D. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
5 shall be fifty feet (50') with a minimum average depth of eighty feet (80'). That
6 portion of a lot used for access on flag lots shall have a minimum width of twenty
7 feet (20').
- 8 E. The minimum frontage of a lot shall be forty feet (40') except that lots fronting on
9 knuckles or cul-de-sacs may have a minimum frontage of thirty-five feet (35') and
10 flag lots may have a minimum frontage of twenty feet (20').
- 11 F. Side yards on interior and through lots shall be not less than five feet (5') in width.
- 12 G. Side yards on corner and reversed corner lots shall be not less than ten feet (10')
13 from the existing street line or from any future street line as shown on any
14 Specific Plan of Highways, whichever is nearer the proposed structure, upon
15 which the main building sides, except where the lot is less than fifty feet (50')
16 wide, the yard need not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the width of the lot.
- 17 H. The rear yard shall be not less than fifteen feet (15') if adjacent to a greenbelt or
18 other open space identified in Specific Plan No. 286. Otherwise, the rear yard
19 shall not be less than twenty feet (20').
- 20 I. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
21 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
22 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

23 In addition, the following standard shall also apply:

24 AA. Lot coverage shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) for one-story buildings.

25 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as those
26 requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance No. 348.

27 b. Planning Areas 2A, 2C, 20, 22, 25, 35A, 35B, 52A and 52B.

1 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 2A, 2C, 20, 22, 25, 35A, 35B, 52A and 52B
2 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those uses permitted in Article VIIIe, Section 8.100
3 of Ordinance No. 348. except that uses permitted pursuant to Sections 8.100.a.(1), (2), (3), (4),
4 (5) and (8); b.(1); and c.(1) shall not be permitted. In addition, the permitted uses identified
5 under Section 8.100.a. shall include undeveloped open space and drainage areas.

6 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 2A, 2C, 20, 22, 25, 35A, 35B,
7 52A and 52B of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article
8 VIIIe, Section 8.101 of Ordinance No. 348.

9 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
10 those requirements identified in Article VIIIe of Ordinance No. 348.

11 c. Planning Areas 4, 27 and 34.

12 (1) The uses permitted in Planning 4, 27 and 34 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
13 same as those uses permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except that uses
14 permitted pursuant to Sections 6.1.b.(1) and (3); and d. shall not be permitted.

15 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 4, 27 and 34 of Specific Plan No.
16 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance No.
17 348, except that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.c. and e.(3) and
18 (4) shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

19 A. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
20 shall be one hundred feet (100') with a minimum average depth of one hundred
21 fifty feet (150').

22 B. The rear yard shall be not less than fifty feet (50').

23 C. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
24 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
25 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

26 (3) Except as provided above, all other requirements shall be the same as those
27 requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance No. 348.

1 d. Planning Areas 5A, 5B, 10B, 12A, 13A, 13B, 14A, 14B, 21A, 21B, 23, 24, 32, 37, 38
2 and 44.

3 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 5A, 5B, 10B, 12A, 13A, 13B, 14A, 14B,
4 21A, 21B, 23, 24, 32, 37, 38 and 44 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those uses
5 permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except that uses permitted pursuant to
6 Sections 6.1.b.(1) and (3); and d. shall not be permitted. In addition, the permitted uses identified
7 under Section 6.1.a shall also include public parks and public playgrounds.

8 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 5A, 5B, 10B, 12A, 13A 13B, 14A,
9 14B, 21A, 21B, 23, 24, 32, 37, 38 and 44 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those
10 standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance No. 348, except that the development
11 standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.e.(3) and (4) shall be deleted and replaced by the
12 following:

13 A. The rear yard shall be not less than twenty feet (20').

14 B. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
15 of two (2) feet. No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
16 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

17 (3) Except as provided above, all other requirements shall be the same as those
18 requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance No. 348.

19 e. Planning Areas 8 and 40.

20 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 8 and 40 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be
21 the same as those uses permitted in Article IXb, Section 9.50 of Ordinance No. 348 except that
22 the uses permitted pursuant to Section 9.50.a.(30), (52) and (64) shall not be permitted. In
23 addition, the permitted uses identified under Section 9.50.b. shall include mini-warehouses,
24 trailer and boat storage, recreational vehicle storage, and vehicle storage.

25 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 8 and 40 of Specific Plan No. 286
26 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article IXb, Section 9.53 of Ordinance No. 348.

27 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
28

1 those requirements identified in Article IXb of Ordinance No. 348.

2 f. Planning Area 9.

3 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 9 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same
4 as those uses permitted in Article VIII, Section 8.1 of Ordinance No. 348.

5 (2) The development standards for Planning Area 9 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be
6 the same as those standards identified in Article VIII, Section 8.2 of Ordinance No. 348.

7 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as those
8 requirements identified in Article VIII of Ordinance No. 348.

9 g. Planning Areas 7, 10A, 11, 19, 31, 39 and 42.

10 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 7, 10A, 11, 19, 31, 39 and 42 of Specific
11 Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.1 of
12 Ordinance No. 348, except that uses permitted pursuant to Sections 6.1.b.(1) and (3); and d. shall
13 not be permitted.

14 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 7, 10A, 11, 19, 31, 39 and 42 of
15 Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those permitted in Article VI, Section 6.2 of
16 Ordinance No. 348, except that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.b.,
17 c., d. and e. (2), (3) and (4) shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

18 A. Lot area shall be not less than five thousand (5,000) square feet. The minimum lot
19 area shall be determined by excluding that portion of a lot that is used solely for
20 access to the portion of a lot used as a building site.

21 B. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
22 shall be fifty feet (50') with a minimum average depth of eighty feet (80'). That
23 portion of a lot used for access on "flag" lots shall have minimum width of twenty
24 feet (20').

25 C. The minimum frontage of a lot shall be forty feet (40') except that lots fronting on
26 knuckles or cul-de-sacs may have a minimum frontage of thirty-five (35') and
27 except that "flag" lots may have a minimum frontage of twenty feet (20'). Lot
28

1 frontage along curvilinear streets may be measured at the building setback in
2 accordance with zone development standards.

3 D. Side yards on interior and through lots shall be not less than five feet (5') in width.
4 Side yards on corner and reversed corner lots shall be not less than ten feet (10')
5 from the existing street line or from any future street line as shown on any
6 Specific Plan of Highways, whichever is nearer the proposed structure, upon
7 which the main building sides, except where the lot is less than fifty feet (50')
8 wide, the yard need not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the width of the lot.

9 E. The rear yard shall be not less than fifteen feet (15') if adjacent to a greenbelt or
10 other open space identified in Specific Plan No. 286. Otherwise, the rear yard
11 shall not be less than twenty feet (20').

12 F. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
13 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
14 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

15 In addition, the following standard shall also apply:

16 AA. Lot coverage shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) for one-story buildings.

17 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
18 those requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance 348.

19 h. Planning Areas 12B, 16A, 16B, 26A, 33 and 45.

20 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 12B, 16A, 16B, 26A, 33 and 45 of Specific
21 Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those uses permitted in Article VIIIe, Section 8.100 of
22 Ordinance No. 348, except that uses permitted pursuant to Sections 8.100.a.(1), (2), and (6); and
23 b.(1) shall not be permitted. In addition, the permitted uses identified under Section 8.100.a.
24 shall include public parks and trails.

25 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 12B, 16A, 16B, 26A, 33 and 45 of
26 Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VIIIe, Section
27 8.101 of Ordinance No. 348.

1 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
2 those requirements identified in Article VIIIe of Ordinance No. 348.

3 i. Planning Areas 15, 26B and 46.

4 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 15, 26B and 46 of Specific Plan No. 286
5 shall be the same as those uses permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348. In
6 addition, the permitted uses identified under Section 6.1.a. shall also include public schools.

7 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 15, 26B and 46 of Specific Plan
8 No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance
9 No. 348, except that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.e.(3) and (4)
10 shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

11 A. The rear yard shall be not less than twenty feet (20').

12 B. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
13 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
14 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

15 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
16 those requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance No. 348.

17 j. Planning Area 18.

18 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 18 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
19 same as those uses permitted in Article IXb, Section 9.50 of Ordinance No. 348, except that the
20 uses permitted pursuant to Sections 9.50.a.(11), (23), (30), (32), (52) and (64); and b.(5) and (7)
21 shall not be permitted. In addition, the permitted uses identified under Section 9.50.a. shall also
22 include single-family dwellings, multiple family dwellings, congregate care residential facilities,
23 public and private recreation areas, and paseos/trails.

24 (2) The developments standards for commercial uses within Planning Area 18 of
25 Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article IXb, Section 9.53
26 of Ordinance No. 348.

- 1 F. The maximum ratio of floor area to lot area shall not be greater than two to one
2 (2:1), not including basement floor area.
- 3 G. All buildings and structures shall not exceed fifty feet (50') in height, unless a
4 height up to seventy-five feet (75') is specifically permitted under the provisions
5 of Section 18.34 of Ordinance No. 348.
- 6 H. Automobile storage space shall be provided as required by Section 18.12 of
7 Ordinance No. 348.
- 8 I. Interior side yards may be reduced to accommodate zero lot line or common wall
9 situations, except that, in no case shall the reduction in side yard areas reduce the
10 required separation between detached structures.
- 11 J. Setback areas may be used for driveways, parking and landscaping.
- 12 K. A minimum of fifteen percent (15%) of the site proposed for development shall
13 be landscaped and irrigated.
- 14 L. Trash collection areas shall be screened by landscaping or architectural features in
15 such a manner as not to be visible from a public street or from any adjacent
16 residential area.
- 17 M. Outside storage areas are prohibited.
- 18 N. Utilities shall be installed underground except that electrical lines rated at 33kV or
19 greater may be installed above ground.
- 20 O. All lighting fixtures, including spot lights, electrical reflectors and other means of
21 illumination for signs, structures, landscaping, parking, loading, unloading and
22 similar areas, shall be focused, directed and arranged to prevent glare to direct
23 illumination on residential uses.

24 (4) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirement shall be the same as those
25 requirements identified in Article IXb of Ordinance No. 348.

26 k. Planning Areas 28 and 30.

- 27 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 28 and 30 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be
28

1 the same as those uses permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except that
2 uses permitted pursuant to Sections 6.1.b.(1) and (3); and d. shall not be permitted.

3 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 28 and 30 of Specific Plan No.
4 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance No.
5 348, except that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.b., c., d. and e.(2)
6 and (3) shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

7 A. Lot area shall be not less than twenty thousand (20,000) square feet. The
8 minimum lot area shall be determined by excluding that portion of a lot that is
9 used solely for access to the portion of a lot used as a building site.

10 B. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
11 shall be one hundred feet (100') with a minimum average depth of one hundred
12 fifty feet (150'). That portion of a lot used for access on flag lots shall have a
13 minimum width of twenty feet (20').

14 C. The side yard shall not be less than ten feet (10').

15 D. The rear yard shall not be less than fifty feet (50').

16 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
17 those requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance No. 348.

18 1. Planning Area 29.

19 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 29 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
20 same as those uses permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except that uses
21 permitted pursuant to Section 6.1.b.(1), (3) and d. shall not be permitted.

22 (2) The development standards for Planning Area 29 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall
23 be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance No. 348, except
24 that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.b., c., d. and e.(2), (3) and (4)
25 shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

26 A. Lot area shall be not less than two and one-half (2 1/2) gross acres. The minimum
27 lot area shall be determined by excluding that portion of a lot that is used solely

1 for access to the portion of a lot used as a building site.

2 B. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
3 shall be fifty feet (50') with a minimum average depth of eighty feet (80').

4 C. The minimum frontage of a lot shall be forty feet (40').

5 D. Side yards on interior and through lots shall be not less than five feet (5') in width.

6 E. Side yards on corner and reversed corner lots shall be not less than ten feet (10')
7 from the existing street line or from any future street line as shown on any
8 Specific Plan of Highways, whichever is nearer the proposed structure, upon
9 which the main building sides, except where the lot is less than fifty feet (50')
10 wide, the yard need not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the width of the lot.

11 F. The rear yard shall be not less than fifteen feet (15') if adjacent to a greenbelt or
12 other open space identified in Specific Plan No. 286. Otherwise, the rear yard
13 shall not be less than twenty feet (20').

14 G. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
15 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
16 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

17 In addition, the following standard shall also apply:

18 AA. Lot coverage shall not exceed fifty percent (50%).

19 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
20 those requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance 348.

21 m. Planning Area 36.

22 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 36 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
23 same as those uses permitted in Article IXb, Section 9.50 of Ordinance No. 348 except that the
24 uses permitted pursuant to Section 9.50.a.(30), (52) and (64) shall not be permitted.

25 (2) The development standards for Planning Area 36 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall
26 be the same as those standards identified in Article IXb, Section 9.53 of Ordinance No. 348.

27 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
28

1 those requirements identified in Article IXb of Ordinance No. 348.

2 n. Planning Area 41.

3 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 41 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
4 same as those uses permitted in Article VIII, Section 8.1 of Ordinance No. 348.

5 (2) The development standards for Planning Area 41 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall
6 be the same as those standards identified in Article VIII, Section 8.2 of Ordinance No. 348.

7 (3) The residential uses within Planning Area 41 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall
8 comply with the development standards and also be subject to the standards for Planned
9 Residential Developments set forth in Article XVIII, Section 18.5 of Ordinance 348 except that
10 the standards set forth in Section 18.5 b. and c. shall be deleted and replaced with the following:

11 A. Not less than 20 percent (20%) of a project area shall be used for open area or
12 recreational facilities, or a combination thereof. The height of buildings shall not
13 exceed thirty-five feet (35') and the distance between buildings shall be ten feet (10').

14 B. Building setbacks from a project's interior streets and boundary lines shall be eight
15 feet (8'). The minimum building setback from interior drives shall be five feet (5').

16 (4) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as those
17 requirements identified in Article VIII of Ordinance No. 348.

18 o. Planning Area 43.

19 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 43 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
20 same as those uses permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except that uses
21 permitted pursuant to Section 6.1.b.(1) and (3) and d. shall not be permitted.

22 (2) The development standards for Planning Area 43 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall
23 be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance No. 348, except
24 that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.b., c., d. and e.(2), (3) and (4)
25 shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

26 A. Lot area shall be not less than four (4) gross acres. The minimum lot area shall be
27 determined by excluding that portion of a lot that is used solely for access to the
28

1 portion of a lot used as a building site.

2 B. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
3 shall be fifty feet (50') with a minimum average depth of eighty feet (80').

4 C. The minimum frontage of a lot shall be forty feet (40').

5 D. Side yards on interior and through lots shall be not less than five feet (5') in width.

6 E. Side yards on corner and reversed corner lots shall be not less than ten feet (10')
7 from the existing street line or from any future street line as shown on any
8 Specific Plan of Highways, whichever is nearer the proposed structure, upon
9 which the main building sides, except where the lot is less than fifty feet (50')
10 wide, the yard need not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the width of the lot.

11 F. The rear yard shall be not less than fifteen feet (15') if adjacent to a greenbelt or
12 other open space identified in Specific Plan No. 286. Otherwise, the rear yard
13 shall not be less than twenty feet (20').

14 G. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
15 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
16 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

17 In addition, the following standard shall also apply:

18 AA. Lot coverage shall not exceed fifty percent (50%).

19 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
20 those requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance 348.

21 p. Planning Areas 47, 49, 50 and 51.

22 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Areas 47, 49, 50 and 51 of Specific Plan No. 286
23 shall be the same as those uses permitted in Article VI, Section 6.1 of Ordinance No. 348, except
24 that uses permitted pursuant to Section 6.1.b.(1) and (3) and d. shall not be permitted.

25 (2) The development standards for Planning Areas 47, 49, 50, and 51 of Specific Plan
26 No. 286 shall be the same as those standards identified in Article VI, Section 6.2 of Ordinance
27 No. 348, except that the development standards set forth in Article VI, Section 6.2.c., and e.(3)

1 and (4) shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

- 2 A. The minimum average width of that portion of a lot to be used as a building site
3 shall be sixty feet (60') with a minimum average depth of one hundred feet (100').
4 However, for areas immediately adjacent to low density residential as shown on
5 Figure 4-10 of Specific Plan No. 286, the minimum average width of that portion
6 of the lot to be used as a building site shall be one hundred feet (100') with a
7 minimum average depth of one hundred fifty feet (150'). That portion of a lot
8 used for access on "flag" lots shall have minimum width of twenty feet (20').
- 9 B. The rear yard shall be not less than twenty feet (20'). However, for areas
10 immediately adjacent to low-density residential as shown on Figure 4-10 of
11 Specific Plan No. 286, the rear yard shall not be less than fifty feet (50').
- 12 C. Chimneys and fireplaces shall be allowed to encroach into side yards a maximum
13 of two feet (2'). No other structural encroachments shall be permitted in the front,
14 rear or side yard except as provided for in Section 18.19 of Ordinance No. 348.

15 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
16 those requirements identified in Article VI of Ordinance 348.

17 q. Planning Area 48.

18 (1) The uses permitted in Planning Area 48 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall be the
19 same as those uses permitted in Article IXb, Section 9.50 of Ordinance No. 348, except that the
20 uses permitted pursuant to Section 9.50.a.(14), (19), (22), (25), (29),(30), (37), (41), (43), (44),
21 (49), (50), (52), (54), (62), (64), (69), (71), (72), (80), (85), and (91); b.(1), (2), (6), (7), (9), (13),
22 (17), and (18) shall not be permitted.

23 (2) The development standards for Planning Area 48 of Specific Plan No. 286 shall
24 be the same as those standards identified in Article IXb, Section 9.53 of Ordinance No. 348.

25 (3) Except as provided above, all other zoning requirements shall be the same as
26 those requirements identified in Article IXb of Ordinance No. 348.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after its adoption.

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

By John J. Benoit
Chairman **JOHN J. BENOIT**

ATTEST:
KECIA HARPER-IHEM
Clerk of the Board

By Kalle Bayton
Deputy

(SEAL)

APPROVED AS TO FORM
December 29, 2015

By Michelle Clack
MICHELLE CLACK
Deputy County Counsel

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) SS

I HEREBY CERTIFY that at a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of said county held on February 2, 2016, the foregoing ordinance consisting of 3 Sections was adopted by the following vote:


AYES: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Washington Benoit and Ashley
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

DATE: February 2, 2016

KECIA HARPER-IHEM
Clerk of the Board
BY *K. Harper-Ihem*
Deputy

SEAL

RANCHO CALIFORNIA AREA
SECTION 28, T. 6 S., R. 2 W., S. B. B. & M.




SP ZONE SPECIFIC PLAN
(SP00286A6)

MAP NO. 2.2386
CHANGE OF OFFICIAL ZONING PLAN
AMENDING

MAP NO. 2 ORDINANCE NO. 348

CHANGE OF ZONE CASE NO. 7829
ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822
DATE: _____




**RANCHO CALIFORNIA AREA
SECTION 28, T. 6 S., R. 2 W., S. B. B. & M.**

LINE TABLE		
LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L1	N00°04'31"E	5.00'
L2	N64°11'29"W	115.24'
L3	N58°50'35"W	98.52'
L4	N00°54'03"E	82.11'
L5	N79°08'38"W	266.66'
L6	N60°41'18"W	53.39'
L7	N54°27'05"W	45.27'
L8	N27°52'32"W	71.51'

CURVE TABLE			
CURVE	DELTA	RADIUS	LENGTH
C1	64°00'20"	48.00'	53.62'
C2	22°19'16"	425.00'	165.57'

SP ZONE SPECIFIC PLAN
(SP00286A6)

MAP NO. 2.2386
CHANGE OF OFFICIAL ZONING PLAN
AMENDING
MAP NO. 2 ORDINANCE NO. 348
CHANGE OF ZONE CASE NO. 7829
ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 348.4822
DATE: _____



Clerk's Original

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

**Steve Weiss, AICP
Planning Director**

*402B
Set for
02-02-2016*

DATE: December 15, 2015

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Planning Department – Riverside

SUBJECT: SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3 (SP00286S3), CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829 (CZ07829), AND TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 36687 (TR36687)

(Charge your time to these case numbers)

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

- Place on Administrative Action
 - Receive & File
 - EOT
- Labels provided If Set For Hearing
 - 10 Day 20 Day 30 day
- Place on Consent Calendar
- Place on Policy Calendar (Resolutions; Ordinances; PNC)
- Place on Section Initiation Proceeding (GPIP)
- Set for Hearing (Legislative Action Required; CZ, GPA, SP, SPA)
- Publish in Newspaper: (3rd Dist) Press Enterprise
 - Addendum to earlier Environmental Document
 - 10 Day 20 Day 30 day
- Notify Property Owners (app/agencies/property owner labels provided)


Designate Newspaper used by Planning Department for Notice of Hearing:
(3rd Dist) Press Enterprise (Please use a one-eighth page AD for the newspaper)

**3 Extra sets were taken to:
Clerk of the Board**

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

Desert Office · 77-588 Duna Court, Suite H
Palm Desert, California 92211
(760) 863-8277 · Fax (760) 863-7040

"Planning Our Future... Preserving Our Past"



RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER
SEPTEMBER 30, 2015**

I. AGENDA ITEM 4.3

SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687

– Consider an Addendum to Certified EIR – Applicant: Keith Gardner – Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units per Acre) and Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) as reflected on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan of SP 286 – Location: Northerly of Safflower Street, southerly of Koon Street, easterly of Winchester Road, and westerly of Woodshire Drive – 1,656 Gross Acres (20.3 Acres for the Tentative Tract Map) – Zoning: Specific Plan (SP No. 286 [Winchester 1800]).

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Specific Plan No. 286, Substantial Conformance No. 3, proposes to reduce the amount of acres within Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres by designating a larger area to Planning Area 2A (which is designated Open Space: Conservation Drainage). The land use designation for Planning Area 7 will remain as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The project also proposes to increase the acreage for Planning Area 8 from 29.1 to 32.7 (an increase of 3.6 acres) and proposes to reduce the acreage for Planning Area 9 from 29.7 to 19.9. As a result of these changes Planning Area 2A would increase from 15.6 acres to 27.4 acres. The total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan will decrease from 4,720 to 4,710. Change of Zone No. 7829 proposes to modify the existing Specific Plan zoning ordinance text to allow for 71 units in Planning Area 7 with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. The number of units previously allowed was 85 units and it is being reduced to 75. The change of zone will also formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7. Tentative Tract Map No. 36687 is a Schedule A subdivision of 20.27 acres into 71 residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. and 14 open space lots.

III. MEETING SUMMARY:

The following staff presented the subject proposal:


Project Planner: Damaris Abraham at (951) 955-5719 or email dabraham@rctlma.org.

- Keith Gardner, Applicant's Representative, spoke in favor of the proposed project.
- No one spoke in opposition or in a neutral position.

IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES:

None

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 30, 2015**

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

Public Hearing: Closed

Motion by Commissioner Taylor Berger, 2nd by Commissioner Sanchez

A vote of 5-0,

RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

CONSIDER an **ADDENDUM** to **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 374**; and,

APPROVE SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3; and,


TENTATIVELY APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829; and,

APPROVE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687.

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.: 4.3
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisory District: Third
Project Planner: Damaris Abraham
Planning Commission: September 30, 2015

SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286,
SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687
Environmental Assessment No. 42686
Applicant: Keith Gardner
Engineer/Representative: Jake Smith


Steve Weiss, AICP
Planning Director

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

Specific Plan No. 286, Substantial Conformance No. 3 proposes to reduce the amount of acres within Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres by designating a larger area to Planning Area 2A (which is designated Open Space: Conservation Drainage). The land use designation for Planning Area 7 will remain as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The project also proposes to increase the acreage for Planning Area 8 from 29.1 to 32.7 (an increase of 3.6 acres) and proposes to reduce the acreage for Planning Area 9 from 29.7 to 19.9. As a result of these changes Planning Area 2A would increase from 15.6 acres to 27.4 acres. The total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan will decrease from 4,720 to 4,710.

Change of Zone No. 7829 proposes to modify the existing Specific Plan zoning ordinance text to allow for 71 units in Planning Area 7 with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. The number of units previously allowed was 85 units and it is being reduced to 75. The change of zone will also formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7.

Tentative Tract Map No. 36687 is a Schedule A subdivision of 20.27 acres into 71 residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. and 14 open space lots. The Tentative Tract Map covers Planning Areas 7 and a portion of 2A. The project includes off-site improvements that include grading and drainage easement.

The project is located northerly of Safflower Street, southerly of Koon Street, easterly of Winchester Road, and westerly of Woodshire Drive.

BACKGROUND:

The Winchester 1800 Specific Plan (Specific Plan No. 286) with Certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) No. 374 was adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on April 29, 1997. There have been six major amendments to the Specific Plan that reduced the land use intensity of the Specific Plan area. As a result of these prior amendments, the total number of dwelling units was reduced from 5,806 to 4,720. Although only 4,720 homes are allowed in Specific Plan No. 286 (SP 286), EIR No. 374 evaluated a "worst case" scenario by assuming future development with up to 5,806 dwelling units.

To date, Specific Plan No. 286 largely has been built-out, with exception of lands north of the existing drainage channel within Planning Area 2C. In this northern portion of the Specific Plan a 5.5-acre park site has been constructed, and Planning Areas 5A, 5B, and 12A have been developed with residential

**SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687
Planning Commission Staff Report: September 30, 2015
Page 2 of 8**

uses; the remainder of the area northerly of Planning Area 2C is undeveloped or used for agricultural production. Planning Area 7 is currently vacant.

Changes to the Specific Plan contained in Substantial Conformance No. 3 include: increasing the amount of acres associated with Planning Area 2A from 15.6 to 27.4 acres; reducing acreage from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres for Planning Area 7; increasing acreage from 29.1 to 32.7 for Planning Area 8; and reducing the acreage from 29.7 to 19.9 for Planning area 9.

As such, the overall acreages within the specific plan for the land use designations Open Space – Conservation Drainage, Commercial Retail, Medium High Density Residential, and Medium Density Residential are being modified by Substantial Conformance No. 3. These changes include:

- Open Space – Conservation Drainage increases from 71.3 to 83.1;
- Commercial Retail increases acreages from 54.9 to 58;
- Medium Density Residential decreases acreages from 878.3 to 872.6 and decreases the amount of allowable units within this category from 2,875 to 2,865
- Medium High Density Residential decreases acreage from 214.1 to 204.3

Although the commercial retail land use designation is slightly increasing (an increase of 3.6 acres), the Open Space: Conservation Drainage is increasing by 11.8 acres and the medium High Density Residential designation is decreasing by 9.8 acres and the total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan are decreasing from 4,720 to 4,710.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

1. Existing General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units per Acre) and Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) as reflected on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan of SP286A6; Highway 79 Policy Area
2. Surrounding General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Commercial Retail per Specific Plan No. 286 to the north and west
Medium Density Residential, per Specific Plan No. 286 to the east
Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Medium Density Residential per Specific Plan No. 286 to the south
3. Existing Zoning (Ex. #2): Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800)
4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #2): Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2A, 6, 8, 52A to the north
Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2A, 8, 9 to the south
Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Area 5 to the east
Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 5. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1): | Areas 2C, 11, 14A to the west
Vacant |
| 6. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1): | Vacant and agricultural uses to the north and west
Single family residences to the south |
| 7. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 1,656 (for the SP)
Total Acreage for TR36687: 20.3
Total Proposed Lots: 85
Proposed Min. Lot Size: 5,000
Schedule: A |
| 8. Environmental Concerns: | See attached environmental assessment |

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CONSIDER an ADDENDUM to ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 374, based on the findings and conclusions in Environmental Assessment No. 42686; and,

APPROVE SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

TENTATIVELY APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829, to revise the Specific Plan zoning ordinance and to formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report, and, subject to adoption of the zoning ordinance by the Board of Supervisors; and,

APPROVE TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687, 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 in the attached Addendum to EIR No. 374, which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units per Acre) and Open Space: Conservation (OS:C) as reflected on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan of SP286A6 on the Southwest Area Plan.
2. Section 2.11.4 of Ordinance No. 348 provides that an application for a determination of substantial conformance may be approved only if the following findings are made:
 - a. That the project as modified meets the intent and purpose of the adopted specific plan; and,
 - b. That the project as modified is consistent with the findings and conclusions contained in the resolution adopting the specific plan.

3. The substantial conformance to the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan is proposing to reduce the amount of acres within Planning Area 7 from designating a larger area to Planning Area 2A (which is designated Open Space: Conservation Drainage). The project is also proposing to increase the acreage for Planning Area 8 slightly and proposes to reduce the acreage for Planning Area 9. As a result of these changes, the commercial retail land use designation is slightly increasing (an increase of 3.6 acres), the Open Space: Conservation Drainage is increasing by 11.8 acres and the medium High Density Residential designation is decreasing by 9.8 acres and the total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan are decreasing from 4,720 to 4,710. The substantial conformance will protect topographic features and will improve drainage by designating a larger area for open space for conservation and drainage purposes. The project will not increase the overall land use density or intensity because it is designating a larger area to open space and the total number of residential units is being decreased. The proposed project meets the intent and purpose of the adopted specific plan and is consistent with the findings and conclusions contained in the resolution adopting the specific plan.
4. The Tentative Tract Map is proposing to subdivide 20.27 acres into 71 residential lots, which will have a density of 3.5 dwelling units per acre. This is in conformance with the density required by the Community Development: Low Density Residential designation (2-5 dwelling units per acre)
5. The proposed project is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area. The purpose of the Highway 79 Policy Area is to address transportation infrastructure capacity within the policy area. SWAP 9.2 of the Highway 79 Policy Area requires the establishment of a program in the Highway 79 Policy Area to ensure that overall trip generation does not exceed system capacity and that the system operation continues to meet Level of Service standards. In general, the program would establish guidelines to be incorporated into individual Traffic Impact Analysis that would monitor overall trip generation from residential development to ensure that development projects within the Highway 79 Policy Area produce traffic generation at a level that is 9% less than the trips projected from the General Plan traffic model residential land use designations. Individually, projects could exceed the General Plan traffic model trip generation level, provided it can be demonstrated that sufficient reductions have occurred on other projects in order to meet Level of Service standards. The project's proposed reduction in residential intensity would result in a decrease in traffic from the trips projected from the General Plan traffic model, which assumed build out in accordance with the approved SP 286. Accordingly, because the project would result in a net reduction of traffic that exceeds 9%, the project would be consistent with Policy SWAP 9.2.
6. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Commercial Retail per Specific Plan No. 286 to the north and west, Medium Density Residential, per Specific Plan No. 286 to the east, and Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Medium Density Residential per Specific Plan No. 286 to the south.
7. As a result of Section 3.2.I, and in accordance with Section 3.2.J. of Ordinance No. 460, the applicant will provide written assurances from the owners of the properties underlying the off-site improvement. The Flood Control District has conditioned the project that prior to map recordation (50.FLOOD RI. 4 and 50.FLOOD RI.5) that written agreement be provided for the Flood Control District for review and approval. In the event the above referenced property owners or their

successor(s)-in-interest do not provide to the Flood Control District the necessary dedications, eminent domain proceedings may need to be instituted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

8. The existing zoning for the site is Specific Plan (Winchester 1800) and will remain Specific Plan. The project is proposing modifications to the existing zoning ordinance.
9. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2A, 6, 8, 52A to the north, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2A, 8, 9 to the south, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Area 5 to the east, and Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2C, 11, 14A to the west.
10. The project is surrounded by properties which are vacant and agricultural uses to the north and west and single family residences to the south.
11. This project is located within Criteria cell 5279 of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP). A Habitat Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS 2160) was submitted for review. As part of the HANS review Lot 84 will be dedicated as open space. This project fulfills the requirements of the WRCMSHCP.
12. As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, the guidelines allow for the updating and use of a previously certified EIR for projects that have changed or are different from the previous project or conditions analyzed in the certified EIR. In cases where changes or additions occur with no new or more severe significant environmental impacts, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR may be prepared.

As provided in the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) No. 42681, the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental impacts not identified in the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) No. 374 and none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 exist. The proposed project will not result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, does not propose any substantial changes which require major revisions to EIR No. 374, no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified based on the following:

- a) This project is proposing to a substantial conformance to the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, a Change of Zone, and a Tentative Tract Map to reconfigure planning area boundaries, adjust acreages and unit allocations, and subdivide approximately 20.3 acres to facilitate the future development of 71 single-family residential dwelling units within the northernmost portion of the Specific Plan. These changes would result in decrease from 4,720 to 4,710 dwelling units on-site. Although the commercial retail land use designation is slightly increasing (an increase of 3.6 acres), the Open Space: Conservation Drainage is increasing by 11.8 acres and the medium High Density Residential designation is decreasing by 9.8 acres. This will result in a reduction in environmental impacts as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed by EIR No. 374. As such, there would be no new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects as a result of the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would not require major revisions to the previously-certified EIR No. 374.

- b) EIR No. 374 concluded that implementation of the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to wildlife/vegetation (due to the expansive loss of agricultural field habitat), climate and air quality (due to short term particulate emissions during construction and cumulative emissions that would exceed the threshold of significance), noise (due to regional traffic increases), and agriculture (due to development on Class I and II Prime soils). In addition, EIR No. 374 concluded that the project would be growth-inducing. As demonstrated in the accompanying Initial Study/Environmental Assessment form and its associated analyses, there are no components of the proposed project that would result in new or increased impacts to wildlife/vegetation, climate and air quality, noise or agriculture. This project is proposing to a substantial conformance to the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, a Change of Zone, and a Tentative Tract Map to reconfigure planning area boundaries, adjust acreages and unit allocations, and subdivide approximately 20.3 acres to facilitate the future development of 71 single-family residential dwelling units within the northernmost portion of the Specific Plan. These changes would result in decrease from 4,720 to 4,710 dwelling units on-site. Although the commercial retail land use designation is slightly increasing (an increase of 3.6 acres), the Open Space: Conservation Drainage is increasing by 11.8 acres and the medium High Density Residential designation is decreasing by 9.8 acres, resulting in a reduction in environmental impacts as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed by EIR No. 374. As such, the proposed project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts identified in the EIR No. 374.
- c) Subsequent to the certification of EIR No. 374, no new information of substantial importance has become available which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR No. 374 was prepared.
- d) This project is proposing to a substantial conformance to the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, a Change of Zone, and a Tentative Tract Map to reconfigure planning area boundaries, adjust acreages and unit allocations, and subdivide approximately 20.3 acres to facilitate the future development of 71 single-family residential dwelling units within the northernmost portion of the Specific Plan. These changes would result in decrease from 4,720 to 4,710 dwelling units on-site. Although the commercial retail land use designation is slightly increasing (an increase of 3.6 acres), the Open Space: Conservation Drainage is increasing by 11.8 acres and the medium High Density Residential designation is decreasing by 9.8 acres, resulting in a reduction in environmental impacts as compared to what was evaluated and disclosed by EIR No. 374. As such, the project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts beyond those disclosed in EIR No. 374.
- e) Subsequent to the certification of EIR No. 374, no new mitigation measures or alternatives have been identified that were infeasible at the time EIR No. 374 was certified and that would substantially reduce impacts to wildlife/vegetation, climate and air quality, noise, or agricultural resources.
- f) Subsequent to the certification of EIR No. 374, no new mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in EIR No. 374 have been identified to reduce the significant unavoidable impacts to wildlife/vegetation, climate and air quality, noise, or agricultural resources.

- g) Technical reports that evaluate the proposed project were prepared for the subject areas of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology/water quality, hazards, traffic, and noise. These technical reports, as set forth in the EA for the addendum, do not identify any new impacts or substantial increases in impacts to the environment beyond that which was disclosed in EIR No. 374.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Land Use Designations shown in the Specific Plan, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan and SP286A6 as modified through Substantial Conformance No. 3.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan 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 clearly compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
6. The project is consistent with the provisions of CEQA as demonstrated through the attached addendum to previously certified EIR No. 374 and is consistent with section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
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 fault zone;
 - b. A high fire area; or,
 - c. An airport influence area.
3. The project site is located within:
 - a. The City of Temecula sphere of influence;
 - b. The boundaries of the Hemet Unified School District;
 - c. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area; and,
 - d. A low to moderate liquefaction potential area.
4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 476-010,-024, 476-010-026, 476-010-036.

**SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 286, SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE NO. 3
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7829
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 36687
Planning Commission Staff Report: September 30, 2015
Page 8 of 8**

DA:da

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\SP00286S3\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\DH-PC\SP286S3.CZ7829.TR36687.Staff Report.docx


Date Prepared: 05/07/15

Date Revised: 09/11/15

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CZ07829 SP00286S3 TR36687
VICINITY/POLICY AREAS**

Supervisor Washington
District 3

Date Drawn: 08/05/2015
Vicinity Map



Zoning Area: Rancho California

Author: Vinnie Nguyen



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Ordinance that revised the zoning codes for the County. The new General Ordinance contains different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951)955-3200 (Western County) or in Palm Desert at (760)365-6277 (Eastern County) or Website: <http://www.riverside.ca.gov>


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CZ07829 SP00286S3 TR36687

Supervisor Washington
District 3


Date Drawn: 08/05/2015
Exhibit 5

EXISTING GENERAL PLAN



Zoning Area: Rancho California

Author: Vinnie Nguyen



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different type of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951)955-3200 (Western County) or in Palm Desert at (760)863-8277 (Eastern County) or Website: <http://rctplanning.rctplma.org>

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


CZ07829 SP00286S3 TR36687

Supervisor Washington
District 3

Date Drawn: 08/05/2015


Exhibit 3

PROPOSED ZONING



Zoning Area: Rancho California

Author: Vinnie Nguyen




DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different type of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951)955-3200 (Western County) or in Palm Desert at (760)863-8277 (Eastern County) or Website <http://planning.rctlma.org>

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CZ07829 SP00286S3 TR36687

Supervisor Washington
 District 3


Date Drawn: 08/05/2015
 Exhibit 1

LAND USE




Zoning Area: Rancho California


Author: Vinnie Nguyen



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different type of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951)955-3200 (Western County) or in Palm Desert at (760)863-8277 (Eastern County) or Website <http://planning.rcplma.org>

Figure III-1 Land use Plan





- NOTES:**
1. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.
 2. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 3. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 4. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 5. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 6. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 7. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 8. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 9. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 10. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 11. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 12. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 13. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 14. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 15. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 16. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 17. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 18. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 19. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 20. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 21. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 22. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 23. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 24. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.
 25. THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.

PUBLIC UTILITIES / SERVICES:

SCHOOL DISTRICT:
 SAN ANTONIO SCHOOL DISTRICT
 2100 MARSH ROAD
 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201
 (210) 343-2000

ELECTRIC:
 TEXAS ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION & TRANSPORTATION COMPANY
 2000 MARSH ROAD
 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201
 (210) 343-2000

GAS:
 TEXAS GAS COMPANY
 2000 MARSH ROAD
 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201
 (210) 343-2000

SEWER:
 SAN ANTONIO WATER & SEWER UTILITY
 2000 MARSH ROAD
 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201
 (210) 343-2000

TELEPHONE:
 SBC COMMUNICATIONS
 2000 MARSH ROAD
 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201
 (210) 343-2000

ZONING AND LAND USE SUMMARY



SECTION	AREA (AC)	ZONING	LAND USE
SECTION A-A	1.2	RESIDENTIAL	RESIDENTIAL
SECTION B-B	1.5	RESIDENTIAL	RESIDENTIAL
SECTION C-C	1.8	RESIDENTIAL	RESIDENTIAL
TOTAL	4.5		

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
 THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP:
 I HEREBY STATE THAT THE MAP AND INSTRUMENT UNDER WHICH THIS PROJECT IS BEING DEVELOPED ARE THE PROPERTY OF THE PLANNING AND ENGINEERING FIRM AND I AM NOT PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION OR KNOWLEDGE OF ANY KIND TO THE PUBLIC.

PREPARED BY:
H&S
 HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
 2000 MARSH ROAD
 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201
 PH: (210) 343-2000

EXHIBIT "F" TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 36687 AMENDED NO. 2




RESIDENTIAL LOT SUMMARY

LOT NO.	AREA (SQ FT)	AREA (AC)
1	10,000	0.23
2	10,000	0.23
3	10,000	0.23
4	10,000	0.23
5	10,000	0.23
6	10,000	0.23
7	10,000	0.23
8	10,000	0.23
9	10,000	0.23
10	10,000	0.23
11	10,000	0.23
12	10,000	0.23
13	10,000	0.23
14	10,000	0.23
15	10,000	0.23
16	10,000	0.23
17	10,000	0.23
18	10,000	0.23
19	10,000	0.23
20	10,000	0.23
21	10,000	0.23
22	10,000	0.23
23	10,000	0.23
24	10,000	0.23
25	10,000	0.23
26	10,000	0.23
27	10,000	0.23
28	10,000	0.23
29	10,000	0.23
30	10,000	0.23
31	10,000	0.23
32	10,000	0.23
33	10,000	0.23
34	10,000	0.23
35	10,000	0.23
36	10,000	0.23
37	10,000	0.23
38	10,000	0.23
39	10,000	0.23
40	10,000	0.23
41	10,000	0.23
42	10,000	0.23
43	10,000	0.23
44	10,000	0.23
45	10,000	0.23
46	10,000	0.23
47	10,000	0.23
48	10,000	0.23
49	10,000	0.23
50	10,000	0.23
51	10,000	0.23
52	10,000	0.23
53	10,000	0.23
54	10,000	0.23
55	10,000	0.23
56	10,000	0.23
57	10,000	0.23
58	10,000	0.23
59	10,000	0.23
60	10,000	0.23
61	10,000	0.23
62	10,000	0.23
63	10,000	0.23
64	10,000	0.23
65	10,000	0.23
66	10,000	0.23
67	10,000	0.23
68	10,000	0.23
69	10,000	0.23
70	10,000	0.23
71	10,000	0.23
72	10,000	0.23
73	10,000	0.23
74	10,000	0.23
75	10,000	0.23
76	10,000	0.23
77	10,000	0.23
78	10,000	0.23
79	10,000	0.23
80	10,000	0.23
81	10,000	0.23
82	10,000	0.23
83	10,000	0.23
84	10,000	0.23
85	10,000	0.23
86	10,000	0.23
87	10,000	0.23
88	10,000	0.23
89	10,000	0.23
90	10,000	0.23
91	10,000	0.23
92	10,000	0.23
93	10,000	0.23
94	10,000	0.23
95	10,000	0.23
96	10,000	0.23
97	10,000	0.23
98	10,000	0.23
99	10,000	0.23
100	10,000	0.23

OPEN SPACE LOT SUMMARY

LOT NO.	AREA (SQ FT)	AREA (AC)
1	10,000	0.23
2	10,000	0.23
3	10,000	0.23
4	10,000	0.23
5	10,000	0.23
6	10,000	0.23
7	10,000	0.23
8	10,000	0.23
9	10,000	0.23
10	10,000	0.23
11	10,000	0.23
12	10,000	0.23
13	10,000	0.23
14	10,000	0.23
15	10,000	0.23
16	10,000	0.23
17	10,000	0.23
18	10,000	0.23
19	10,000	0.23
20	10,000	0.23
21	10,000	0.23
22	10,000	0.23
23	10,000	0.23
24	10,000	0.23
25	10,000	0.23
26	10,000	0.23
27	10,000	0.23
28	10,000	0.23
29	10,000	0.23
30	10,000	0.23
31	10,000	0.23
32	10,000	0.23
33	10,000	0.23
34	10,000	0.23
35	10,000	0.23
36	10,000	0.23
37	10,000	0.23
38	10,000	0.23
39	10,000	0.23
40	10,000	0.23
41	10,000	0.23
42	10,000	0.23
43	10,000	0.23
44	10,000	0.23
45	10,000	0.23
46	10,000	0.23
47	10,000	0.23
48	10,000	0.23
49	10,000	0.23
50	10,000	0.23
51	10,000	0.23
52	10,000	0.23
53	10,000	0.23
54	10,000	0.23
55	10,000	0.23
56	10,000	0.23
57	10,000	0.23
58	10,000	0.23
59	10,000	0.23
60	10,000	0.23
61	10,000	0.23
62	10,000	0.23
63	10,000	0.23
64	10,000	0.23
65	10,000	0.23
66	10,000	0.23
67	10,000	0.23
68	10,000	0.23
69	10,000	0.23
70	10,000	0.23
71	10,000	0.23
72	10,000	0.23
73	10,000	0.23
74	10,000	0.23
75	10,000	0.23
76	10,000	0.23
77	10,000	0.23
78	10,000	0.23
79	10,000	0.23
80	10,000	0.23
81	10,000	0.23
82	10,000	0.23
83	10,000	0.23
84	10,000	0.23
85	10,000	0.23
86	10,000	0.23
87	10,000	0.23
88	10,000	0.23
89	10,000	0.23
90	10,000	0.23
91	10,000	0.23
92	10,000	0.23
93	10,000	0.23
94	10,000	0.23
95	10,000	0.23
96	10,000	0.23
97	10,000	0.23
98	10,000	0.23
99	10,000	0.23
100	10,000	0.23

EXISTING EASEMENT:
 THE PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ZONING ORDINANCE.



SECTION B-B
 1/8" = 1' SCALE

DATE	NO.	DESCRIPTION
4/21/15	254E-1	20' WIDE EASEMENT
2/11/15	2013-1	20' WIDE EASEMENT
1/11/15	171	RESIDENTIAL
TOTAL LOTS	14	NUMBERED

SECTION C-C
 1/8" = 1' SCALE

DATE	NO.	DESCRIPTION
4/21/15	254E-1	20' WIDE EASEMENT
2/11/15	2013-1	20' WIDE EASEMENT
1/11/15	171	RESIDENTIAL
TOTAL LOTS	14	NUMBERED



LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN KOON STREET, TRACT 36687


APN 476-010-036-01

IN-TRACT STREETS, CHANNEL, & DETENTION BASIN LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLANTING PLAN

FOR

HIGHLIPPOINTE
COMMUNITIES
Residential Land Development

SHEET NO. KEY



INDEX MAP SCALE: 1/8\"/>

ABBREVIATIONS

- CL CENTER LINE
- CLR CLEAR
- BC BOTTOM OF CURB
- BS BOTTOM OF SLOPE
- BS BOTTOM OF STEP
- EA EACH
- FL FLOW LINE
- FL FLOW LINE
- FOC FACE OF CURB
- FS FINISH SURFACE
- GB GRADE BREAK
- INV INVERT
- IR INNER RADIUS
- OR OUTER RADIUS
- OR OUTLET RADIUS
- PL PROPERTY LINE
- POB POINT OF BEGINNING
- R/W RIGHT OF WAY
- RAD. RADIUS
- SIM SIMILAR
- TOC TOP OF CURB
- TOC TOP OF GRADE
- TOP OF CURB
- TOP OF SLOPE
- TOP OF STEP
- TOP OF WALL
- TYP TYPICAL

IRRIGATION STATEMENT FOR COMPLIANCE - ORDINANCE 852.2

- 1. THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE FINAL IRRIGATION DESIGN PLANS:
 - L1. SMART CONTROLLER WITH ANET GAUGES WITH ACCESS TO REAL-TIME ET (MINIRAIN)
 - L2. MASTER VALVE AND ZONE SENSOR (CHECK FOR PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL LOTS)
 - L3. ANTI-SIPHON CHECK VALVES
 - L4. HYDROZONES WILL BE PROPERLY DESIGNATED
 - L5. ALL IRRIGATION SYSTEMS WILL BE DESIGNED TO MEET THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS TO METHOD OF ADJACENT TO PERMEABLE SURFACE WITH NO AUTOMATICALLY TO METHOD OF ADJACENT TO PERMEABLE SURFACE WITH NO AUTOMATICALLY
 - L6. MINIMUM OF 100 GAL PER HOUR PER 1000 SQ FT

PLAN CHECK OVERSIGHT ENGINEER
REGISTRATION NUMBER
DATE SIGNED

APPROVES AS TO CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE COUNTY STANDARDS AND PRACTICES (TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ONLY - ON-SITE)



NOTE: APPROVAL BY THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT IS FOR WORK WITHIN THE ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY ONLY.

WORK CONTAINED WITHIN THESE PLANS IS THE PROPERTY OF SIA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF SIA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE.

FOR A CHANGING PLAN OR FOR A CHANGING PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED.


THESE PLANS MAY BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED ON THE LATEST ORDINANCES.

DATE: 04-01-15

DATE: 04-01-15

PLAN CHECK OVERSIGHT ENGINEER
REGISTRATION NUMBER
DATE SIGNED

APPROVES AS TO CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE COUNTY STANDARDS AND PRACTICES (PLANNING DEPARTMENT ONLY - ON-SITE)



VICINITY MAP SCALE: 1/8\"/>

CLIENT / APPLICANT
HIGHPOINTE COMMUNITIES
20 ENTERPRISE
SUITE 320
ALISO VIEJO, CA 92656
TEL: (949) 472-0800

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT / PREPARER
SIA, INC.
31726 RANCHO VIEJO ROAD, SUITE 201
ALISO VIEJO, CA 92656
TEL: (949) 276-6500
FAX: (949) 276-6506
CONTACT: DENNY SMITHGALL

MAINTENANCE ENTITY
TO BE SELECTED

SHEET INDEX

TITLE SHEET	L1
LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN	L2-L9
PARK ENLARGEMENT	L10
BIO-SWALE & BASIN COUNTY STANDARD DETAILS	L11
MAINTENANCE EXHIBIT	EKI

TRACT NO. 36687
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRACT 36687
STREETS, CHANNEL & DETENTION BASIN
LS CONCEPT PLANTING PLAN

PREPARED BY:
SIA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
31726 RANCHO VIEJO ROAD
ALISO VIEJO, CA 92656
PHONE # 949-276-6500 / FAX # 949-276-6506
CERT NO. 3332, EXP. 05/2016



DATE: 04-01-15

DATE: 04-01-15


DATE: 04-01-15

DATE: 04-01-15

DATE: 04-01-15

CASE: TR36687, AMD #1
EXHIBIT: L (Sheets 1-11)
DATE: 05/07/15
PLANNER: D. ABRAHAM

PLAN CHECK OVERSIGHT ENGINEER	REGISTRATION NUMBER	DATE SIGNED	ORD. 959 VERSION
APPROVED AS TO CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE COUNTY STANDARDS AND PRACTICES (TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ONLY - ROW / OFF-SITE).			
APPROVED AS TO CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE COUNTY STANDARDS AND PRACTICES (PLANNING DEPARTMENT ONLY - ON-SITE).			
PLAN CHECK OVERSIGHT LIA / CD	REGISTRATION NUMBER	DATE SIGNED	TEXT/TITLE APP P#



MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY

- INVERSIPE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AREA - 77,548 SQ. FT. (INCLUDES SUBDIVISION)
- AREA - 1,415 SQ. FT. (INCLUDES PARK DISTRICT)
- AREA - 1,415 SQ. FT. (INCLUDES PARK DISTRICT)
- AREA - 1,415 SQ. FT. (INCLUDES PARK DISTRICT)
- AREA - 1,415 SQ. FT. (INCLUDES PARK DISTRICT)

GRAPHIC SCALE
SCALE 1" = 100'

BENCHMARK
BENCH MARK: _____

PREPARED BY:
SIA LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
31728 RANCHO MEJO ROAD
PHOENIX # 949-278-6500 / FAX # 949-278-6508
CERT. NO. 3333, EXP. 02/2016 DATE: _____

TRACT NO. 36827
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRACT 36827
STREETS, CHANNEL & DETENTION BASIN
LS CONCEPT PLANTING PLAN
FOR IMPROVING COMMENTS

SHEET NO. EX1
OF 2 SHEETS

DATE NO. _____

811
Know what's below.
Call before you dig.

NOTE: APPROVAL BY THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT IS FOR WORK WITHIN THE ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY ONLY.
THESE PLANS CONTAINED WITHIN THESE PLANS SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT AND A CHANGING PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED.
The work shown on this plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT and a CHANGING PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED.
The work shown on this plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT and a CHANGING PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED.



TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ONLY - ROW / OFF-SITE.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 42686

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Specific Plan No. 286, Substantial Conformance No. 3, Tentative Tract Map No. 36687, Change of Zone No. 7829

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

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

Contact Person: Damaris Abraham

Telephone Number: 951-955-5719

Applicant's Name: Keith Gardner, Keefer Consulting

Applicant's Address: 6149 Bluffwood Drive, Riverside, California 92506

I. PROJECT INFORMATION


A. Project Description:

Specific Plan No. 286, Substantial Conformance No. 3 proposes to reduce the amount of acres within Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres by designating a larger area to Planning Area 2A (which is designated Open Space: Conservation Drainage). The land use designation for Planning Area 7 will remain as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The project also proposes to increase the acreage for Planning Area 8 from 29.1 to 32.7 (an increase of 3.6 acres) and proposes to reduce the acreage for Planning Area 9 from 29.7 to 19.9. As a result of these changes Planning Area 2A would increase from 15.6 acres to 27.4 acres. The total number of residential dwelling units within the Specific Plan will decrease from 4,720 to 4,710.

Change of Zone No. 7829 proposes to modify the existing Specific Plan zoning ordinance text to allow for 71 units in Planning Area 7 with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. The number of units previously allowed was 85 units and it is being reduced to 75. The change of zone will also formalize the Planning Area boundaries for the reconfigured Planning Areas 2A and 7.

Tentative Tract Map No. 36687 is a Schedule A subdivision of 20.27 acres into 71 residential lots with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. and 14 open space lots. The Tentative Tract Map covers Planning Areas 7 and a portion of 2A. The project includes off-site improvements that include grading and drainage easement.

Figure I-1: Existing Specific Plan and Proposed Modification



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

C. Total Project Area: 20.3 acres

Residential Acres: 9.47	Lots: 71	Units: 71	Projected No. of Residents:
Commercial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Open Space Acres: 10.83	Lots: 14		

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 476-010,-024, 476-010-026, 476-010-036

E. Street References:

The project is located in the Winchester area, in the County of Riverside. The subject site is generally located northerly of Safflower Street, southerly of Koon Street, easterly of Winchester Road, and westerly of Woodshire Drive.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:

Township 5 South, Range 2 West, Section 28 North East

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:

The environmental setting general vicinity can be categorized as relatively flat land, generally sloping towards the southwest. This area has been master-planned for development of various residential densities and locations.

An existing rural neighborhood is to the northeast of the project site.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. Land Use: The Project site is located within the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the County of Riverside's General Plan. The Project site is currently designated for Medium Density Residential (MDR), and Open Space- Conservation (OS-C), consistent with the existing SP 286. The Project site also is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area. The Project meets all applicable land use policies of the General Plan.

2. Circulation: The proposed Project was reviewed for conformance with County Ordinance 461 by Riverside County Transportation Department. Adequate circulation facilities exist and are proposed to serve the proposed Project. The proposed Project meets with all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.

3. Multipurpose Open Space: The proposed Project meets all applicable Multipurpose Open Space Element Policies and accommodates approximately 3.6 acres of open space land.

4. Safety: The proposed Project allows for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the existing and future users of this Project through the Project's design. The proposed Project meets with all other applicable Safety Element policies.

5. Noise: The proposed Project meets with all applicable Noise Element policies. Consistent with the findings of EIR No. 374, the proposed Project would not exceed Riverside County noise standards.

6. Housing: The Project proposes to develop a portion of the Project site with 72 residential homes consistent with the site's proposed land use designations. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with the General Plan Housing Element policies.

7. Air Quality: The proposed Project is conditioned by Riverside County to control any fugitive dust during mining and processing activities. Since the project is less intensive than the specific plan allows, would not conflict with the South Coast Air Quality District's (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP); would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment; would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and would not create objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people. The proposed Project meets all applicable Air Quality Element policies.

B. General Plan Area Plan(s): Southwest Area

C. Foundation Component(s): Community Development

D. Land Use Designation(s): Medium Density Residential per Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800)

E. Overlay(s), if any: Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800)

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

G. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area Plan in all adjacent directions

2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development in all adjacent directions

3. **Land Use Designation(s):**

North: Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Commercial Retail per Specific Plan No. 286, Planning Areas 6, 2A, 52A, 8

East: Medium Density Residential, per Specific Plan No. 286, Planning Area 5A

West: Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Commercial Retail per Specific Plan No. 286, Planning Areas 9, 2A, 8

South: Medium High Density Residential, Open Space – Conservation Drainage, and Medium Density Residential per Specific Plan No. 286, Planning Areas 11, 2C, 14A

4. **Overlay(s), if any:**

North: Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2A, 6, 8, 52A

East: Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Area 5

South: Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2A, 8, 9

West: Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), Planning Areas 2C, 11, 14A

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

H. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), as adopted by Substantial Conformance No. 5

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** 7

I. Existing Zoning: Specific Plan Zone

J. Proposed Zoning, if any: Specific Plan Zone

K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:

North: Specific Plan Zone (SP 286)

East: Specific Plan Zone (SP 286)

West: Specific Plan Zone (SP 286)

South: Specific Plan Zone (SP 286)

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

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.



Signature

September 10, 2015

Date

Damaris Abraham

Printed Name

For Steve Weiss, AICP, Planning Director

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.

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9 "Scenic Highways", Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is not within a scenic highway corridor.
- b) The project will not damage scenic resources within the project site. There are no unique trees, rock outcroppings, or scenic vistas within the vicinity project site. This project site has been graded for development. No significant changes to the impacts on scenic resources are anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

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

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution), Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 5, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact: **EIR No. 374 Finding:** EIR No. 374 concluded that project development would

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

result in the placement and installation of street lights as required by Riverside County. Entry monuments and signage on the project site also would require illumination. Mitigation Measures 109 through 112 (renumbered herein as MM 26.1 through MM 26.4) were identified to ensure that the project would not interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. EIR No. 374 concluded that these impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the required mitigation. (Riv. County, 1997, pp. V-191, II-44)

a) **No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis:** The Project site is located approximately 22 miles northwest of the Mt. Palomar Observatory and has the potential to create lighting levels that could adversely affect the operation of this facility (Google Earth, 2013). The proposed Project would be required to comply with the County Light Pollution Standard (Ord. No. 655), which is designed to prevent significant lighting impacts that could affect the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Compliance with Ordinance No. 655 is mandatory and would be assured through future County review of building permit applications. In addition, mitigation measures identified in EIR No. 374 (renumbered herein as MM 26.1 through MM 26.4) would continue to apply to the proposed Project. Accordingly, Project impacts to the Mt. Palomar Observatory would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact analyzed in EIR No. 374.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring is required.

3. Other Lighting Issues

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

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project will comply with lighting standards as established by various Riverside County standards and ordinances. New lighting will be introduced with this project, but the impacts to lighting are considered to be less than significant.
- b) The new residences of this project will not be exposed to unacceptable light levels, since the project will comply with established County standards.

Mitigation: No further mitigation required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
4. Agriculture				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, and Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) According to the Riverside County GIS database, the subject property is located within an area of Farmland of Local Importance. However, this property was subject to a Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report which determined that development of this property for urban / suburban development purposes had a greater value than continuing farming activities. Therefore, although this property has been designated as Farmland of Local Importance, all impacts to farmland have been addressed previously. No new impacts to farmlands will occur as a result of this project.
- b) The zoning for the project site is "SP Zone". Accordingly, it is located within Planning Area 7 of Specific Plan No. 286, which plans for residential uses. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract, or located within an agricultural preserve.
- c) There are no properties within 300 feet of the subject property that are zoned for agricultural uses; therefore it is not subject to the "Right to Farm" ordinance.
- d) This project proposes a new subdivision; and it is proposed in accordance with the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

5. Forest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause				

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?				
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3 "Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas," and Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 3, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project is zoned for residential development; and is therefore not in conflict with any forest zoning or timberland.
- b) The development of the project site will not result in the loss of forest land, since the site has historically been used as dry farming. Therefore, there will be no loss of forest land as a result of this project.
- c) There are no forest lands located in close proximity to the project site. In addition, the project site is within an area planned and zoned for future suburban and residential developments. Therefore, there will be no additional changes in the development of the project site that will result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

6. Air Quality Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?				
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Amendment No. 6, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) **EIR No. 374 Finding:** EIR No. 374 did not identify any impacts associated with a conflict with the 1989 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), although EIR No. 374 did disclose that impacts to air quality would be significant and unavoidable on both a direct and cumulative basis. (Riv. County, 1997, p. V.61). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing an air quality management plan (AQMP) to insure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. According to Specific Plan No. 286, the subdivision on this property (TR36687) will not conflict with the established 2003 AQMP due to the project complying with the County's General Plan land use designations and population estimates. The current project is also consistent with the population projections and land use designations of Riverside County; and will not obstruct the implementation of the 2012 AQMP. Therefore, no significant changes are expected from the previous impacts identified.
- b,c) The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is in a non-attainment status of federal ozone standards, carbon monoxide standards, and state and federal particular matter standards. Any development in the SCAB, including the proposed Project, would contribute to these pollutant violations. The construction of the project would comply with standard construction requirements, and although the project would contribute air quality pollutants in the area. Therefore, no new air quality impacts are expected.
- d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. The Addendum for the Environmental Assessment for the prior project (TR36687) concluded that there were no new commercial or manufacturing uses within the project site, or would any use generate significant odors. The current project has the same mix of land uses, and therefore no new impacts to sensitive receptors are anticipated.
- e) The project site is not located within close proximity to a substantial point source emitter. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- f) This residential project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring is 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, HANS02160, On-site Inspection, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 3, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project is within an area covered by the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP). This property is located within "cell" 5279 of the WRCMSHCP and HANS 2160. A Biological Resource

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

meet the statutory definition of a "historical resource" under provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Tang et al. 2013:19). The fire in March 2014, however, has caused extensive damages to the farmhouse, which is the central feature of Site 33-007799 and the primary embodiment of the property's association with its past owners/occupants as well as the historic theme identified above.

(PDA) No. 4876R1 concluded that the historic integrity of Site 33-007799 in relation to the notable persons and events in its past has been significantly compromised. The Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch no longer retains sufficient historic integrity to be considered eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources through its association with a pattern of events that was important in local history. The present recordation program has adequately salvaged and preserved the important architectural, archaeological, and historical data about the ranch complex. Therefore, the proposed redevelopment of the property will not have an unmitigated effect on the significance and integrity of this "historical resource."

c) Although no further impacts to human remains are anticipated, standard County procedures require that conditions be placed on any project that will involve at least some ground disturbing activities. These conditions of approval state that the project shall comply with standard procedures in the event that archaeological items and/or human remains are found during the course of grading.

The project site is not a religious or sacred site, and thus the development of the project is not anticipated to restrict or impact religious or sacred uses within the project area.

e) The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074.

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

d) Paleontological Resources

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity", Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 3, Addendum to Environmental Assessment No. 42686, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site was studied for paleontological resources in 2005. According to that study, there were no archeological resources on site. Since that time, the project site has been graded. Therefore, no further impacts to paleontological resources are anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Assessment (BRA) has been prepared and reviewed. EPD staff has reviewed application HANS02160 and it has been conditioned accordingly. As part of the HANS process, Lot 84 will be dedicated as open space.

- b) The WRCMSHCP identifies several biological species that are of concern in this area. However, this project site was subject to a prior development application Specific Plan No. 286 which was approved in 1997. The current proposal has been reviewed by the Riverside County Environmental Programs Department (EPD); and is has been conditioned accordingly. As part of the HANS process, Lot 84 will be dedicated as open space.
- c) Since the project is considered consistent with the MSHCP, it project will not have any new impacts 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.
- d) Since the project is considered consistent with the MSHCP, it will not have any new impacts on 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.
- e) Since the project is considered consistent with the MSHCP, it will not have any new impacts on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- f) Development of the project has been conditioned by the Riverside County Flood Control Department to comply with the approved Water Quality Management Plan.
- g) Minor temporary impacts the habitat adjacent to construction are anticipated to occur but have not been quantified. The anticipated temporary impacts may occur within the disturbed habitat and agriculture land that comprised the majority of the project area. The areas of temporary impacts will be returned to the preconstruction contours, it will not Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Mitigation: No new mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No new monitoring is required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

8. Historic Resources

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 3, Mitigative Historical Resource Recordation Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch dated September 19, 2014, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, County Archaeological Report (PDA) No 4876R1: "Mitigated Historical Resource Recordation Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County, California" by Bai "Tom" Tang dated March 6, 2015

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Findings of Fact:

a-b) In 2013 the Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch was determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, with a local level of significance, and thus found to meet the statutory definition of a "historical resource" under provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Tang et al. 2013:19). The fire in March 2014, however, has caused extensive damages to the farmhouse, which is the central feature of Site 33-007799 and the primary embodiment of the property's association with its past owners/occupants as well as the historic theme identified above.

(PDA) No. 4876R1 concluded that the historic integrity of Site 33-007799 in relation to the notable persons and events in its past has been significantly compromised. The Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch no longer retains sufficient historic integrity to be considered eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources through its association with a pattern of events that was important in local history. The present recordation program has adequately salvaged and preserved the important architectural, archaeological, and historical data about the ranch complex. Therefore, the proposed redevelopment of the property will not have an unmitigated effect on the significance and integrity of this "historical resource."

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

9. Archaeological Resources

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Mitigative Historical Resource Recordation Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch dated September 19, 2014, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, County Archaeological Report (PDA) No 4876R1: "Mitigated Historical Resource Recordation Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County, California" by Bai "Tom" Tang dated March 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a-b) In 2013 the Jean Nicholas/Karl Frick Ranch was determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, with a local level of significance, and thus found to

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

10. 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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments; County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a-b) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California", dated August 29, 2013 (GEO 2396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

12. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.

8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.

2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

13. 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: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

14. 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: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas Map", Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

- a) GEO No. 2396 concluded:
 1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
 2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
 3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

- a) GEO No. 2396 concluded:
 1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
 2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

16. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

a-c) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No further mitigation required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring required.

17. Soils

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------------	---------------------------	---	---

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation APN:476-010-036, 34491 Washington Street French Valley Area, Riverside County California dated August 29, 2013 (GEO02396), Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a-c) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Geotechnical Evaluation for APN: 476-010-036, French Valley Area, Riverside County, California', dated August 13, 2013 (GEO 2396) Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a-b) GEO No. 2396 concluded:

1. No active or potentially active faults are known to exist at the subject site.
2. Fault rupture is not a problem in terms of site geologic concerns.
3. The possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered to be very low to nil.
4. The potential for the site to be affected by a seiche or tsunami is considered nil due to absence of any large bodies of water near the site.
5. The potential for landslides to occur at or adjacent to the site is considered to be very low to nil.
6. The potential for seismically-induced settlement is considered low.
7. Diamond Valley Lake is a large water storage facility located approximately 2.8 miles to the northeast of the site, it is conceivable that the west dam for this lake could possibly rupture during an earthquake and affect the site by flooding.
8. The rock fall potential is considered to be nil.

GEO 2396 recommended:

1. All undocumented fill material and any loose alluvial materials should be removed from structural areas and areas to receive engineered compacted fill.
2. Careful evaluation of on-site soils and any import fill for their expansion potential should be conducted during the grading operation. (COA 10.PLANNING.17)

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

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

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Geotechnical Evaluation for APN: 476-010-036, French Valley Area, Riverside County, California', dated August 13, 2013 (GEO 2396) Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396, prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated November 14, 2014", dated December 1, 2014. And: "Response to County of Riverside Review Comments, County Geologic Report No. 2396 (#2), prepared by Geopacifica Geotechnical Consultants, dated January 6, 2015

Findings of Fact:

a) This project is not in an area subject to wind erosion or blowsand. Therefore impacts either on this project or as a result of this project are not significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?

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

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

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

Source: Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 3, Addendum to Environmental Assessment No. 42686, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, California Climate Action Registry. *General Reporting Protocol*, Version 3.1, January 2009; OPR's Technical Advisory and CEQA Guideline Amendments dated March 18, 2010 and CalEEMod, Version 2011.1.1.

Findings of Fact:

Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Global climate change refers to changes in average climatic conditions on earth as a whole, including temperature, wind patterns, precipitation and storms. Global warming, a related concept, is the observed increase in average temperature of the earth's surface and atmosphere. Riverside County requires that any analysis of greenhouse gases (GHGs)

The six major greenhouse gases (GHGs) identified by the Kyoto Protocol are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), haloalkanes (HFCs), and perfluorocarbons (PFCs). GHGs absorb longwave radiant energy reflected by the earth, which warms the atmosphere. GHGs also radiate long wave radiation both upward to space and back down toward the surface of the earth. The downward part of this longwave radiation absorbed by the atmosphere is known as the "greenhouse effect." The potential effects of global climate change may include rising surface temperatures, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, and more drought years.

CO₂ is an odorless, colorless natural GHG. Natural sources include the following: decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic outgassing. Anthropogenic (human caused) sources of CO₂ are from burning coal, oil, natural gas, wood, butane, propane, etc. CH₄ is a flammable gas and is the main component of natural gas. N₂O, also known as laughing gas, is a colorless GHG. Some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to the atmospheric load of GHGs. HFCs are synthetic man-made chemicals that are used as a substitute for chlorofluorocarbons (whose production was stopped as required by the Montreal Protocol) for automobile air conditioners and refrigerants. The two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacture. SF₆ is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, nontoxic, nonflammable gas. SF₆ is used for insulation in electric power transmission and distribution equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas for leak detection.

Events and activities, such as the industrial revolution and the increased combustion of fossil fuels (e.g., gasoline, diesel, coal, etc.), have heavily contributed to the increase in atmospheric levels of GHGs.

An air quality analysis of GHGs is a much different analysis than the analysis of criteria pollutants for the following reasons. For criteria pollutants significance thresholds are based on daily emissions because attainment or non-attainment is based on daily exceedances of applicable ambient air quality standards. Further, several ambient air quality standards are based on relatively short-term exposure effects on human health, e.g., one-hour and eight-hour. Since the half-life of CO₂ in the atmosphere is approximately 100 years, for example, the effects of GHGs are longer-term, affecting global climate over a relatively long time frame. As a result, the SCAQMD's current position is to evaluate GHG effects over a longer timeframe than a single day.

In its CEQA & Climate Change document (January, 2008), the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) identifies many potential GHG significance threshold options. The CAPCOA document indicates that establishing quantitative thresholds is a balance between setting the level low enough to capture a substantial portion of future residential and non-residential development, while also setting a threshold high enough to exclude small development projects that will contribute a relatively small fraction of the cumulative statewide GHG emissions. Two potential significance thresholds were 10,000 metric tons per year and 25,000 metric tons per year.

Finally, another approach to determining significance is to estimate what percentage of the total inventory of GHG emissions are represented by emissions from a single project. If emissions are a

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

relatively small percentage of the total inventory, it is possible that the project will have little or no effect on global climate change.

According to available information, the statewide inventory of CO2 equivalent emissions is as follows: 1990 GHG emissions were estimated to equal 427 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent, and 2020 GHG emissions are projected to equal 600 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent, under a business as usual scenario. Interpolating an inventory for the year 2011 results in an estimated inventory of approximately 121 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent. Interpolating an inventory for the year 2012 results in an estimated inventory of approximately 127 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent. These amounts assume that between 1990 and 2020 there is an average increase of 5.76 million tonnes per year of GHG.

A and b) Sources of GHG emissions from the proposed project arise out of both construction and operation. Based on the above methodology, the following outlines GHG emissions for construction and operation:

Construction

Project shall comply with current standards.

Operation

Project shall comply with current standards.

A small percentage of GHG emissions expected compared to the total projected statewide GHG emissions inventory is the basis for the conclusion that both construction and operational related GHG emissions from implementing the project is less than significant. Further, construction-related emissions will be temporary and will come to an end once construction is completed. Thus, the contribution to the cumulative impact to global climate change is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

22) Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
--	------------------------	---------------------	--	--

one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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?

Source: Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project is a residential subdivision within an existing specific plan. As a result, it is not proposing to routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials.
- b) This project is a residential subdivision within an existing specific plan. Although it is conceivable that an industrial accident may occur during the course of construction of the project causing spillage, it is not anticipated to be a significant risk.
- c) The design of this project has been approved by the Riverside County Fire Department. The Fire Department has determined that the project has been designed so that emergency services can adequately service the project. Therefore, the project will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.
- d) This project is primarily a residential subdivision. As a result, incremental increases in household chemicals and waste are anticipated. However, these increases are mitigated by compliance with standard practices such as recycling and green waste disposal. There are two proposed schools near the project site; one to the north in Planning Area 12 and the other to the south in Planning Area 19. However, the standard use, transport, and waste of household chemicals are not anticipated to negatively impact those proposed school sites.
- e) The project site is not located on the State-generated list of hazardous materials sites (Cortese List).

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 3, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

a-d) This project is neither within an area covered by an Airport Master Plan, within 2 miles of a public airport or a 2 miles of a private airstrip. Therefore, impact on this project from airports is considered negligible.

Mitigation: No monitoring required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

24) Hazardous Fire Area

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is not within an area of high wildfire susceptibility. Therefore any impacts from on this project as a result of wildfires is not significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687, Hydrology Analysis for Highpointe – Tract 36687 by Hunsaker & Associates Irvine, Water Quality Management Plan by Hunsaker & Associates

Findings of Fact:

- a) **EIR No. 374 Finding:** EIR No. 374 found that implementation of SP 286 could result in short-term erosion and sedimentation impacts during project grading. Grading activities would temporarily expose ground surfaces during construction thereby creating the potential for erosion and sedimentation of local drainage courses. In addition, the EIR noted that development of the specific plan would alter the composition of surface runoff which would incrementally contribute to the degradation of downstream water quality. **No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis:** As detailed in the hydrology technical report prepared for the Project, under existing conditions, TR36687 drains to the southwest. Additionally, TR36687 is designed to follow the existing flow patterns throughout the site and maintain the same area flow for each drainage sub area post construction. The site's existing hydrology conditions are depicted in Figure 25-1 below while the proposed conditions are depicted in 25-2.


Figure 25-1, Existing Conditions Hydrology Map

New
Significant
Impact

More
Severe
Impacts


New Ability
to
Substantially
Reduce
Significant
Impact

No
Substantial
Change
from
Previous
Impact



New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Figure 25-2, Proposed Conditions Hydrology Map



- b) As part of the proposed Project, on-site stormwater runoff is engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and storm drains, which generally would convey all runoff toward the water quality/detention basins proposed within Lot 80 of TR36687. Following treatment of these flows within the water quality detention/sand filter basins, flows would be conveyed into the proposed flood control channel within Lot 86. The drainage system proposed by TR36687 is designed to accommodate flows originating off-site to the north and east. Although the Project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site through grading to facilitate residential development, the rate of runoff from the site would not increase under post-development conditions. With incorporation of the detention basin in Lot 80, peak runoff would be reduced from 872.8 cfs to 871.3 cfs during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events and from 1,452.5 cfs to 1,450.2 cfs during 100 year (24-hour duration) storm events. Thus, the rate of runoff from the site under post-development conditions would not substantially increase such that erosion or siltation would increase on- or off-site. As such, following implementation of the Project, runoff from the site would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.
- c) The Hydrology Report concluded that the prior project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge systems. The current

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

project proposes no new areas of development; therefore there the impacts to groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge systems are anticipated to remain the same. No new impacts are identified.

d) **EIR No. 374 Finding:** EIR No. 374 did not identify any impacts to groundwater supplies. **No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis:** No potable groundwater wells are proposed as part of the Project; therefore, the Project would not deplete groundwater supplies through direct extraction. Domestic water supplies from the EMWD are reliant on imported water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), recycled water, local groundwater production, and desalted groundwater (EMWD, 2011, p. 27). Because the Project proposes to reduce the maximum number of dwelling units allowed within SP 286 Planning Area 7 by 16 units, the ultimate water demand within SP 286 would be less than what was disclosed in EIR No. 374 and the Project's water demand is therefore fully accounted for by the EMWD's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP); thus, the Project would not increase the demand for groundwater resources beyond what is already assumed by the EMWD as part of their long-term planning efforts. As such, impacts due to the depletion of groundwater supplies would be less than significant. The proposed Project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site, which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. However, the Project's stormwater runoff is engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and storm drains, which would discharge into the drainage channel within Lot 80, which would convey flows southerly to the Warm Springs Creek where groundwater recharge would continue to occur. Thus, with buildout of the Project, the local groundwater levels would not be significantly affected. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, and there would be no net deficit in aquifer water volumes or groundwater table levels as a result of the Project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as analyzed in EIR No. 374.

e-f) **EIR No. 374 Finding:** EIR No. 374 determined that the project site was not located within a mapped floodplain or flood hazard area. As such, impacts were determined to be less than significant. (Riv. County, 1997, p. V-36)

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis: According to Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9, *100 and 500 Year Flood Hazard Zones*, the Project site is not located in a flood hazard zone. In addition, the Project site is not located in a dam failure inundation zone (Riv. County, 2003a, Figure S-10). As such, no impacts due to flooding would occur. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as analyzed in EIR No. 374.

g) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

h) The current project proposes Best Management Practices, and the Flood Control District has conditioned the project accordingly.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is required

Monitoring: No additional monitoring is required.

26) Floodplains

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

NA - Not Applicable U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a-c) As part of the proposed Project, on-site stormwater runoff is engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and storm drains, which generally would convey all runoff toward the water quality/detention basins proposed within Lot 80 of TR36687. Following treatment of these flows within the water quality detention/sand filter basins, flows would be conveyed into the proposed flood control channel within Lot 86. The drainage system proposed by TR36687 is designed to accommodate flows originating off-site to the north and east. Although the Project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site through grading to facilitate residential development, the rate of runoff from the site would not increase under post-development conditions. With incorporation of the detention basin in Lot 80, peak runoff would be reduced from 872.8 cfs to 871.3 cfs during 10-year (24-hour duration) storm events and from 1,452.5 cfs to 1,450.2 cfs during 100 year (24-hour duration) storm events. Thus, the rate of runoff from the site under post-development conditions would not substantially increase such that erosion or siltation would increase on- or off-site. As such, following implementation of the Project, runoff from the site would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.
- d) The project will not cause changes in the amount of surface water in any water body.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Mitigation: No additional mitigation required

Monitoring: No additional monitoring required

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

27) Land Use

a. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) One of the elements of the proposed project is to make the following modifications to Planning Area 7: decrease the residential portion of Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres and reduce the number of units allowed in Planning Area 7 from 85 to 75 units. None of these modifications are considered to be a significant modification to the planned land uses in the area.
- b) EIR No. 374 Finding: EIR No. 374 concluded that the Winchester 1800 project was located within the City of Temecula's sphere of influence and would fit within a logical pattern of development consistent with the ongoing development in adjacent urban areas consistent with the City of Temecula's Draft Preferred Land Use Plan. As such, EIR No. 374 did not identify any impacts to the City of Temecula sphere of influence. (Riv. County, 1997, p. V-6). Given that this proposal is viewed to be in "substantial conformance" to the previously-adopted Specific Plan, no substantial changes are anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

28) Planning

a. Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) One of the elements of the proposed project is to make the following modifications to Planning Area 7: decrease the residential portion of Planning Area 7 from 21.1 acres to 15.4 acres and reduce the number of units allowed in Planning Area 7 from 85 to 75 units.. None of these modifications are considered to be a significant modification to the planned land uses in the area.
- b) To the north of the project site is Planning Areas 2A and 6 within Specific Plan No. 286, per Amendment No. 6. Planning Area 2A is a drainage way / water course that traverses the northern portion of the Specific Plan from northeast to southwest. Planning Area 6 is designated as Medium High Density Residential (5-8 dwelling units / acre). These are residential planning areas that have minimum lot sizes of 4,000 square feet. To the south, is Planning Areas 11 and 14A. These Planning Areas have a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet at 6,000 square feet, respectively. The mix of residential lot sizes within the project site is within the range of lot sizes already established with the surrounding projects. Therefore, no impact from surrounding zoning is anticipated.
- c) To the north of the project site is Planning Areas 2A and 6 within Specific Plan No. 286, per Amendment No. 6. Planning Area 2A is a drainage way / water course that traverses the northern portion of the Specific Plan from northeast to southwest. Planning Area 6 is designated as Medium High Density Residential (5-8 dwelling units / acre). These are residential planning areas that have minimum lot sizes of 4,000 square feet. To the south, is Planning Areas 11 and 14A. These Planning Areas have a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet at 6,000 square feet, respectively. The mix of residential lot sizes within the project site is within the range of lot sizes already established with the surrounding projects. Therefore, no impact from surrounding zoning is anticipated. Therefore, no impacts from surrounding land uses are anticipated.
- d) The project site for Tentative Tract Map No. 36687 is designated as 'Medium Density Residential (2-5 du/ac); per Planning Area 7 within Specific Plan No. 286. The proposed Tentative Tract Map proposes to subdivide 20.27 acres into 72 residential lots. This calculation translates into a density of 3.55 dwelling units / acre; which is within the density range allowed by the General Plan.
- e) This project does not propose the division of an existing community.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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?

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
--	------------------------	---------------------	--	--

mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
c. Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area", Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) There are no known mineral resources in the project vicinity.
- b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of locally-important mineral resources.
- c) There is no surface mine in the project vicinity.
- d) There are no proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries in the project vicinity.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

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

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

30) Airport Noise

a. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/>				

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private airport.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

b) The project site not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation: a-b) No mitigation required.

Monitoring: a-b) No monitoring required.

31) Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

a) This project is not within vicinity of any railroads.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

32) Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact: This project is not in close vicinity to a State or Federal Highway.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

33) Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact: No other noises are anticipated to impact the project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
34) Noise Effects on or by the Project				
a. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); Project Application Materials, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) This project proposes a residential subdivision in accordance with the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan. As such, it will incrementally and permanently increase the amount of ambient noise in the area. However, the amount of noise has been evaluated in the Specific Plan No. 286 and EIR 374. No unacceptable ambient noise sources are anticipated.
- b) This project proposes a residential subdivision in accordance with the Winchester Hills Specific Plan. As such, it will temporarily and periodic increase the amount of ambient noise in the area during project construction. However, the amount of noise has been evaluated in the Specific Plan No. 286 and EIR 374. No unacceptable temporary noise sources are anticipated.
- c) This project proposes a residential subdivision in accordance with the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan. There are no General Plan Roadways adjacent to the project, or within 600 feet of the project site. Therefore, no unacceptable noise levels are anticipated.
- d) Upon completion of the project, future residences will be exposed to ground-borne noises and ground-borne vibrations caused by typical urban / suburban uses in the general vicinity. However, these noises and vibrations are not anticipated to be significant.

Mitigation: No additional mitigation is 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a demand for additional housing, particularly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project is proposed on property that is undeveloped, and therefore is not displacing any existing housing.
- b) This project is designed to be responsive to the housing market, and is thus meant to provide a mix of housing types that can be obtained by buyers of a variety of incomes.
- c) The project is proposed on property that is undeveloped, and therefore is not displacing any existing housing.
- d) This project is not within a County Redevelopment Area. Therefore, it is not anticipated to affect a County Redevelopment Area.
- e) This project is being developed in accordance with the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan, which was originally approved in 1997. As such, the current Housing Element of the Riverside County General Plan (adopted in 2004) used this Specific Plan as part of that analysis. Therefore, the project is consistent with the Housing Element of Riverside County, and local housing projections.
- f) The project proposes new housing in an area that is currently not developed. However, this project is being proposed in accordance with the existing Specific Plan for which an EIR was prepared which analyzed this issue. Although this project is proposing new residences in the project area; it is consistent with population projections for this area. No unanticipated population growth is expected as a part of this project.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring 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

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

This project has been reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department. The Fire Department has approved of the design of this project. In addition, the tentative map will require the payment of Development Impact Fees (DIF's) prior to building permit occupancy. A portion of these fees will be used for long-term planning of Fire Department facilities.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required on this project.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

37) Sheriff Services

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

The tentative map will require the payment of Development Impact Fees (DIF's) prior to building permit occupancy. A portion of these fees will be used for long-term planning of Sheriff Department facilities.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required on this project.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38) Schools

Source: GIS database, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

The tentative map will require the payment of school fees prior to the issuance of building permits. These fees are used for long-term planning of school district facilities.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required on this project.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

39) Libraries

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

The tentative map will require the payment of Development Impact Fees (DIF's) prior to building permit occupancy. A portion of these fees will be used for long-term planning of library facilities.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required on this project.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

40) Health Services

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Substantial Conformance No. 5, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

The tentative map will require the payment of Development Impact Fees (DIF's) prior to building permit occupancy. A portion of these fees will be used for long-term planning of library facilities.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required on this project.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

RECREATION

41) Parks and Recreation

a. Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b. Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c. Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

- a) The project does not include new recreational facilities or trails. The project is proposed in conformance with the adopted specific plan Winchester 1800, of which a recreation plan has been adopted. The development of this
- b) The project includes a new recreational trail along the greenbelt / open space lot on the east side of the project. There are no new active recreational facilities (i.e. parks) within the project site. Accordingly, this project is within the Winchester Hills Specific Plan, which has established areas in which parks are to occur. The nearest proposed park spaces are located less than ¼ mile away, on to the north in Planning Area 11, and one to the south in Planning Area 21. Both are connected to the project site through the proposed trail system.
- c) The project is located within the Valley-Wide Parks District. As such, it will be required to pay Quimby Fees to the Valley-Wide Parks District prior to building permit occupancy.

Mitigation: No additional mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No additional monitoring required.

42) Recreational Trails

Source: Riv. Co. 800-Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

This project includes a new trail within the proposed greenbelt / open space lot at the eastern end of this project. This trail is intended to tie into the trail system to the north and to the trail system within Salt Creek to the south. The proposed project will construct the trail system during the construction of the green space / open space lot during project grading.

Mitigation: No further mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

43) Circulation

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

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service

	New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: Riverside County General Plan, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project does not increase the unit count, therefore it was deemed that no additional traffic study is required. Therefore, no new impacts are anticipated.
- b) The proposed project will comply with the parking requirements of residential development as established by the Riverside County Planning Department.
- c) The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established established by the county congestion management agency for designated roadways.
- d) The project will not result in a change of traffic patterns.
- e) The project will not alter waterborne, rail, or air traffic.
- f) The project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature.
- g) This project will institute a construction management plan that will limit impact circulation in the general vicinity during project construction. As such, there may be temporary traffic delays during street improvements to roads surrounding project site, but those impacts will cease upon completion of construction.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

- h) The project has been reviewed and conditioned by the Riverside County Fire Department. Accordingly, the Fire Department has approved the design of the project. No further impacts are identified.
- i) The project will not impact adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No further monitoring is required.

44) Bike Trails

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

This project is not in immediate adjacency to any bike trails. However, the proposed streets interior to this residential project are wide enough to accommodate bicycle use by future residents.

Mitigation: No further mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

45) Water

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a-b) Water services will be provided by Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and is subject to that District's requirements. EMWD has indicated that they have the capacity of servicing this project by issuing a "will-serve" letter to the project.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

46) Sewer

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Sewer services will be provided by Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and is subject to that District's requirements. EMWD has indicated that they have the capacity of servicing this project by issuing a "will-serve" letter to the project.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

47) Solid Waste

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence, Staff review, project application, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project will not substantially alter existing or future solid waste generation patterns and disposal services. The project will be consistent with the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. The project will be required to comply with the recommendations of the Riverside County Waste Management Department. These requirements are

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

standard to all residential projects and therefore are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

48) Utilities

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

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Staff review, project application, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a-c) The proposed project is within the service boundaries of Southern California Edison for electricity service, Southern California Gas Company for gas service, and Verizon wireless for communication systems service. These utilities are available adjacent to the site and connections to the service lines would not require physical impacts beyond the boundaries of the Project's disturbance area footprint or roadway rights-of-way.
- d) Specific Plan No. 293 features a Master Drainage Plan, which is designed to accommodate on-site and tributary flows. The Project's drainage plan has been designed to be compatible with the Winchester Hills Master Drainage Plan (MDP). Runoff from the Project site would be conveyed to proposed public drainage facilities, some of which are to be constructed by the Project. Master drainage improvements have been accounted for by EMWD in the MDP. Drainage facilities required for the Project would either occur on-site, in roadway rights-of-way (storm drain lines and inlets), or would not involve physical environmental impacts beyond those already planned by the MDP.
- e) Street lighting installed by the Project would not cause physical impacts beyond the boundaries of the Project's disturbance area footprint or adjacent roadway rights-of-way.

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

- f) The Project would construct new roads requiring maintenance. Maintenance of these roadways would not cause physical impacts beyond the boundaries of the Project's disturbance area footprint or adjacent roadway rights-of-way.
- g) No other known government services would be adversely affected by development of the Project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures required.

49) Energy Conservation

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

Source: Staff review, project application, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed Project would not be regarded as an energy-intensive land use and as such, would not result in a conflict with adopted energy conservation plans. Development would be required to comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations regarding energy efficiency.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Source: Staff review, project application, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

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

Source: Staff review, project application, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800), EIR No. 374, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

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

52) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Source: Staff review, project application, Specific Plan No. 286 (Winchester 1800) as shown on Addendum No. 3, site visits, Tentative Tract No. 36687

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

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

- EIR No. 374, which was prepared for the Winchester 1800 Specific Plan (Specific Plan No. 286), and was certified by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on April 29, 1997.

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

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

New Significant Impact	More Severe Impacts	New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Impact
------------------------	---------------------	--	--

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

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

Revised: 9/15/2015 4:33 PM
EA.SP286S3.CZ7829.TR36687