

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



6058

**FROM:** TLMA- Planning Department

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
January 5, 2015

**SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy Amendment) and CHANGE of ZONE NO. 7743** – Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration – APPLICANT: Londen Land Companies, LLC c/o Ashlee Lewis – ENGINEER/REPRESENTATIVE: Bill Warner – Third Supervisorial District – AREA PLAN: Southwest – ZONE AREA: Rancho California – ZONE: Light Agriculture (A-1-5) (5-acre minimum) – POLICY AREA: Highway 79 – LOCATION: East of Dickson Path, South of Auld Road, West of Maddalena Road, and North of Mazoe Street – PROJECT SIZE: 9.49-acres – REQUEST: The General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD) and amend its General Plan Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-Acre Minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR), and the Change of Zone proposes to change the site's Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-Acre Minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49-acres, located within the Southwest Area Plan. Deposit Based Funds 100%.

Departmental Concurrence

Steve Weiss, AICP  
Planning Director

(Continued on next page)

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:**

**For Fiscal Year:**

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

APPROVE

BY:   
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 to deny the project.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Washington, Benoit and Ashley  
 Nays: None  
 Absent: None  
 Date: February 9, 2016  
 xc: Planning, Co.Co., Applicant

Kecia Harper-Ihem  
Clerk of the Board  
By:   
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: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945 and CHANGE of ZONE NO. 7743**

**DATE:** January 5, 2015

**PAGE:** Page 2 of 3

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED MOTIONS: That the Board of Supervisors:**

1. **FIND** that the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") does not apply to projects a public agency disapproves pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15270 (a); and
2. **DENY GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945**, amending the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD) and amending its General Plan Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-Acre Minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR), based on the findings made during the November 4, 2015 Planning Commission hearing and set forth in Resolution No. 2015-024; and
3. **DENY CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7743**, changing the project site's Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-Acre Minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial), based on the findings made during the November 4, 2015 Planning Commission hearing, which are set forth below.

**BACKGROUND:**

*Project Scope*

This General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD) and amend its General Plan Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-Acre Minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR), and the Change of Zone proposes to change the site's Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-Acre Minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49-acres, located within the Southwest Area Plan.

*General Plan Initiation Proceedings ("GPIP")*

This project was submitted to the County of Riverside on February 13, 2008, during the 2008 General Plan Review Cycle application period and was recommended for initiation to the Board of Supervisors. On May 25, 2010, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted an order initiating proceedings for General Plan Amendment No. 945.

*Project History*

The original application for General Plan Amendment No. 945, included four separate parcels (964-050-006, 964-050-007, 964-050-008 and 964-050-009), totaling approximately 20-acres. It was a proposal to change the site's Foundation Component and Land Use Designation to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR) on all four parcels. Since the time of submission, the applicant split the original project into two separate projects, which became GPA00945D1 and GPA00945. General Plan Amendment No. 945D1 includes APN: 964-050-006 only and was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors for a Commercial Retail Land Use Designation on November 25, 2014. General Plan Amendment No. 945 includes APNs: 964-050-008 and 964-050-009 and is now being taken forward for consideration. APN: 964-050-007, associated with the original submission, has been removed from the project scope.

*Planning Commission Hearing – General Plan Amendment Application*

This project was presented to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on November 4, 2015. The Planning Commission recommended denial of the project by a vote of 5-0. The primary finding for a General Plan Foundation Component change is that a "new circumstance" justifying the change, must be made. The applicant and staff's justification for the change was due to the proposed realignment of Butterfield Stage Road at the intersections of Auld Road, Dickson Path, and Pourroy Road. Pursuant to Tentative Parcel Map 32379, the proposed Butterfield Stage Road would become 6-lanes with a 152-foot right-of-way. This realignment and expansion would have an effect on the land use pattern in the area, whereby the properties adjacent to Auld Road on the southside could be better suited for commercial, due to future increased traffic, limited access, and a centralized location which has potential for neighborhood commercial serving uses.

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FORM 11: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945 and CHANGE of ZONE NO. 7743**

**DATE:** January 5, 2015

**PAGE:** Page 3 of 3

However, the Planning Commission's denial recommendation was based upon the following reason:

- The Planning Commission position is the proposed realignment, at this time, is too speculative to be a basis for a Foundation change justification. Although Tentative Parcel Map 32379 was approved, the Final Map has not been processed as of this time. Furthermore, there is currently no public funding for the construction of the realignment, nor is it on Transportation's priority list. As a result, the Planning Commission found that there were no new conditions or circumstances that justify modifying the site's Foundation Component and recommended the Board of Supervisors deny this project.

*Planning Commission Hearing – Change of Zone Application*

Approval of the accompanying Change of Zone, from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-Acre Minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial), is contingent upon General Plan Amendment approval. Should the General Plan Amendment be denied, the proposed Change of Zone would create an inconsistency with the Land Use and as a result, should also be denied.

*Project Opposition*

Prior to the Planning Commission hearing, staff received multiple letters in opposition of the proposed General Plan Amendment, which are included with the Planning Commission report package. One set of letters include 52 signatures from area residents in opposition. Additionally, during the Planning Commission public hearing, multiple people spoke against the proposed project, citing potential issues associated with incompatible land uses, increased traffic, and insufficient environmental analysis.

**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.

**SUPPLEMENTAL:**

**Additional Fiscal Information**


N/A

**Contract History and Price Reasonableness**

N/A

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Planning Commission Minutes**
- Indemnity Agreement**
- Planning Commission Resolution**
- Planning Commission Staff Report**



**RIVERSIDE COUNTY**  
**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

**ORIGINAL**

*Steve Weiss, AICP*  
*Planning Director*

1005B

**DATE: 01/05/16**

**TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors**

**FROM: Planning Department - Riverside Office**

**SUBJECT: General Plan Amendment No. 945 and Change of Zone No. CZ07743**  
(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
- Negative Declaration
  - 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

**SCHEDULE FOR 02/09/2016 BOS HEARING**

**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"*



ORIGINAL

**Attachment A:**

Planning Commission Minutes



RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER  
NOVEMBER 4, 2015**

**I. AGENDA ITEM 4.3**

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy) and CHANGE of ZONE NO. 7743** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Ashlee Lewis – Engineer/Representative: Bill Warner – Third Supervisorial District – Area Plan: Southwest – Zone Area: Rancho California – Zone: Light Agriculture (A-1-5) (5-acre minimum) – Policy Area: Highway 79 – Location: East of Dickson Path, South of Auld Road, West of Maddalena Road, and North of Mazoe Street – Project Size: 9.49 acres.

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD), amend its Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-acre minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio), and change the Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49 acres.

**III. MEETING SUMMARY:**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: John Hildebrand at (951) 955-1888 or email [jhildebr@rctlma.org](mailto:jhildebr@rctlma.org).

In favor of the proposed project:

- Bill Warner, Applicant's Representative, 72-829 Cook St., Palm Desert (760) 341-3101

In opposition:

- Robin Lowe, Respondent, 8172 O'Meara, Hemet (951) 760-2200
- Matthew Duarte, Interested Party
- Robert Yhlen, Interested Party, (951) 852-0526
- Jonathan Adame, Interested Party
- Noah Rau, Neighbor, (951) 852-0992

**IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES:**

None

**V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

Public Comments: Closed

Motion by Commissioner Sanchez, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Hake

A vote of 5-0

**DENIED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy) and CHANGE of ZONE NO. 7743.**

**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](mailto:mcstark@rctlma.org).

**Attachment B:**  
Indemnity Agreement

## INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

This INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT ("Agreement"), made by and between the COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, a political subdivision of the State of California ("COUNTY"), and Londen Land Company, LLC, an Arizona Limited Liability Company, registered in California ("PROPERTY OWNER"), relating to the PROPERTY OWNER'S indemnification of the COUNTY under the terms set forth herein:

### WITNESSETH:

**WHEREAS**, the PROPERTY OWNER has a legal interest in the certain real property described as APN: 964-050-008 and 964-050-009 ("PROPERTY"); and,

**WHEREAS**, on February 13, 2008, PROPERTY OWNER filed an application for General Plan Amendment No. 945 and on August 19, 2010, PROPERTY OWNER filed an application for Change of Zone No. 7743 ("PROJECT"); and,

**WHEREAS**, judicial challenges of projects requiring discretionary approvals, including, but not limited to, California Environmental Quality Act determinations, are costly and time consuming. Additionally, project opponents often seek an award of attorneys' fees in such challenges; and,

**WHEREAS**, since property owners are the primary beneficiaries of such approvals, it is appropriate that such owners bear the expense of defending against any such judicial challenge, and bear the responsibility of any costs, attorneys' fees and damages which may be awarded to a successful challenger; and,

**WHEREAS**, in the event a judicial challenge is commenced against the PROJECT, the COUNTY has requested and the PROPERTY OWNER has agreed to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the COUNTY, its agents, officers, or employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY, its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul any approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the PROJECT or its associated environmental documentation ("LITIGATION"); and,

**WHEREAS**, this Agreement is entered into by the COUNTY and PROPERTY OWNER to establish specific terms concerning PROPERTY OWNER'S indemnification obligation for the PROJECT.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, it is mutually agreed between COUNTY and PROPERTY OWNER as follows:

1. **Indemnification.** PROPERTY OWNER, at its own expense, shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the COUNTY, its agents, officers, and employees from and against any claim, action or proceeding brought against the COUNTY, its agents, officers, and employees to attack, set aside, void or annul any approval of the PROJECT including any associated costs, damages, and expenses including, but not limited to, costs associated with Public Records Act requests submitted to the COUNTY related to the PROJECT and an award of attorneys' fees and costs incurred or arising out of the above-referenced claim, action or proceeding brought against the COUNTY ("Indemnification Obligation.")

2. **Defense Cooperation.** PROPERTY OWNER and the COUNTY shall reasonably cooperate in all aspects of the LITIGATION. Nothing contained in this Agreement, however, shall be construed to limit the discretion of COUNTY, in the interest of the public welfare, to settle, defend, appeal or to decline to settle or to terminate or forego defense or appeal of the LITIGATION. It is also understood and agreed that all litigation pleadings are subject to review, revision and approval by COUNTY's Office of County Counsel.

3. **Representation and Payment for Legal Services Rendered.** COUNTY shall have the absolute right to approve any and all counsel retained to defend COUNTY in the LITIGATION. PROPERTY OWNER shall pay the attorneys' fees and costs of the legal firm retained by PROPERTY OWNER to represent the COUNTY in the LITIGATION. Failure by PROPERTY OWNER to pay such attorneys' fees and costs may be treated as an abandonment of the PROJECT and as a default of PROPERTY OWNER's obligations under this Agreement.

4. **Payment for COUNTY's LITIGATION Costs.** Payment for COUNTY's costs related to the LITIGATION shall be made on a deposit basis. LITIGATION costs include any associated costs, fees, damages, and expenses as further described in Section 1. herein as Indemnification Obligation. Within thirty (30) days of receipt of notice from COUNTY that LITIGATION has been initiated against the PROJECT, PROPERTY OWNER shall initially deposit with the COUNTY's Planning Department the total amount of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000). PROPERTY OWNER shall deposit with COUNTY such additional amounts as COUNTY reasonably and in good faith determines, from time to time, are necessary to cover costs and expenses incurred by the COUNTY, including but not limited to, the Office of County Counsel, Riverside County Planning Department and the Riverside County Clerk of the Board associated with the LITIGATION. Within ten (10) days of written notice from COUNTY, PROPERTY OWNER shall make such additional deposits. Collectively, the initial deposit and additional deposits shall be referred to herein as the "Deposit."

5. **Return of Deposit.** COUNTY shall return to PROPERTY OWNER any funds remaining on deposit after ninety (90) days have passed since final adjudication of the LITIGATION.

6. **Notices.** For all purposes herein, notices shall be effective when personally delivered, delivered by commercial overnight delivery service, or sent by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, to the appropriate address set forth below:

COUNTY:  
Office of County Counsel  
Attn: Melissa Cushman  
3960 Orange Street, Suite 500  
Riverside, CA 92501

PROPERTY OWNER:  
The Londen Companies  
Attn: Ashlee Lewis  
4343 E. Camelback Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85018

With a copy to:  
NV5  
Attn: Bill Warner  
42-829 Cook St., Ste. 104  
Palm Desert, CA 92211

7. **Default and Termination.** This Agreement is not subject to termination, except by mutual agreement or as otherwise provided herein. In the event of a default of PROPERTY OWNER's obligations under this Agreement, COUNTY shall provide written notification to PROPERTY OWNER of such alleged default and PROPERTY OWNER shall have ten (10) days after receipt of written notification to cure any such alleged default. If PROPERTY OWNER fails to cure such alleged default within the specified time period or otherwise reach agreement with the COUNTY on a resolution of the alleged default, COUNTY may, in its sole discretion, do any of the following or combination thereof:

- a. Deem PROPERTY OWNER's default of PROPERTY OWNER's obligations as abandonment of the PROJECT and as a breach of this Agreement;
- b. Rescind any PROJECT approvals previously granted;
- c. Settle the LITIGATION.

In the event of a default, PROPERTY OWNER shall remain responsible for any costs and attorney's fees awarded by the Court or as a result of settlement and other expenses incurred by the COUNTY related to the LITIGATION or settlement.

8. **COUNTY Review of the PROJECT.** Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to limit, direct, impede or influence the COUNTY's review and consideration of the PROJECT.

9. **Complete Agreement/Governing Law.** This Agreement represents the complete understanding between the parties with respect to matters set forth herein. This Agreement shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

10. **Successors and Assigns.** The obligations specific herein shall be made, and are binding on the successors in interest of the PROPERTY OWNER, whether the succession is by agreement, by operation of law or by any other means.

11. **Amendment and Waiver.** No modification, waiver, amendment or discharge of this Agreement shall be valid unless the same is in writing and signed by all parties.

12. **Severability.** If any term, provision, covenant or condition of this Agreement is held to be invalid, void or otherwise unenforceable, to any extent, by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Agreement shall not be affected thereby, and each term, provision, covenant or condition of this Agreement shall be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

13. **Survival of Indemnification.** The parties agree that this Agreement shall constitute a separate agreement from any PROJECT approval, and if the PROJECT, in part or in whole, is invalidated, rendered null or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction, the parties agree to be bound by the terms of this Agreement, which shall survive such invalidation, nullification or setting aside.

14. **Interpretation.** The parties have been advised by their respective attorneys, or if not represented by an attorney, represent that they had an opportunity to be so represented in the review of this Agreement. Any rule of construction to the effect that ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting party shall not be applied in interpreting this Agreement.

15. **Captions and Headings.** The captions and section headings used in this Agreement are inserted for convenience of reference only and are not intended to define, limit or affect the construction or interpretation of any term or provision hereof.

16. **Jurisdiction and Venue.** Any action at law or in equity arising under this Agreement or brought by a party hereto for the purpose of enforcing, construing or determining the validity of any provision of this Agreement shall be filed in the Courts of Riverside County, State of California, and the parties hereto waive all provisions of law providing for the filing, removal or change of venue to any other court or jurisdiction.

17. **Counterparts; Facsimile & Electronic Execution.** This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an

original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same document. To facilitate execution of this Agreement, the parties may execute and exchange facsimile or electronic counterparts, and facsimile or electronic counterparts shall serve as originals.

18. **Joint and Several Liability.** In the event there is more than one PROPERTY OWNER, the liability of PROPERTY OWNER shall be joint and several, and PROPERTY OWNER each of them shall be jointly and severally liable for performance of all of the obligations of PROPERTY OWNER under this Agreement.

19. **Effective Date.** The effective date of this Agreement is the date the parties sign the Agreement. If the parties sign the Agreement on more than one date, then the last date the Agreement is signed by a party shall be the effective date.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the parties hereto have duly caused this Agreement to be executed by their authorized representatives as of the date written.

**COUNTY:**  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE,  
a political subdivision of the State of California

By: Steven Weiss  
Steven Weiss  
Riverside County Planning Director

Dated: 1-14-16

**PROPERTY OWNER:**  
Londen Land Company, LLC, an Arizona Limited Liability Company,  
registered in California

By: Lynn Londen  
Lynn Londen  
Manager

Dated: 12-22-15

ok  
12-22-15

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL  
BY: Michelle Clack  
MICHELLE CLACK  
DATE: 1/13/16




ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

State of Arizona            )  
                  *MARICOPA*        ) SS.  
County of ~~Riverside~~        )

On December 22, 2015 before me, Marce L. Boersma, Notary Public personally appeared Priscilla Lynn Londen who provided to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that they executed the same in their authorized capacities and that by their signatures on the instrument the person, or entity upon behalf of which the person acted executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of Arizona that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL.



*Marce L. Boersma*

# **Attachment C:**

Planning Commission Resolution

2  
3 **RESOLUTION NO. 2015-024**  
4 **RECOMMENDING DENIAL OF**  
5 **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945**  
6

7 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et. seq., a public  
8 hearing was held before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on  
9 November 4, 2015, to consider the above-referenced matter; and,

10 **WHEREAS**, the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") does not apply to projects a  
11 public agency disapproves pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15270 (a); and,

12 **WHEREAS**, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the  
13 public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

14 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Planning  
15 Commission of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on November 4, 2015, that the  
16 Planning Commission recommends the following:  
17

- 18
- 19 1. **FIND** that CEQA does not apply to projects a public agency disapproves pursuant to State CEQA  
20 Guidelines Section 15270 (a); and,
  - 21 2. **DENY** General Plan Amendment No. 945, based upon the following:
    - 22 a. The proposed realignment of Butterfield Stage Road, is at this time, too speculative to be a  
23 basis for a General Plan Foundation Component Amendment.
    - 24 b. The proposed realignment is part of Tentative Parcel Map 32379, which was previously  
25 approved. A Final Map however, has not been approved, nor has it been filed for  
26 consideration.  
27  
28

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


- c. Furthermore, there is currently no funding for the construction of the Butterfield Stage Road realignment, nor is it on the County of Riverside Transportation Department's priority list.
- d. Therefore, based upon the above, the proposed realignment of Butterfield Stage Road is too speculative and there are no new conditions or circumstances disclosed during the review process that justify modifying the site's General Plan Foundation Component.
- e. As a result, the Planning Commission recommends denial of the proposed GPA No. 94 because it is unable to satisfy the required finding set forth in Section 2.5, subsection g. of Ordinance No. 348.

**Attachment D:**

Planning Commission Report Package

Agenda Item No.: 4.3  
Area Plan: Southwest  
Zoning Area: Rancho California  
Supervisorial District: Third  
Project Planner: John Earle Hildebrand III  
Planning Commission: November 04, 2015

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945  
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7743  
Environmental Assessment No. 41773  
Applicant: Londen Land Companies, LLC c/o  
Ashlee Lewis  
Engineer/Representative: NV5 c/o Bill Warner

  
Steve Weiss, AICP  
Planning Director

## COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy Amendment) and CHANGE of ZONE NO. 7743** – Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD), amend its Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-acre minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR), and change the project site's Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49 acres, located East of Dickson Path, South of Auld Road, West of Maddalena Road, and North of Mazoe Street, within the Southwest Area Plan.

### BACKGROUND:

#### *General Plan Initiation Proceedings ("GPIP")*


This project was submitted on February 13, 2008, during the 2008 General Plan Review Cycle application period and was recommended for initiation to the Board of Supervisors by County staff, the Planning Director, and the Planning Commission. On May 25, 2010, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors adopted an order initiating proceedings for General Plan Amendment No. 945. The GPIP report package is included with this report. GPA No. 945 and Change of Zone No. 7743 (the "project") are now being taken forward for consideration.

#### *Airport Influence Area ("AIA")*


The project site is located within the French Valley Airport Influence Area. As a result, this project is required to be reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC"). File No. ZAP1045FV12 was submitted to the ALUC for review in December 2011. Based upon the location of the project site relative to the airport, ALUC made a determination that the proposed General Plan Amendment is consistent with French Valley Airport Influence Area. No restrictions are imposed upon the site or the site's ultimate use as commercial.

**Project History**

The original application for General Plan Amendment No. 945, included four separate parcels (964-050-006, 964-050-007, 964-050-008 and 964-050-009), totaling approximately 20-acres. It was a proposal to change the site's Foundation Component and Land Use Designation to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR) on all four parcels. Since the time of submission, the applicant split the original project into two separate projects, which became GPA00945D1 and GPA00945. General Plan Amendment No. 945D1 includes APN: 964-050-006 only and was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors for a Commercial Retail Land Use Designation on November 25, 2014. General Plan Amendment No. 945 includes APNs: 964-050-008 and 964-050-009 and is now being taken forward for consideration. APN: 964-050-007, associated with the original submission, is no longer a part of either project.



GPA00945 & CZ07743



GPA00945D1 & CZ07822

**SB 18 and AB 52 Tribal Consultations**

Pursuant to SB 18 requirements, Riverside County staff previously requested a list from the Native American Heritage Commission ("NAHC") of Native American Tribes whose historical extent includes the project site. Consultation request notices were sent to each of the Tribes on the list on November 29, 2010. SB 18 provides for a 90-day review period in which all noticed Tribes may request consultation regarding the proposed project. County staff received no consultation requests for this project during the 90-day review period.

AB 52 became effective on July 1, 2015. In compliance with AB 52, separate notices regarding this project were mailed to all requesting Tribes on September 10, 2015. AB 52 provides for a 30-day review period in which all noticed Tribes may request consultation regarding the proposed project. County staff received notification from the Pechanga Tribe within the 30-day period, requesting to initiate consultation on this project. County staff discussed this project with the Pechanga Tribe on October 10, 2015,

explaining that the project scope includes a legislative action only. There is no accompanying implementing project and it will result in no physical disturbance of the site. The Pechanga Tribe concluded that this project could move forward with no additional consultation, provided they are again noticed during the time of any future implementing project. In accordance with this request and in compliance with AB 52, County staff will notice the Pechanga tribe, as well as all other requesting Tribes, at the time a project is submitted.

**ISSUES OF POTENTIAL CONCERN:**

*City of Temecula – Sphere of Influence*

The project site is located within the City of Temecula sphere of influence. As a result, this proposed project was previously provided to the City of Temecula for their review. In a letter dated May 19, 2014 the City of Temecula requested a traffic impact analysis, and specified intersections that they would like to have analyzed. It was resolved that a traffic analysis will be prepared at the time of an implementing project. The study will be provided to the City for their review.

*General Plan Amendment Findings*

This project includes both a Regular Foundation Amendment and an Entitlement/Policy Amendment. A Regular Foundation Amendment application is allowed to be submitted only during a General Plan Review Cycle, which was previously every five (5) years and is now every eight (8) years. This project was submitted on February 13, 2008, within the 2008 General Plan Review Cycle application period. A Regular Foundation Amendment is required to adhere to a two-step approval process; whereby the first step is for the Board of Supervisors to adopt an order to initiate the Amendment proceedings. The second step, after initiation, is for the proposed Regular Foundation Amendment to go through the entitlement process, where the project will be publicly noticed and prepared for both Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors hearings and finalized during an adoption cycle.


The Administration Element of the Riverside County General Plan and Article 2 of Ordinance No. 348 provides that three (3) findings must be made to justify a Regular Foundation Amendment. Additionally, five (5) findings must be made to justify an Entitlement/Policy Amendment. This proposed project is a request to change from one Foundation Component to another, as well as from one Land Use Designation to another. As a result, both sets of findings must be made. There is some overlap between the Foundation and Entitlement/Policy Amendment findings, which are further described below:

- 1) (FOUNDATION FINDING) *The Foundation change is based on substantial evidence that new conditions or circumstances disclosed during the review process justify modifying the General Plan, that the modifications do not conflict with the overall Riverside County Vision, and that they would not create an internal inconsistency among the elements of the General Plan.*

*New Circumstance*

A proposed realignment of Butterfield Stage Road at the intersections of Auld Road, Dickson Path, and Pourroy Road will result in the subdivision of a single 20-acre parcel into 3 parcels and include dedication for right-of-way. Although this project site is not a part of this Tentative Parcel Map ("TPM") area, the realignment impacts the adjacent properties to the east, including the project site. The realignment will result in an expansion to the circulation system in the immediate area, changing the pattern of development and land use along Auld Road.





Proposed Realignment – Tentative Parcel Map 32379

The approximate 20-acre property shown in the above TPM has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial Retail and as discussed above, the property to the east was recently amended to Commercial Retail under GPA00945D1. As a result of the realignment and dedication for right-of-way, there will be a decrease in some potentially developable commercial property. The Foundation Component Amendment justification for GPA00945D1 was that there would be no net increase in commercial property by changing the site's land use to Commercial Retail.

Looking at this corridor area along the southside of Auld Road from Pourroy Road on the west to Maddalena Road on the east in a larger context, the realignment will have an effect on the project site as well. It will create an expansion to the circulation system for the area, changing traffic patterns and ultimately land use. These properties adjacent to Auld Road on the southside, will be better suited for commercial, due to the increased traffic, limited access, and a centralized location, ideal for neighborhood commercial serving uses. Amending the project site's land use to commercial is a reasonable change as it will create a continuation of the Auld Road commercial corridor to a logical transition area at Maddalena Road. This proposed realignment represents a new condition and justifies a Foundation Component Amendment.

#### *Riverside County Vision*

The Riverside County General Plan Vision Statement discusses many concepts, which are distinguished by categories and include housing, population growth, healthy communities, conservation, transportation, and several others. This project has been reviewed in conjunction with the Vision Statement and staff has determined that the project is consistent with it. Specifically, the Jobs and the Economy portion of the General Plan Vision Statement says, "Jobs/housing balance is significantly improved overall, as well as within subregions of the County." This Foundation Amendment will result in providing a blend of land uses for the area in support of a more balanced Jobs/Housing mix. Additional commercial land along the Auld Road corridor is appropriate and will potentially enable localized jobs and services creation. For these reasons, this project is consistent

with the Riverside County Vision Statement and this General Plan Foundation Component modification is justified.

*Internal Consistency*

Excluding the French Valley Airport Influence Area ("AIA") and the Highway 79 Policy Area, the project site is not located within any other policy area or special overlay that would result in an inconsistency from a General Plan Foundation Component Amendment to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR). The Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") has determined that this proposed General Plan Amendment is consistent with the AIA criteria for commercial development and the Highway 79 Policy only applies to residential development.

Staff has reviewed this project in conjunction with each of the ten (10) Riverside County General Plan Elements, which includes Vision, Land Use, Circulation, Multi-Purpose Open Space, Safety, Noise, Housing, Air Quality, Healthy Communities, and Administration, and has determined that this project is in conformance with the policies and objectives of each element. This is supported through the Jobs and Economy section of the Vision Statement, which states the following:

- Jobs/housing balance is significantly improved overall, as well as within subregions of the County.

This proposed General Plan Foundation Component Amendment will provide an opportunity to establish a neighborhood serving commercial use under a future implementing project, further balancing the jobs/housing ratio. This project will not create an inconsistency with any of the General Plan elements and as a result, a General Plan Foundation Component Amendment is justified.

2) (ENTITLEMENT/POLICY FINDING) The proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with:

a) The Riverside County Vision:

As demonstrated in the above discussion, this proposed General Plan Foundation Component Amendment is consistent with the Vision Statement of the Riverside County General Plan. In addition, this Entitlement/Policy Amendment is also consistent with the Vision Statement for the same reasons. The Vision Statement encourages the establishment of an appropriate Jobs/Housing balance at both the regional and localized scales. Creating pockets of Commercial Land Use in appropriate locations to support residential communities, furthers this Vision. As a result, this project is consistent with the Riverside County Vision Statement.

b) Any General Plan Principle; or

The Riverside County General Plan, Appendix B: General Planning Principles consists of seven (7) categories, including Community Development, Environmental Protection, Transportation, Community Design, Agricultural, Rural Development, and Economic Development. This project has been reviewed in conjunction with these categories and staff has determined that the project is consistent with the planning principles contained within. Specifically, there are two principles that are of note.

The first principal is within the Community Development category – Commerce and Industrial Development:

- "Promote a mix of uses, especially including high employment uses such as commercial and office development as well as mixed-use projects."

There is a concern that an ample supply of commercially designated property in the area might be compromised by the realignment of Butterfield Stage Road. The designation of the project site to Commercial Retail will help negate any potential loss of commercial acreage along the Auld Road corridor due to right-of-way dedications.

The second principal is within the Community Design category – Community Variety, Choice, and Balance:

- "Distributing growth in a rational way between urban, suburban and rural spheres with an appropriate allocation of resources to meet necessary infrastructure requirements."

This project will result in a shift from residential to commercial land use, in support of the pending growth in the area. It will be located far enough away from the commercial retail sites on Highway 79 to service the surrounding residential subdivisions. In addition, the location will encourage local and cross-town traffic to remain on the Butterfield Stage Road bypass. There is no conflict with any General Plan principle.

c) Any Foundation Component designation in the General Plan.

As demonstrated in the above findings, this proposed Foundation Component Amendment in conjunction with the Entitlement/Policy Amendment, does not conflict with the Riverside County Vision Statement or any of the General Plan principles. This Amendment will result in a logical extension of the existing and future Commercial Retail development patterns along the Auld Road corridor, which supports the County's goals and vision.

3) (ENTITLEMENT/POLICY FINDING) The proposed amendment would either contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the General Plan or, at a minimum, would not be detrimental to them.

One of the primary goals of the Riverside County General Plan is to enable orderly and managed growth throughout the County. This is achieved through adherence to the General Plan's established policies, which enable implementation of the goals. The following two General Plan policies will be achieved through this Amendment:

- Policy LU 23.1 - Accommodate the development of commercial uses in areas appropriately designated by the General Plan and the plan land use maps.

Based upon the proposed realignment and the future enhanced circulation system around the project site, a Commercial Land Use designation is appropriate and can be accommodated along the Auld Road corridor. Furthermore, with the designation of the project site to Commercial Retail, this will help negate the loss of some commercial property due to road dedication.

- Policy LU 3.1 (c) - Promote parcel consolidation or coordinated planning of adjacent parcels through incentive programs and planning assistance.

Through the Planning Department review process and a holistic view of the project site in conjunction with the Auld Road corridor, consolidation of property for commercial use is a

reasonable transition for the area. Furthermore, this project will result in providing a nearly seamless continuation of commercial property on the southside of Auld Road, from Dickson Path on the west to Maddalena Road on the east. As demonstrated, this proposed General Plan Amendment will contribute to the achievement of the General Plan purpose.

4) (ENTITLEMENT/POLICY FINDING) *Special circumstances or conditions have emerged that were unanticipated in preparing the General Plan.*

As stated in the above findings, the realignment of Butterfield Stage Road at the intersections of Auld Road, Dickson Path, and Pourroy Road will divide a single 20-acre Commercial Retail designated property into three smaller disconnected parcels, reducing the developable commercial area. This proposed realignment changes the land use pattern along the Auld Road corridor; whereby, commercial uses are now more appropriate. The proposed realignment is a new circumstance and as a result, this General Plan Amendment is a reasonable change.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Existing Foundation General Plan Land Use (Ex #6): | Rural (R)   |
| 2. Proposed Foundation General Plan Land Use (Ex #6): | Community Development (CD)  |
| 3. Existing General Plan Land Use (Ex #6):            | Rural Residential (RR)  |
| 4. Proposed General Plan Land Use (Ex #6):            | Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 Floor Area Ratio)   |
| 5. Surrounding General Plan Land Use (Ex #6):         | Specific Plan (SP) to the north, Rural Residential (RR) to the south, Rural Residential (RR) to the east, Commercial Retail (CR) and Rural Residential (RR) to the west.                                      |
| 6. Existing Zoning (Ex #2):                           | A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum)   |
| 7. Proposed Zoning:                                   | General Commercial (C-1/C-P)  |
| 8. Surrounding Zoning (Ex #2):                        | Specific Plan (SP) to the north, Rural Agricultural, 2 ½ Acre Minimum (R-A-2 ½) to the east, Light Agriculture, 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) to the south and General Commercial (C-1/C-P) to the west              |
| 9. Existing Land Use (Ex #1):                         | Vacant Land   |
| 10. Surrounding Land Use (Ex #1):                     | Single family residential to the north, Single family residential and vacant land to the south, Single family residential and vacant land to the east, Single family residential and vacant land to the west. |
| 11. Project Size:                                     | 9.49 acres  |
| 12. Environmental Concerns:                           | See Environmental Assessment File No. 41773   |

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**ADOPT PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION No. 2015-024** recommending adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 945 to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors;

**THE PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

**ADOPT** a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41773**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

**TENTATIVELY APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945**, amending the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD) and amending its Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-acre minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio on two parcels, totaling 9.49-acres, in accordance with the Proposed General Plan Land Use Exhibit #6; based on the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and, pending final adoption of the General Plan Amendment Resolution by the Board of Supervisors; and,

**TENTATIVELY APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7743**, changing the project site's Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49 acres, in accordance with the Proposed Change of Zone Exhibit #3; based on the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and, pending final adoption of the Change of Zone Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors.

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

1. The project site has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) and is located in the Southwest Area Plan.
2. The project site is surrounded by properties which have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Specific Plan to the north, Rural Residential (RR) to the east and south, and Commercial Retail (CR) to west.
3. This Regular Foundation Component Amendment and an Entitlement/Policy Amendment will result in a land use change to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio).
4. As provided in this staff report, this project is consistent with both the Administrative Element of the Riverside County General Plan and Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348.
5. As provided in this staff report, this project is in conformance with each of the Riverside County General Plan Elements and will not create an internal inconsistency with them.
6. As provided in this staff report, this project does not conflict with nor does it require any changes to the Riverside County Vision Statement.
7. As provided in this staff report, this project is consistent with the planning principles in Appendix B of the Riverside County General Plan.

8. Special circumstances or conditions have emerged that were unanticipated in preparing the General Plan. Looking at this corridor area along the southside of Auld Road from Pourroy Road on the west to Maddalena Road on the east in a larger context, the realignment will have an effect on the project site as well. It will create an expansion to the circulation system for the area, changing traffic patterns and ultimately land use. These properties adjacent to Auld Road on the southside, will be better suited for commercial, due to the increased traffic, limited access, and a centralized location, ideal for neighborhood commercial serving uses. Amending the project site's land use to commercial is a reasonable change as it will create a continuation of the Auld Road commercial corridor to a logical transition area at Maddalena Road. This proposed realignment represents a new condition and justifies a Foundation Component Amendment.
9. The Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element Policy LU 23.1 states, "Accommodate the development of commercial uses in areas appropriately designated by the General Plan and the plan land use maps." Based upon the proposed realignment and the future enhanced circulation system around the project site, a Commercial Land Use designation is appropriate and can be accommodated along the Auld Road corridor. Furthermore, with the designation of the project site to Commercial Retail, this will help negate the loss of some commercial property due to road dedication.
10. The Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element Policy LU 3.1 (c) states, "Promote parcel consolidation or coordinated planning of adjacent parcels through incentive programs and planning assistance." Through the Planning Department review process and a holistic view of the project site in conjunction with the Auld Road corridor, consolidation of property for commercial use is a reasonable transition for the area. Furthermore, this project will result in providing a nearly seamless continuation of commercial property on the southside of Auld Road, from Dickson Path on the west to Maddalena Road on the east.
11. The Zoning Classification of the project site is A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum).
12. The project site is surrounded by properties which have a Zoning Classification of Specific Plan (SP) to the north, General Commercial (C-1/C-P) to the west, and Light Agriculture 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) to the south and east.
13. The accompanying Change of Zone application will result in a change of the site's Zoning Classification to C-1/C-P (General Commercial).
14. Environmental Assessment No. 41773 identified no potentially significant impacts, and resulted in a Negative Declaration of environmental effects.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

1. This proposed project is in conformance with the Community Development: Commercial Retail Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.
2. This proposed project is consistent with the General Commercial (C-1/C-P) Zoning Classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
3. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.

4. The proposed project is compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
5. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
6. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside 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. The boundaries of a City; or
  - b. A Criteria Cell of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan ("MSHCP"); or
  - c. A County Service Area ("CSA"); or
  - d. A Fault zone; or
  - e. A "High" wildfire hazard zone.
3. The project site is located within:
  - a. The city of Temecula sphere of influence; and
  - b. State Fire Responsibility Area; and
  - d. A Flood Zone and Dam Inundation Area.
4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 964-050-008 and 964-050-009.

2  
3 **RESOLUTION NO. 2015-024**  
4 **RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF**  
5 **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 945**  
6

7 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section(s) 65350/65450 et. seq.,  
8 public hearings were held before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on  
9 November 04, 2015, to consider the above-referenced matter; and,

10 **WHEREAS**, all the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and  
11 Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been met and the environmental document  
12 prepared or relied on is sufficiently detailed so that all the potentially significant effects of the project on  
13 the environment and measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen such effects have been evaluated  
14 in accordance with the above-referenced Act and Procedures; and,

15 **WHEREAS**, the matter was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the  
16 public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

17 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Planning  
18 Commission of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on November 04, 2015, that it has  
19 reviewed and considered the environmental document prepared or relied on and recommends the  
20 following based on the staff report and the findings and conclusions stated therein:  
21

22 **ADOPTION** of the Negative Declaration environmental document, Environmental Assessment  
23 File No. 41773; and  
24


25 **ADOPTION** of General Plan Amendment No. 945  
26  
27  
28



**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**CZ07743 GPA00945**  
**VICINITY/POLICY AREAS**

Supervisor Washington  
 District 3

Date Drawn: 10/02/2015  
 Vicinity Map



Zoning Area: Rancho California

Author: Vinnie Nguyen



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2015, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for various portions of the County. The new General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided in the current zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department at (951) 865-4977 (Eastern County) or Website: [WWW.RIVERSIDECOUNTY.CA.GOV](http://WWW.RIVERSIDECOUNTY.CA.GOV)



RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
**CZ07743 GPA00945**

Supervisor Washington  
 District 3


Date Drawn: 10/02/2015  
 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>




RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CZ07743 GPA00945

PROPOSED ZONING


Supervisor Washington  
District 3

Date Drawn: 10/02/2015  
Exhibit 3



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

## CZ07743 GPA00945

### PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN


Supervisor Washington  
District 3

Date Drawn: 10/02/2015  
Exhibit 6



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>



IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 32379**  
 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PARCEL 1 OF PARCEL MAP 9509  
 RECORDED IN BOOK 39, PAGE 80 OF PARCEL MAPS,  
 RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
 AMENDMENT # 3

SHEET 1 OF 1



- GENERAL NOTES**
- LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PARCELS 1, 2 & 3 OF PARCEL MAP 9509 RECORDED IN BOOK 39, PAGE 80 OF PARCEL MAPS, RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, LIES WITHIN SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 7 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST.
  - TOTAL GROSS/NET ACRES: 20.47/16.42
  - NUMBER OF LOTS: 3 & 16 RESIDUAL
  - MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE: 2.46 ACRES
  - PROPOSED LAND USE: COMMERCIAL
  - EXISTING LAND USE: VACANT
  - PROPOSED ZONING: C-1/P-C-P
  - EXISTING ZONING: C-1/P-C-P
  - SEWERING ZONING: A-1-10 AGRICULTURAL, R-4-S
  - SEWERAGE SYSTEM: SEWERAGE PLAN
  - SEWERAGE: MANHOLE, WATER DISTRICT
  - UTILITIES AND SERVICES: WATER - CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT; GAS - CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY; ELECTRIC - CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC COMPANY; TELEPHONE - CALIFORNIA TELEPHONE COMPANY; CABLE - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY; CABLE - CALIFORNIA TELEPHONE COMPANY
  - SCHOOL DISTRICT: THERESA VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
  - ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 980-000-001
  - THOMAS BROS. GATED: 2002 EXTENSION PG 538 E2
  - MAP PREPARATION DATE: MAY 2004
  - SOURCE OF TOPOGRAPHY: NATIONAL MAPS AND RECORDS
  - THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN FEMA FLOOD ZONE 3776 A, A FLOOD HAZARD AREA IN ZONE 3 OF AREAS OF DISASTER.
  - THE PROPERTY IS NOT WITHIN A SPECIFIC PLAN.
  - THE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP CONTAINS THE ENTIRE UNDIVIDED INTEREST OF THE LAND DEDICATED.
  - THE PROPERTY IS NOT WITHIN A COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT.
  - SCHEMATIC "C" PARCEL MAP
  - THE PROPERTY IS NOT SUBJECT TO FLOOD HAZARD INFORMATION OR LIMITATION.

**LEGEND**

FOURMILE  
 DASHED LINE

**GRAPHIC SCALE**  
 1 inch = 40 feet

**OWNER**  
 THOMAS BROS. GATED  
 A THOMAS LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
 2002 EXTENSION PG 538 E2  
 EAST CREST ROAD, SUITE 212  
 THERESA VALLEY, CA 92584  
 PHONE: (951) 843-3441

**PREPARED BY**  
 DJJ ENGINEERING, INC.  
 11111 UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
 THERESA VALLEY, CA 92584  
 PHONE: (951) 843-3441

**APPROVED BY**  
 DJJ ENGINEERING, INC.  
 11111 UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
 THERESA VALLEY, CA 92584  
 PHONE: (951) 843-3441

**REMARKS:**  
 AN EMBLEM IN FAVOR OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE FOR PARCEL MAP 32379, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PARCEL 1 OF PARCEL MAP 9509, RECORDED IN BOOK 39, PAGE 80 OF PARCEL MAPS, RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AMENDMENT # 3, WAS FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY CLERK OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, ON MAY 20, 2004.

**NORTHERN PORTION AULD ROAD**  
 10' WIDE IN EXISTING PLACE 2.6' TO 13.7' WIDE IN ELEVATION FROM 2003 TO 1302.70  
 10' WIDE IN EXISTING PLACE 2.6' TO 13.7' WIDE IN ELEVATION FROM 2003 TO 1302.70

**PROPOSED AULD ROAD**  
 10' WIDE

**PROPOSED BUTTERFIELD ROAD**  
 10' WIDE



# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

**Environmental Assessment No.:** 41773

**Project Case(s):** General Plan Amendment No. 945 and Change of Zone No. 7743

**Lead Agency Name:** County of Riverside Planning Department

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

**Lead Agency Contact Person:** John Earle Hildebrand III

**Lead Agency Telephone Number:** 951-955-1888

**Applicant's Name:** Londen Land Companies, LLC c/o Ashlee Lewis

**Applicant's Address:** 4343 East Camelback Road, Phoenix, AZ 85018

**Applicant's Telephone Number:** 602-957-1650

### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

**A. Project Description:** Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD), amend its Land Use Designation from Rural Residential (RR) (5-acre minimum) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio), and change the Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49 acres.

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

**C. Total Project Area:** 9.49

**D. Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 964-050-008 and 964-050-009

**E. Street References:** East of Dickson Path, South of Auld Road, West of Maddalena Road, and North of Mazoe Street

**F. Section, Township & Range Description:** Township 7 South, Range 2 West, Section 9

**G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:** The project site is vacant land, surrounded by single family residential and other vacant land.

### II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

#### A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The project site is currently designated Rural: Rural Residential (RUR:RR) (5 Ac. Min.). This General Plan Amendment will result in amending the General Plan Foundation Component of the project site from Rural (RUR) to Community Development (CD), amend the General Plan Land Use Designation of the project site from Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum Lot Size) to Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20-0.35 Floor Area Ratio), and change the Zoning Classification from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5-acre minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial) on two parcels, totaling 9.49 acres. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Land Use Element.

2. **Circulation:** The project site is bounded by Auld Road, Dickson Path and Maddalena Road providing a number of options for access into the site. The project site also falls

within the boundary of the Highway 79 Policy Area and is consistent with the requirements of the policy area. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Circulation Element.

3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The project site is located within the Western Riverside County Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP); however, the project is not located within a criteria cell. Although, the project site is not located within a criteria cell, the site will be required to conform to additional plan wide Requirements of the MSHCP, including Riparian/Riverine Policies, Specific Species Surveys, Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines (UWIG) and Narrow Endemic Plant Species Policies and Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Analysis (DBESP) as applicable. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Open Space Element.
  4. **Safety:** The project site is located within a State responsibility fire area and shall adhere to such requirements. The project site has a low potential for liquefaction and is susceptible to subsidence. The site is not located within a flood zone or a fault zone. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Safety Element.
  5. **Noise:** The proposed General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the land use designation of the project site to a commercial designation which is not considered to be a significant noise generating uses. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Noise Element.
  6. **Housing:** This project will not result in the construction of new dwelling units nor will it result in the demolition of any dwelling units. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Housing Element.
  7. **Air Quality:** The general plan amendment may result in additional vehicle trips in the vicinity of the subject site. This project is consistent with the provisions of the Air Quality Element.
  8. **Healthy Communities:** This project is consistent with the provisions of the Healthy Communities Element.
- B. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area Plan
- C. **General Plan Foundation Component (Existing):** Rural (R)
- D. **General Plan Foundation Component (Proposed):** Community Development (CD)
- E. **General Plan Land Use Designation (Existing):** Rural Residential (RR)
- F. **General Plan Land Use Designation (Proposed):** Commercial Retail (CR)
- G. **Overlay(s), if any:** N/A
- H. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Highway 79 Policy Area
- I. **Adjacent and Surrounding:**
1. **Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area Plan to the north, south, east and west

- 2. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development (CD) to the north and west. Rural (R) to the south and east.
- 3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Medium Density Residential (MDR) to the north, Rural Residential (RR) to the south and east and Commercial Retail (CR) to the west.
- 4. **Overlay(s), if any:** N/A
- 5. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Highway 79 Policy Area to the north, south, east and west.

**J. Adopted Specific Plan Information**

- 1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** N/A
- 2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** N/A

**K. Existing Zoning:** Light Agriculture, 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5)

**L. Proposed Zoning,:** General Commercial (C-1/C-P)

**M. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:** Specific Plan (SP) to the north, Rural Agricultural, 2 ½ Acre Minimum (R-A-2 ½) to the east, Light Agriculture, 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) to the south and General Commercial (C-1/C-P) to the west.

**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

10/01/2015

Date

John Earle Hildebrand III, *Project Planner*  
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 proposal and to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the proposal. This initial study will only be evaluating potential environmental impacts associated with the General Plan Foundation Component Amendment, subsequent development applications will be reviewed for CEQA compliance at the time they are submitted. 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 proposed General Plan Amendment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>AESTHETICS</b> Would the project				
<b>1. Scenic Resources</b>				
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," Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any State, County or Eligible Scenic Highway and therefore will not have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor.
- b) The project site does not contain any significant rock outcroppings, vegetation or unique landmark features. The proposal shall not obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public. Any commercial development would be required to comply with the Countywide Design Guidelines along with any landscaping requirements. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

### 2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

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

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

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

**Findings of Fact:**

The project site is located 20.36 miles from the Mt. Palomar Observatory and is within Zone B of Riverside County Ordinance 655 (Regulating Light Pollution). Subsequent development applications consistent with the General Plan Amendment proposing lighting shall be conditioned to comply with Ordinance No. 655. Compliance with Ordinance No. 655 restricts the use of certain light fixtures emitting light into the night sky that may create undesirable light glow and detrimentally affect astronomical observations and research.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring measures are required

**3. Other Lighting Issues**

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** Project Application Description

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The proposal will not directly create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. If approved, GPA No. 945 would allow for the subsequent approval of commercial development projects that would create a new source of lighting; however, implementing projects will be reviewed for such impacts during the development review process prior to any discretionary action or project approval. Per Riverside County ordinances, lighting will be required to be hooded and shielded in order to prevent the creation of substantial light. Reflective surfaces will be minimized in construction of the development which would limit the potential for substantial glare created by the project. With adherence to the Ordinance No. 655 lighting control measures and landscape buffering it is not anticipated that spill-over light would adversely surrounding properties. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

b) As this proposal is a land use and zoning change only, it would not directly expose residential property to unacceptable light levels. Subsequent implementing project will be required to comply with the necessary County ordinance, policies and programs, such as Ordinance No. 655 to ensure that surrounding residential properties to the north, south, east and west of the project site are not

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

adversely impacted by the development. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

**AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES** Would the project

**4. Agriculture**

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

b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?

c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?

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?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, Staff Review and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The Riverside County General Plan Open Space element, Figure OS-2 shows that the project site has been designated as Farmland of Local Importance. Farmlands of local importance do not fall in the categories of Prime, Statewide or Unique Farmlands but are of locally significant economic importance. As the site has not been designated as Prime, Statewide Unique Farmland, the proposal will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

b) The project site is vacant land and is not being used for agricultural purposes. The site is not within an agricultural preserve, and will not conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps). As a result, there will be no impacts.

c) While GPA No. 945 does not propose any grading or construction, future implementing development applications as a result of GPA No. 945 may propose and cause the development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. Given the existing Community Development Foundation Component (including commercial and residential designations) land use designations found to the east and the north of the subject site, there is a logical progression of

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

Community Development within the area based on the vision for the French Valley community. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for potential impacts of proposals on the surrounding properties. Mitigation measures and or County-approved Conditions of Approval shall be required as a result of the development application review if necessary. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

d) The proposal will convert an area that has been identified by the Riverside County Land Information System as Farmland of Local Importance to non-agricultural use. However, the system has also indicated that disturbances have already occurred on-site and has identified the site as Developed/Disturbed Land. GPA No. 945 proposal would not adversely impact the already disturbed land. Subsequent implementing development applications will also be reviewed in order to identify and mitigate any potential adverse impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**5. Forest**

a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?

b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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?

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

Findings of Fact:

a) As a land use and zoning change only, the proposal will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g)). There will be no impacts.

b) As a land use and zoning change only, the proposal will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There will be no impacts.

c) As a land use and zoning change only, the proposal will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, would result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**AIR QUALITY** Would the project

**6. Air Quality Impacts**

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

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook

Findings of Fact:

a-f) The proposed land use change could result in a net increase in vehicle trips at build out, based upon the proposed change to commercial. However, the amount of the increase is too speculative to provide a detailed analysis at this time. Any future implementing project will specifically address air quality impacts.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**7. Wildlife & Vegetation**

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State conservation plan?				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** GIS database, WRCMSHCP, General Plan, Environmental Programs Department Staff Review

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The project site is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP); however, the site is not within an identified criteria cell area. Any future implementing development application shall be required to comply with additional plan wide requirements of the MSHCP, including Riparian/Riverine Policies, Specific Species Surveys, Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines (UWIG) and Narrow Endemic Plant Species Policies and Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation Analysis (DBESP) as applicable. all applicable requirements of the MSHCP during the review process. As a result, impacts are less than significant.

b) The project site has been disturbed by previous activities. A plant survey concluded that no sensitive plant species were found on the project site. The subject proposal does not include any project specific development which would cause ground disturbance at this time, any further disturbance proposed by subsequent implementing development applications will be required to

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

comply with the MSHCP along with any Federal or State regulations during the application review process. As a result, impacts are less than significant.

c) This environmental assessment is addressing a land use change only and no development project is being proposed at this time. Subsequent implementing development projects will be reviewed at the time of application for adverse impacts 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. As a result, impacts are less than significant.

d) This environmental assessment is addressing a land use change only and no development project is being proposed at this time. Subsequent implementing development projects will be reviewed at the time of application for adverse impacts on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The project site has not been identified by the MSHCP as wildlife corridor or constrained linkage area. As a result, impacts are less than significant.

e-f) This environmental assessment is addressing a land use change only and no development project is being proposed at this time. Subsequent implementing development projects will be reviewed at the time of application for adverse impacts 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 Wildlife Service. Currently, no watercourses traverse the subject site. Any subsequent development project will be required comply with all applicable plans, policies and regulations set forth by Fish and Game. As a result, impacts are less than significant.

g) This environmental assessment is addressing a land use change only and no development project is being proposed at this time. Subsequent implementing development projects will be reviewed at the time of application for any conflicts with local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Currently, the project site does not contain any oak trees or other protected resources. As a result, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures 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: Project Application Materials, General Plan

Findings of Fact:

a-b) There are no known historic features located on the project site. Furthermore, the project site has been previously disturbed through mining operations for the past 40 years. The necessity for



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

additional historic resource studies will be determined at the time of an implementing project. As a result, there will be no impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring measures are required

9. Archaeological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** Project Application Materials, General Plan, County Archaeologist.

**Findings of Fact:**

a-e) Pursuant to SB 18 requirements, Riverside County staff previously requested a list from the Native American Heritage Commission ("NAHC") of Native American Tribes whose historical extent includes the project site. Consultation request notices were sent to each of the Tribes on the list on November 29, 2010. SB 18 provides for a 90-day review period in which all noticed Tribes may request consultation regarding the proposed project. County staff received no consultation requests for this project during the 90-day review period.

AB 52 became effective on July 1, 2015. In compliance with AB 52, separate notices regarding this project were mailed to all requesting Tribes on September 10, 2015. AB 52 provides for a 30-day review period in which all noticed Tribes may request consultation regarding the proposed project. County staff received notification from the Pechanga Tribe within the 30-day period, requesting to initiate consultation on this project. County staff discussed this project with the Pechanga Tribe on October 10, 2015, explaining that the project scope includes a legislative action only. There is no accompanying implementing project and it will result in no physical disturbance of the site. The Pechanga Tribe concluded that this project could move forward with no additional consultation, provided they are again noticed during the time of any future implementing project. In accordance with this request and in compliance with AB 52, County staff will notice the Pechanga tribe, as well as all other requesting Tribes, at the time a project is submitted.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent

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

Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

**10. Paleontological Resources**

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity," Riverside County Land Information System

Findings of Fact:

Pursuant to the Riverside County Land Information System, the project site is located in an area of high (High A) paleontological sensitivity. This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS** Would the project

<b>11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is neither in a fault zone nor is it within 1/2 mile of a fault. This amendment will result in a land use change only, no people or structures will be exposed to adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury or death. Subsequent implementing development applications would be subject to review by the County Geologist and shall be required to comply with applicable recommendations specified in geotechnical or other necessary studies. As a result, there will be no impacts.

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

b) The project site is not documented to contain a known active fault. However, future development projects will be reviewed in accordance with CEQA guidelines in order to ensure that the health, safety and welfare of the general public are protected. As a result, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**12. Liquefaction Potential Zone**

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction," Chief Engineering Geologist review.

Findings of Fact:

The project site is shown as having a low liquefaction potential. Geological and geotechnical investigations or other studies may be required during the review of implementing projects. Design and construction of the implementing projects shall incorporate any mitigation measures and conditions of approval from the County Geologist. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all commercial development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. As a result, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**13. 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 Figure S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Chief Engineering Geologist review.

Findings of Fact:

The project site is located within an area that has been identified by the County General Plan as having a "very high" ground shaking risk. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for potential ground shaking impacts and will also be required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development in order to mitigate any potential adverse impacts along with any other applicable Federal, State and local policies. As a result, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**14. Landslide Risk**

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope," Chief Engineering Geologist review.

Findings of Fact: The proposal is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposal, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazard. As a result, there will be no impacts

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No mitigation is required

**15. Ground Subsidence**

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas Map," Chief Engineering Geologist review.

Findings of Fact: The project site is located in an area susceptible to subsidence but it is not located near any documented areas of subsidence. Subsequent development applications will be required to comply with the California Building Code's (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development in order to mitigate any potential adverse impacts along with any other applicable Federal, State and local policies. As a result, there will be no impacts

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**16. Other Geologic Hazards**

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: There are no active volcanoes in Southern California. The site is not subject to any other geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow or volcanic hazards. As a result, there will be no impacts.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**17. Slopes**

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

Source: Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposal does not include any ground disturbing activities. Subsequent implementing development applications that propose grading and any other ground disturbing activity shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Geologist, Riverside County Planning Department and the Riverside County Building and Safety-Grading Division for compliance with applicable Federal, State and local policies and codes. As a result, there will be no impacts.

b) GPA No. 945 does not include any grading; therefore, no slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet are being proposed. Subsequent implementing development applications proposing grading and any other ground disturbing activity shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Geologist, Riverside County Planning Department and the Riverside County Building and Safety-Grading Division for compliance with applicable Federal, State and local policies and codes. As a result, there will be no impacts.

c) No grading is proposed as part of GPA No. 945 and therefore, will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems. Subsequent implementing development applications proposing grading and any other ground disturbing activity shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Geologist, Riverside County Planning Department and the Riverside County Building and Safety-Grading Division for compliance with applicable Federal, State and local policies and codes. As a result, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**18. 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposal will not directly result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Subsequent implementing development applications may have the potential to result in soil erosion during grading and construction; however, such applications will be subject to the development review process that will further ensure the protection of public health, safety and welfare. As a result, there will be no impacts.

b) If the project site is determined to be located on expansive soil, during the review of future implementing development projects, compliance with applicable Federal, State and local policies will be required including compliance with the California Building Code (CBC). As a result, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**19. Erosion**

a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposal will not change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed and required to comply with applicable Federal, State and local policies in order to ensure consistency and to mitigate any potential adverse impacts. As a result, there will be no impacts.

b) The proposed amendment will not directly result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for compliance any applicable Federal, State and local policies in order to mitigate any potential adverse impacts. As a result, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

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

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

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) As the proposed amendment is a land use and zoning change only, the proposal will not be directly impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand either on or off site. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for potential adverse wind erosion and blowsand impacts during the development review process. Future projects will be required to comply with any applicable Federal, State and local policies in order to ensure compliance and mitigate any potential adverse impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** Would the project

**21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

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

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

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

a-b) This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. At this stage, the project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the site, as there is no associated development project. This project will result in an amendment to the site's General Plan foundation component and change of Zone, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. Additionally, any future implementing project on this site will be required to comply with California's AB-32 greenhouse gas reduction requirements as well as Riverside County's Climate action Plan. Many of the identified potential mitigation measures resulting from GHG impacts are implemented during the construction phase of the project. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b, d-e) The project is not anticipated to utilize, store, or transport hazardous materials. The proposed activities are not anticipated to create significant hazards to the general public or the environment due to use of hazardous materials. The project will result in higher development intensity of the site than was proposed in the General Plan in 2003. The increase in density may result in an overburden of streets previously identified as evacuation routes for other projects. However, the Transportation Department will require any future development proposals on the site, to add mitigation to those projects to assure the streets will accommodate adequate emergency provisions.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, there will be no impacts.

c) The project will result in higher development intensity of the site than was proposed in the General Plan in 2003. The increase in density may result in an overburden of streets previously identified as evacuation routes for other projects. However, the Transportation Department will require any future development proposals on the site, to add mitigation to those projects to assure the streets will accommodate adequate emergency provisions. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.



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

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**23. Airports**

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**Findings of Fact:**

a-b) The project site is located within "Zone E" of the "French Valley Airport Plan." More specifically, the project site is located approximately 9,000 feet easterly of Runway 18-36 of the airport. Per ALUC, land use intensity is not limited within "Zone E." Subsequent implementing development applications may require review by the Airport Land Use Commission in order to ensure consistency with the plan and its policies and to ensure that future uses will not propose any prohibited or discouraged uses in "Zone E" that may present hazards to flight.

c) The proposal will not directly result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on the project site as the proposal does not include the development of any commercial or residential uses. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed and required to comply with mitigation and monitoring measures, if necessary, to prevent hazards for people residing or working in the subject area.

d) The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and does not directly result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the subject area. Development of the implementing projects will be reviewed in order to ensure that there will be no safety hazards for people residing or working in the subject area.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**24. Hazardous Fire Area**

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

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

Findings of Fact:

Although the project site is located in a high fire area, this project does not propose to add people or structures to the site in question, it is not anticipated that the proposal would 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. Subsequent development applications will be reviewed to ensure that the health, safety and public welfare of the general public is not at risk from fire.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is 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 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)?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposal will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off site as the proposal is for a land use change only. No implementing project has been submitted at this time. Subsequent implementing development projects shall be reviewed for potential drainage alterations. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.
- b) The proposal will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements as the proposal is for a land use change only. Subsequent implementing development applications will be subject to provide BMP improvement plans along with any necessary documentation to Riverside County Flood Control District. Subsequent development projects will also be required to comply with NPDES. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.
- c) The proposal will not directly substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Subsequent implementing development applications shall be reviewed for potential adverse groundwater impacts during the development review process. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.
- d) The proposal will not directly 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. Subsequent implementing development applications shall be reviewed for potential adverse storm water impacts during the development review process. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.
- e) The northwest corner of the project site is located within an area of flooding sensitivity, however the remainder of the site does not fall within this area and no housing is proposed. Because GPA No. 945 does not propose to add people or structures to the site in question, the proposal will not place

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

housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation maps. Subsequent implementing development applications shall be reviewed for potential adverse impacts associated with placing potential housing within a 100-year flood hazard area during the development review process. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

f) No structures are being proposed as part of GPA No. 945, therefore, no structures will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flows. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for the placement of structured in relation to flooding sensitivity.

g) The proposal would not otherwise degrade water quality. Subsequent implementing development application will be reviewed according to CEQA guidelines in order to identify any potential adverse impacts to water quality. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

h) The proposal does not include new or retrofitted stormwater BMP's which could result in significant environmental effects. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

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

b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The proposal will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off site as the proposal is for a land use change only. No implementing project has been submitted at this time. Subsequent implementing development projects shall be reviewed for potential drainage alterations. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

b) The proposal would not cause changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff. Subsequent implementing development projects shall be reviewed for potential changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

c) The northwest corner of the project site is not located within a flood plain, however the proposal will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area) as the proposal does not propose any structures or uses at this time. Subsequent development applications will be reviewed in order to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the general public. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

d) The proposal will not cause any change in the amount of surface water in any water body. Subsequent implementing development projects shall be reviewed for potential changes in the amount of surface water in any water body. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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?

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The General Plan Amendment falls into the Foundation Component Amendment category as it proposes to change 18.99 Gross Acres of land that is currently designated as Rural: Rural Residential (RUR:RR) to Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20 – 0.35 Floor Area Ratio) land use designation. The proposed site is located within the French Valley community, a community that has been characterized by and is committed to more urban uses through the adoption of a number of Specific Plans in the area. Along with the cities of Murrieta and Temecula, the Southwest Area Plan has focused its urban development in French Valley. As the amendment and change of zone is seeking a change to commercial designations, the proposal would be consistent with the planned land use vision for the area. The Community Development: Commercial Retail designation

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

can also be found directly west of the subject site. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant.

b) The project site is located within the designated City of Temecula, sphere of influence area. The City of Temecula was provided an opportunity to consult with the County, as they received information regarding the proposed General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone applications. The City's review resulted in no comments or concerns regarding the project. There will be no impacts.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site has a current zoning designation of Light Agriculture, 5 acre minimum (A-1-5) which is inconsistent with the proposed land use designation of Commercial Retail. As part of this application, the proposed zoning change from Light Agriculture, 5 acre minimum to General Commercial will bring the proposed General Plan designation and the proposed zoning designation into consistency. There will be no impacts.

b) Aside from the existing Light Agriculture zone to the east and south of the site, the amendment proposal is consistent with the more intense surrounding zoning designations with the Specific Plan (SP) zone to the north and General Commercial (C-1/CP) to the west. There will be no impacts

c) The project site is surrounded by single-family residences to the north and scattered single-family residences along with vacant land to the south, east and west of the site. The proposed amendment provides an opportunity for services that will support the existing residential to be developed in the area. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed in order to ensure land use compatibility prior to future project approval. There will be no impacts

d) The amendment is proposing a Land Use Designation of Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20-0.35 Floor Area Ratio). Existing Community Development Foundation designations can be found north of

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

the subject site, directly across Auld Road and directly west of the project site including Commercial Retail and Specific Plan. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for consistency with the proposed land use designation and any applicable policies of the Comprehensive General Plan. There will be no impacts

e) The proposal will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The proposed project is four contiguous parcels transitioning into commercially zoned land which is consistent with land use to the east. No established community would be disrupted as a result of GPA No. 945. There will be no impacts

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**29. Mineral Resources**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area," Chief Engineering Geologist review.

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The project site is located in an area where available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. Upon the County Geologist's review, it was determined that the site is classified as MRZ-3 for mineral resources (not a significant resource). There will be no impacts

b) The project site is not located within a locally important mineral resource recovery site designated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. There will be no impacts

c) The project site is not located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine and therefore will not be incompatible. There will be no impacts

d) There are no proposed or known abandoned quarries or mines on the project site. Implementation of this proposed amendment will not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines. There will be no impacts

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

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is 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?

NA  A  B  C  D

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

NA  A  B  C  D

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map, Airport Land Use Commission Staff Review

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The project site lies outside of the area that would be subject to average exterior noise levels of 55 CNEL or greater under ultimate airport development conditions. The proposal would not expose people residing or working in the subject sites area to excessive noise levels. There will be no impacts

b) The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. There will be no impacts

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**31. Railroad Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, Staff Review

**Findings of Fact:** The project site is not located adjacent to or near an active railroad line; therefore, no impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required



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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**32. Highway Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or within the vicinity of a highway, therefore, no impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**33. Other Noise**

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County Community Health Agency Review, Staff Review

Findings of Fact: As the proposal is for a land use and zoning change only, no other noise impacts are expected in or immediately surrounding the subject site. Per the Riverside County Community Health Agency's review, the proposal shall comply with the following: Facility-related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home," must not exceed the following worst-case noise levels 45 Db(a)- 10 minute noise equivalent ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. (nighttime standard) and 65 dB(A)- 10 minute leq, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. (daytime standard). Subsequent implementing development applications will be required to comply with the Riverside County office of Industrial Hygiene's possible noise reduction measures as well as Riverside County Ordinance No. 847, *Regulating Noise in Riverside County*. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**34. Noise Effects on or by the Project**

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, Staff Review

**Findings of Fact:**

a) GPA No. 945 will not directly result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels as no implementing project is associated with this amendment and exact noise levels cannot be determined at this time. Subsequent implementing development applications will be required to comply with the Riverside County office of Industrial Hygiene's possible noise reduction measures as well as Riverside County Ordinance No. 847, *Regulating Noise in Riverside County*. There will be no impacts.

b) GPA No. 945 will not directly result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposal as no implementing project is associated with this amendment and temporary or periodic increases in noise levels cannot be determined at this time. Subsequent development applications will be required to comply with the Riverside County Office of Industrial Hygiene's possible noise reduction measures as well as Riverside County Ordinance No. 847, *Regulating Noise in Riverside County*. There will be no impacts.

c) GPA No. 945 is proposing a General Plan land use change as well as a zoning change and will not directly expose persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, zoning ordinance or Ordinance No. 847 or applicable standards of other agencies. Subsequent implementing development applications will be required to comply with the Riverside County office of Industrial Hygiene's possible noise reduction measures as well as Riverside County Ordinance No. 847, *Regulating Noise in Riverside County*. There will be no impacts.

d) The proposal will not expose persons to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. There will be no impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

- a) The project site is currently vacant land. No dwelling units will be displaced. There will be no impacts.
- b) The proposal will not impact population and housing in Riverside County. There will be no impacts.
- c) The proposal will not displace substantial numbers of people thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There will be no impacts.
- d-f) The proposal will not affect a Riverside County Redevelopment Area, cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections, or induce substantial population growth in an area directly or indirectly. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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**

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact: The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Fire Department. Any impacts associated with the provision of new or altered fire facilities will be mitigated by the payment of standard fees to the County of Riverside. Approval of GPA No. 945 will not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of implementing projects and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. Implementing projects will be conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**37. Sheriff Services**

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: The proposed area is serviced by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The proposal will not have an incremental effect on the level of sheriff services provided in the vicinity of the project area. Approval of GPA No. 945 will not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of future GPA No. 945 implementing projects and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. Future implementing projects will be conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**38. Schools**

Source: GIS database, Staff Review

Findings of Fact: The project sites located within the boundaries of the Temecula Unified School District. Approval of GPA No. 945 will not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of future GPA No. 945 implementing projects and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. Future implementing projects will be conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects to school services. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**39. Libraries**

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: Library services for the existing residence on the project site are provided by the Riverside County Public Library System for which development mitigation fees are required pursuant to Ordinance No. 659 such fees may be used at the County's discretion to provide additional library facilities. Approval of GPA No. 945 will not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of future GPA No. 945 implementing projects and surrounding projects would have to meet all

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

applicable environmental standards. Future implementing projects will be conditioned to comply with County Ordinance No. 659 in order to mitigate the potential effects to library services. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**40. Health Services**

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Staff Review

Findings of Fact: Approval of GPA No. 945 will not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Subsequent implementing development applications have the potential to introduce people, property and structures into previously undeveloped areas; thereby, increasing the use of existing medical and health care services and facilities as well as contribute incrementally to demand for new or expanded services and facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative impacts of implementing projects and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. As a result, impacts associated with this project are considered less than significant

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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

Findings of Fact:

a) Approval of GPA No. 945 will not result in impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for impacts on park and recreational facilities. There will be no impacts.

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

b) The proposed land use and zoning change does not 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. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for impacts on park and recreational facilities. There will be no impacts.

c) The project site is not located within a CSA and is not subject to Quimby fees. Prior to project approval, subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for any changes related to the subject site's status of being within a CSA or being subject to Quimby fees prior to future project approval. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**42. Recreational Trails**

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

Source: Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments, Staff Review

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or within the vicinity of any designated General Plan Recreational Trails. Therefore, the proposal will not have any impacts. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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?

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

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

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

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

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

d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

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

e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?</b>				
f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Transportation Department Review

**Findings of Fact:**

a) The project site is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area of the Riverside County General Plan. The Highway 79 Policy states "...ensure that overall within the Highway 79 Policy Area, development projects produce traffic generation at a level that is 9% less than the trips projected from the General Plan traffic model residential land use designations." However, this Policy is applicable to residential land use only, not commercial. As a result, this policy does not apply to this project. Furthermore, details of a future implementing project will be reviewed in conjunction with all applicable circulation plans. This General Plan Land Use Amendment and Change of Zone by themselves are consistent with the existing circulation plans for the area. As a result, the impacts are less than significant.

This Policy intends to limit the existing build-out of the current Land Use Designation, due to potential infrastructure limitations. The proposed increase to the project site's density is in conflict with the Policy. Mitigation, which shall be adhered to during time of any implementing project, is proposed below. This mitigation will assure that the goals of the Policy are met at the implementation stage of development. The project is consistent with all other plans. With the proposed mitigation, the impacts are less than significant.

b) The future implementing project will address any congestion management programs through standard fees and mitigation. As previously discussed, this is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. At this stage, the project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the site, as there is no associated development project. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. The impacts are less than significant.

c-d) No air traffic or water traffic will be altered due to the proposed project. There will be no impacts.

e-i) There is no accompanying development associated with this proposed General Plan Amendment, therefore there are no design changes to the streets or roads that may increase hazards due to road design. The proposed change does not conflict with any adopted policies regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian access, as the project site is currently vacant land. The surrounding circulation system will not change and therefore, will not impact any policies regarding transit or other alternative means of travel. Once a development proposal or land use application to subdivide, grade,

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

or build on the property is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. As a result, the impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**44. Bike Trails**

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

GPA No. 945 proposes is for a land use and zoning change only, therefore, no direct impacts to bike trails would occur as a result of this amendment. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed and required to comply with any applicable bike trail standards set forth by the County. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** Would the project

**45. Water**

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

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

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

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) GPA No. 945 proposes a land use and zoning change only, therefore, the proposal does not directly require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or the expansion of existing facilities. The project site falls within the jurisdiction of Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), as such, subsequent development applications would be required to determine that the site has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health will require any future projects to provide a "will serve" letter from EMWD for the site as well as any other necessary information to ensure compliance with applicable County ordinances. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required



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

Monitoring: No monitoring is 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, Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) GPA No. 945 proposes a land use and zoning change only, therefore, the proposal does not directly require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. The project site falls within the jurisdiction of EMWD, as such, subsequent implementing development applications will be required to determine that the site has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health will require any future projects to provide a will serve letter from EMWD for the site as well as any other necessary information to ensure compliance with applicable County ordinances. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No mitigation is 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, Staff Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The amendment proposes a land use and zoning change only. Subsequent implementing development applications will be required to provide proof that the site will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and that the

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

project will be in compliance with the applicable Federal, State and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste. There will be no impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan, Staff Review

**Findings of Fact:**

a-h) GPA No. 945 proposes a land use and zoning change only, therefore, the proposal does not directly impact any facility used for the transmission of the specified utilities, nor, will the proposal require the construction of new or the expansion of existing facilities which could cause significant environmental effects. Subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed in order to determine potential impacts on such facilities and for compliance with current plans relating to utility facilities.

This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. This project will result in amending the site's General Plan Foundation Component, Land Use Designation, and Zoning Classification, which could eventually lead to development on the property. Should a development proposal or land use application for subdividing, grading, or construction of the site be submitted, a subsequent Environmental Analysis shall be prepared, to assess the potential impacts. There will be no impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**49. Energy Conservation**

a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan

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

**Findings of Fact:** GPA No. 945 proposes a land use and zoning change only, therefore, the proposal does not directly impact or conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans. Prior to approval, subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for consistency with adopted energy conservation plans. There will be no impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

**Source:** Staff review, Project Application Materials

**Findings of Fact:** As GPA No. 945 proposes a land use change only and does not propose grading or construction, the 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. Prior to approval, subsequent implementing development applications will be reviewed for potential impacts on the environment. There will be no impacts.

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

**Source:** Staff review, Project Application Materials

**Findings of Fact:** No impacts have been identified for GPA No. 945 that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Prior to approval, future implementing development applications as a result of GPA No. 945 will be reviewed for any potential cumulative impacts. There will be no impacts.

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

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

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: GPA No. 945 proposes a land use and zoning change only, therefore, the proposal would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. No improvements to the site are associated with GPA No. 945. Future implementing development applications as a result of GPA No. 945 will be reviewed as necessary to determine potential environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There will be no impacts.

**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: N/A

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

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

**VII. AUTHORITIES CITED**

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

Revised: 10/14/2015 3:43 PM  
EA 2010.docx



# AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION RIVERSIDE COUNTY

**CHAIR**

Simon Housman  
Rancho Mirage

**VICE CHAIRMAN**  
Rod Ballance  
Riverside

**COMMISSIONERS**

Arthur Butler  
Riverside

John Lyon  
Riverside

Glen Holmes  
Hemet

Greg Pettis  
Cathedral City

Richard Stewart  
Moreno Valley

**STAFF**

Director  
Ed Cooper

Russell Brady  
John Guerin  
Barbara Santos

County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon St., 14<sup>th</sup> Floor.  
Riverside, CA 92501  
(951) 955-5132

[www.rcaluc.org](http://www.rcaluc.org)

March 12, 2012

Tamara Harrison, Urban Regional Planner IV  
Riverside County Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street, Twelfth Floor  
Riverside CA 92501  
HAND DELIVERY

**RE: AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION (ALUC) DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**  
File No.: ZAP1045FV12  
Related File No.: GPA00945 (General Plan Amendment) and CZ07743 (Change of Zone)  
APN: 964-050-006 through 964-050-009

Dear Ms. Harrison:

On March 8, 2012, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) found the above-referenced general plan amendment and change of zone **CONSISTENT** with the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FVALUCP), as amended in 2011.

The general plan amendment is described as follows: A proposal to amend the Southwest Area Plan's land use designation on 18.99 acres located southerly of Auld Road, easterly of Dickson Path, and westerly of Maddalena Road (within the unincorporated community of French Valley) from Rural Residential within the Rural Foundation Component (R:RR) to Commercial Retail within the Community Development Foundation Component (CD:CR).

The change of zone is described as follows: A proposal to change the zoning of the site described above from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, 5 acre minimum lot size) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial).

The finding of consistency relates to airport compatibility issues and does not necessarily constitute an endorsement of a proposed project. In this situation, both the existing designation and zoning and the proposed designation and zoning are consistent with the FVALUCP.

A copy of the "Notice of Airport in Vicinity" is enclosed, for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact Russell Brady, Airport Land Use Commission Contract Planner, at (951) 955-0549, or John Guerin, Airport Land Use Commission Principal Planner, at (951) 955-0982.

Sincerely,  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

  
Edward C. Cooper, Director

JJGJG:bks

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

**STAFF REPORT**

**AGENDA ITEM:** 3.1

**HEARING DATE:** March 8, 2012

**CASE NUMBER:** ZAP1045FV12 – Congregation Havurim, Hoskings Murrieta, Inc., LOLA I, Londen Land Co. LLC, and Janet Smith  
(Representative: Leonard Bustin)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GPA 945 (General Plan Amendment), CZ 7743 (Change of Zone)

**MAJOR ISSUES:** None

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of CONSISTENCY for the general plan amendment and change of zone.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** GPA 945 is a proposal to amend the Southwest Area Plan's land use designation on 18.99 acres from R:R (Rural Residential within the Rural Foundation Component) to CD:CR (Commercial Retail within the Community Development Foundation Component). CZ 7743 is a proposal to change the zoning of the site from A-1-5 (Light Agriculture – 5 acre minimum) to C-1/C-P (General Commercial).

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is located southerly of Auld Road, easterly of Dickson Path, and westerly of Maddalena Road in the unincorporated community of French Valley (easterly of the City of Murrieta and northerly of the City of Temecula), approximately 9,000 feet easterly of Runway 18-36 at French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:** 2011 French Valley Airport Land Use Plan

- a. Airport Influence Area: French Valley Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Zone E
- c. Noise Levels: Below 55 CNEL

**BACKGROUND:**

Non-Residential Land Use Intensity: The site is located in Zone E of the French Valley Airport

Influence Area. Land use intensity is not limited within Zone E.

Prohibited and Discouraged Uses: No specific development is proposed at this time. The applicant does not propose any uses prohibited or discouraged in Zone E (hazards to flight) within the project. The typical uses allowed and permitted within the General Commercial zone would generally not present any hazards to flight.

Noise: The property lies outside the area that would be subject to average exterior noise levels of 55 CNEL or greater under ultimate airport development conditions. Therefore, no special mitigation of noise from aircraft is required.

Part 77: The elevation of the site ranges from 1,372 to 1,384 feet above mean sea level (1372-1384 feet AMSL) according to the Riverside County GIS. The elevation of Runway 18-36 at its northerly terminus is approximately 1347 feet AMSL. At a distance of approximately 9,000 feet from the runway, FAA review would be required for any structures with top of roof exceeding 1437 feet AMSL. The project does not propose any specific development at this time; however, the proposed C-1/C-P zone allows structures up to 50 feet in height. At this maximum height, a structure would only approach 1434 feet AMSL. Therefore, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) obstruction evaluation review would likely not be required depending on the actual grading and structure height proposed.

Open Area: Zone E of the French Valley Airport Land Use Plan does not have any requirements for provision of open space.

Attachment/Disclosure: State law requires notification in the course of real estate transactions if the property is located in an Airport Influence Area.

General plan amendments and changes of zone are not subject to conditions.


# NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influent area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you. Business & Professions Code Section 11010 (b) (13)(A)



# GPA00945 - AIA Map


Within: French Valley



**Legend**

- Airports
- AIA
- City Boundaries
- Cities
- adjacent\_highways
- Interstate
- Interstate 3
- State Highways: 60
- State Highways 3
- US HWY
- OUT
- highways\_large
- HWY
- INTERCHANGE
- INTERSTATE
- USHWY
- counties
- cities

**Notes**  
 APNs: 964-050-006, 964-050-007, 964-050-008, and 964-050-009




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



REPORT PRINTED ON...6/8/2015 3:06:43 PM

© Riverside County TLMA GIS





# City of Temecula

## Community Development

41000 Main Street • Temecula, CA 92590

Phone (951) 694-6400 • Fax (951) 694-6477 • [www.cityoftemecula.org](http://www.cityoftemecula.org)

May 19, 2014

Larry Ross, Principal Planner  
Riverside County Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

RECEIVED  
MAY 22 2014

ADMINISTRATION  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**SUBJECT: Response General Plan Amendment No. 945D1 and Change of Zone No. 7822**

Dear Mr. Ross:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Change of Zone. The proposed project is located within the City's Sphere of Influence, as such; the City of Temecula Community Development Department reviews proposed projects that are within the City's sphere of influence to determine if there are potential impacts or concerns the City may have with the proposed projects.

The Initial Case Transmittal Notice indicates the proposed GPA would amend the General Foundation Component amendment from Rural to Community Development, and would amend the land use from Rural Residential (5 acre minimum) to Commercial Retail. The Change of Zone proposed would amend the zoning from Light Agriculture to General Commercial.

The City of Temecula is requesting an Initial Study be prepared to determine potential impacts of the project. As part of the Initial Study, please include the following as part of the traffic impact analysis (TIA):

The proposed project's TIA should evaluate "collector" or higher classification street intersections within a 5 mile radius that may experience 50 or more peak hour trips from the proposed project, as defined in Section 6.0 of the County's guidelines. At a minimum, the following intersections in the City of Temecula should be included in the TIA:

- Winchester Road at Nicolas Road
- Winchester Road at Margarita Road
- Winchester Road at Ynez Road
- Winchester Road at I-15 Ramps
- Murrieta Hot Springs Road at Pourroy Road
- Murrieta Hot Springs Road at Butterfield Stage Road
- Butterfield Stage Road at Calle Chapos
- Butterfield Stage Road at La Serena Way
- Butterfield Stage Road at Rancho California Road
- Nicolas Road at Joseph Road

The Butterfield Stage Road extension between Calle Chapos and La Serena Way will be completed within the month. Therefore, any intersection analysis performed on Butterfield Stage Road should also be included in all scenarios; Existing Plus Project to Buildout."


If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (951) 506-5173 or e-mail me at Armando.villa@cityoftemecula.org.

Sincerely,



Armando G. Villa, AICP  
Director of Community Development

cc: Greg Butler, Assistant City Manager  
Tom Garcia, Director of Public Works  
Dale West, Associate Planner



# City of Temecula

## Community Development

41000 Main Street • Temecula, CA 92590

Phone (951) 694-6400 • Fax (951) 694-6477 • [www.cityoftemecula.org](http://www.cityoftemecula.org)

July 8, 2014

Larry Ross, Principal Planner  
Riverside County Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**SUBJECT: Comments Regarding Notice of Public Hearing and Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 945D1 and Change of Zone No. 7822**

Dear Mr. Ross:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced Notice of Public Hearing and Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 945D1 and Change of Zone (CZ) No. 7822. The proposed project is located within the City's Sphere of Influence, as such; the City of Temecula Community Development Department reviews proposed projects that are within the City's sphere of influence to determine if there are potential impacts or concerns the City may have with the proposed projects.


The City submitted a comment letter, dated May 19, 2014, requesting an initial study be prepared to determine the potential impacts. Additionally, we requested that the traffic impact analysis analyze "collector" or higher classification street intersections within a five-mile radius that may experience 50 or more peak hour trips from the proposed project.

The proposed project will result in the land use conversion from the Rural Foundation Component to the Community Development Foundation Component, and a change in Zoning from Light Agriculture to General Commercial. This conversion is a significant change in land use intensity and should not be allowed without an appropriate level of environmental analysis.

The City of Temecula is requesting the Riverside County Planning Commission direct staff to adequately analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the project.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (951) 506-5173 or e-mail me at [armando.villa@cityoftemecula.org](mailto:armando.villa@cityoftemecula.org).

Sincerely,



Armando G. Villa, AICP  
Director of Community Development

cc: Juan Perez, Director, Riverside County Transportation, 4080 Lemon Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor,  
Riverside, CA 92501

Greg Butler, Assistant City Manager  
Tom Garcia, Director of Public Works  
Dale West, Associate Planner

**APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
GENERAL PLAN**

**JUSTIFICATION FOR AMENDMENT**




Reference APNs 964-050-006,007,008 & 009


Our application is to change the general plan designation of four parcels from Rural foundation to Community Development. Upon acceptance of this application, we shall also apply for a concurrent change of zone to Commercial Retail.

Our plan cures problems created by the proposed route of Butterfield Stage Road and incorporates sensible and necessary land use updates in the process. The alignment of Butterfield Stage Road at the intersections of Auld Road, Dickson Path and Pourroy Road will divide a contiguous twenty acre Commercial Retail site into three smaller disconnected parcels. Butterfield Stage Road is further planned to curve around our parcels and our access will become sub-standard. We have solved these problems with this petition. Our application proposes a safe access and re-establishes a site large enough for a shopping center of approximately nineteen acres at this location. Subject to site plan approval the applicants shall record a private reciprocal easement agreement. Due to the co-joined nature of our petition filed by this small congregation of approximately fifty families, largely in response to condemnations and losses for the Butterfield Stage Road right of way, we request that County remove the burden of cost for this application and the continuance of our zoning request.

Dickson Path between APN 964-050-001 (existing Commercial Retail) and applicant APN 964-050-006 will no longer be needed upon the construction of Butterfield Stage Road. Recommend vacation at that time.

We are located far enough away from the commercial retail sites on Highway 79 to service the surrounding subdivisions and our ideal location will encourage local and cross-town traffic to remain on the Butterfield Stage Road bypass.

initial 1   
initial 2   
initial 3 x 



# RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

*Steven Weiss, AICP  
Planning Director*

November 4, 2015

## MEMO

**RE: AGENDA ITEM 4.3 – GPA00945 & CZ07743 – STAFF RESPONSES TO NEW LETTERS**

**To: Planning Commission**

After preparation of the staff report package and prior to the Planning Commission hearing, County staff received the attached letters regarding GPA00945. Below is a listing, citing each letter and a brief accompanying staff response.

**1. Davis – Wojcik – Duarte Law Corporation**

- Representing the interests of property owners in the area. Generally opposed to the land use change. States, the middle property as remaining residential in middle of commercial land uses, approved under GPA00945D1 and proposed under GPA00945. States the GPA00975 was successfully denied, due to incompatibility and community concerns.

**2. Petition to Dismiss GPA00945**

- Multiple signatures of people not in favor of the project.

**3. Corey Sullivan**

- Resident concerned about the land use change to commercial. States potential issues related to traffic, pollution, noise, and accidents. Is against the change, would like the area to stay residential/rural.

**4. Noah Rau & Brianne Yhlen**

- Property owners of the parcel in the middle of GPA00945D1 and GPA00945. Is opposed to the land use change. Disagrees with the new circumstance that the Auld Road reconfiguration will change the area.

**5. Kyle & Lauren Mikowski**

- Homeowners along Pourroy Road. Prefers the area stays rural residential and not change to commercial land use.

**6. Jeanne Marie Bender**

- Homeowner in the area, north of project site. They are concerned about increased traffic, trash, and privacy. Is against the proposed land use change.

**7. Joe Swall**

- Prefers the land use stays residential. Has concerns as to what type of commercial use will be established at the site. There are no current plans for any specific use as this is a General Plan Amendment and change of Zone only.

**8. Johnson & Sedlack Attorney at Law**

- Submitted a 20-page document opposing the project and contesting the environmental, representing Noah Rau & Brianne Yhlen (Property Owners to the west), as well as another property owner to the south

**9. Endangered Habitats League ("EHL")**

- Recommends the Planning Commission deny the project. States the land use change "leapfrogs" over vacant parcels.

**10. Valley Wide Recreation & Park District**

- Provides conditions that will be imposed upon any future development. Pertains to park fee assessment and ongoing maintenance districts.

**11. Johnson & Sedlack Attorney at Law**

- Letter requesting to be noticed of all future project hearings.

**12. Johnson & Sedlack Attorney at Law**

- Submitted a 22-page document opposing the project and contesting the environmental, representing "Concerned Area Residents" and Tualota Estates.



# DWD

DAVIS • WOJCIK • DUARTE

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

November 2, 2015

Ms. Ruthanne Taylor-Berger  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Re: Proposed General Plan Amendment No. 945

Dear Commissioner Taylor-Berger:

As you may know, this office previously represented the interests of concerned residents with respect to proposed General Plan Amendment No. 975 in the area neighboring Auld and Pourroy Roads. After several continuances, a community meeting conducted by the applicant, a lengthy hearing in which several residents spoke out against the amendment, and an extensive discussion among the sitting Planning Commissioners, the Commission unanimously voted to *deny* staff's recommendation and not approve the application.

While we were pleased with the Commission's finding, my clients have again become aware of another application, Proposed General Plan Amendment No. 945 and Change of Zone No. 7743 that similarly affects their joint interests and have retained my office to represent them in formally opposing the application. Quite simply, the rationale and logic which led the Commission to deny the prior application requires you and your colleagues to reach the same result in this matter. One only look to the comments of your colleagues, made after a lengthy public hearing with numerous speakers in opposition to the project, for justification to also deny this new application.

Commissioner Valdivia--

*"I am concerned that there are parcels now that are being removed and I am concerned about the land assemblage that I see that would be conducive for some future development. Seems to be very inconsistent and, as a result, I don't think I'll be supporting staff's recommendation."*

Commissioner Leach--

*"I do love transition pieces, as you know, I always push for the happy neighbors on both sides..."*

*I don't think with the assemblage of parcels that are there that it's going to be doable, especially losing that one piece over there. And having an entrance, regardless of how Butterfield Stage comes in and how that's going to go, knowing this is very far in the future because we don't know what Butterfield Stage is doing."*

1001 E. Morton Place, Ste. A  
Hemet, CA 92543  
Phone: (951) 652-9000  
Fax: (951) 658-8308

Please respond to:

lawdwd.com

28544 Old Town Front St., Ste. 201  
Temecula, CA 92590  
Phone: (951) 587-2222  
Fax: (951) 658-8308

Commissioner Ruthanne Taylor-Berger  
November 2, 2015  
Page 2

Commissioner Sanchez--

*"I would have much rather have seen, a more larger set of parcels coming together as one and then maybe using the transition that Commissioner Leach just explained coupled with the creek that's there and that would have been a little bit more appealing to me, but right now I'm having trouble supporting this as well."*

Commissioner Hake

*"I have struggled mightily with this from the get go....**What we're struggling with is that there is no project here, we are being asked to make a policy decision here....**I'm struggling with it, I don't think I can move forward with it today.*

Commissioner Leach--

*"Even with buffers and that kind of thing, it still, to me, needs to be a transition. I'd like to see a project to recommend to the Board that they approve this. It hurts my heart a little bit because I don't have a whole picture to make that recommendation."*

As before, GPA No. 945 also consists of an application that (1) is without a project, (2) has lost a key parcel, (3) improperly relies upon the future development of a Butterfield Stage Road alteration, and (4) forms a land assemblage without transition that is wholly inconsistent with neighboring uses.

Rest assured your constituents living in the area remain steadfastly committed to opposing these fundamental threats to their quality and standard of living.

### **BACKGROUND**

At the outset, it is my understanding that GPA 945 was originally submitted in February of 2008 contemplating a change of a total of 4 parcels, totaling 20 acres, from Rural: Rural Residential to Community Development: Commercial Retail. Sometime thereafter, some of the applicants requested to be separated from the original application of GPA No. 945 and these applicants became GPA 945D1. The applicants further requested a concurrent change in zoning as part of the new application. With these revisions, No. 945D1 was submitted to the Planning Commission, and on July 16, 2014 the Planning Commission approved the General Plan Amendment and change of zoning.

Commissioner Ruthanne Taylor-Berger  
November 2, 2015  
Page 3

However, each and every one of the notices regarding this GPA was generated using an outdated tax roll. The use of outdated information resulted in a failure to notify several neighboring landowners, including my client, Mr. Noah Rau, of the proposed amendment and change in zoning. Please be advised that Mr. Rau *reserves all rights and does not, by way of this correspondence, intend to waive any claims against the County or any such responsible parties.*

The original GPA 945 application has since been further revised to now include only two parcels totaling approximately 9.5 acres. The most recent parcel to withdraw is that of Mr. Rau, who now finds himself literally in the middle of this mess as the record owner of APN 964-050-007. Mr. Rau intends to utilize his property as a single family residence with the remaining acreage devoted to the historical use for horses and, like many of his neighbors, vehemently opposes this amendment.

A Notice of Public Hearing and Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration in regards to this issue was received, and we are advised that the hearing will be held on November 4, 2015. We are also aware that the Planning Commission has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment; however, the County fails to recognize and consider the effects on residents of this area, like Mr. Rau. The previous zoning change was made to the west of Mr. Rau's property without his knowledge and or consent, and to further add to his frustration, this GPA attempts to add further commercial zoning changes.

#### **PROBLEMS WITH GPA NO. 945**

I have reviewed Staff's recommendation on this issue and it my understanding that the Planning Department is supporting the proposed Amendment and Change of Zone. As before, I believe the Commission should disregard the recommendation and maintain a consistent plan for this region by maintaining the status quo.

Again, the basis for denial of GPA No. 945 is identical to the basis for denial of GPA No. 975. Specifically, the premature reliance upon the proposed Butterfield Stage Road, the inconsistency in land use caused by the proposed assemblage of properties, as well as the lack of traditional transitional elements, are just some of the reasons why, as before, the Commission should deny this application. If the Commission were to ignore the evidence which previously lead them to conclude that a fundamental change to the land designation was inappropriate, I fear such an inconsistent determination would set an unhealthy precedent for the general public resulting from the uneven application of similar facts.

Review of the staff report indicates that the recommendation was based largely upon the proposed Butterfield Stage Road and the anticipated effect this will have on the region. However, this proposed road is no closer to completion than it was three years ago, let alone three months ago.

Commissioner Ruthanne Taylor-Berger

November 2, 2015

Page 4

Reliance upon its completion when the proposed road (which dates back to 2006 and certainly does not constitute a changed circumstance) necessarily requires *eminent domain* of neighboring parcels (including the aforementioned Mr. Rau) is premature and misguided. Notwithstanding what the maps and proposed realignments suggested several years ago in Tentative Parcel Map 32379, there exists several practical problems (including the current lack of funds to complete the project) in addition to the inevitable legal challenges to any such proposal. Making planning decisions in reliance upon this proposed road is putting the proverbial cart in front of the horse and represents--in my opinion--an irresponsible and reckless course of action.

Furthermore, the parcels of GPA No. 945 and 945D1 – while linear – are not contiguous. If adopted as proposed, a single family residence with show horses would find itself in the midst of several separate commercial developments. This is simply not good planning and further highlights the fact that this application is inappropriate given the assemblage of properties. More importantly, the homes and lifestyles of those residents who intend to continue to live on the properties that they have invested millions of dollars in, are being put at risk for the benefit of a select few who have no intention of residing in the region.

As evidence of the citizens' concerns, I would refer you to the enclosed petition, which I was asked to forward to you on their behalf. As you can see, the residents were able to gather nearly 70 signatures in the short few weeks since the Notice of Hearing was mailed to owners in the area. This is indicative of the strong disagreement with the proposal as it stands. But for the indisputable inadequacies in noticing GPA No. 945D1, I believe the Commission would have seen the same vocal opposition to that project as well. Regardless, rest assured, given enough time, this determined group could and would gather significantly more opposition to this proposal and has demonstrated a willingness to put its money where its mouth is.

Additionally, it is my understanding that, if you haven't already, you will be hearing from several of the residents directly, voicing their specific arguments in opposition to GPA No. 945. These individuals, whose lifestyles and investments are at stake, have eloquently articulated their complaints, concerns, and justifications for opposing the application in a way that demonstrates why they are passionate about maintaining the status quo.

#### CONCLUSION

I realize that you were not a part of the original proceedings on the GPA 975 issue. Nevertheless, I urge you to recognize--as your colleagues did--that this type of alteration to the General Plan is not consistent with the current use in the area and would not only cause a drastic change in the area, but also lead to a hodgepodge array of projects with no internal consistency. Furthermore, reliance upon so-called "new circumstances" including the speculative 2006 map for Butterfield Stage Road is no justification for fundamentally altering this community.

Commissioner Ruthanne Taylor-Berger  
November 2, 2015  
Page 5

I appreciate your attention to this important issue and look forward to addressing it with you and the other Commissioners at the hearing. If you would like to discuss this matter further, I invite you or your staff to contact me to discuss my clients' positions. I look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,  
DAVIS | WOJCIK | DUARTE

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Matthew Duarte".

Matthew Duarte, Esq.

enclosures

cc: Olivia Balderrama, Supervisor's Office (via email: obalderrama@rcbos.org)  
John Earle Hildebrand, Planning Dept. (via email: jhildebr@redlma.org)  
Clients

## Petition to Dismiss the Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA 945

Petition summary and background	We the residents, located in the area surrounding the proposed change of zoning described as the region west of Maddalena Road and south of Auld Road, as evidence by our signatures below hereby REJECT the General Plan Amendment No. 945 Intent to adopt a negative declaration made by the applicant Ashlee Lewis.
Action petitioned for	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to dismiss this proposed zoning change.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
Jill Smith		32341 Perigord Rd Winchester	10-25-15
Barry Jones		32348 Perigord Rd Winchester	10-25-15
Johnny Terrence		32355 PERIGORD RD WINCHESTER	10-25-15
Paul Crossland		32343 PERIGORD RD, WINCHESTER	10-25-15
DENNIS STEPHAN		32397 Perigord Rd Winchester	10-25-15
LARRY HOLT		32404 Perigord Rd Winchester	10-25-15
Connie Dent		32432 Perigord Rd Winchester	10-25-15
Mike Robbins		32467 Perigord Rd Winchester	10/25/15
David Jenkins		32232 Saint Martin St. Winchester	10-25-15
FRANK AWSON		32315 Saint Martin St.	10-25-15
Zane Laughlin		32304 Saint Martin St.	10-25-15
Stephanie Broad		32369 Perigord Rd	10-25-15



Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
Benjamin Smith		32041 Perigord Rd Winchester	10-26-15
Roy Huxier		36874 MONTREAU RD Winchester	10-26-15
JAMES OTT		36862 MONTREAUX - WINCHESTER	10-26-15
Cortney Ellingworth		36875 Montreaux Rd. Winchester	10-26-15
Eric Ellingworth		36875 Montreaux Rd. Winchester	10-26-15
Noelle Clark		36803 Montreaux Rd. Winchester	10-27-15
PATRICK JONES		36755 MONTREAUX RD WINCHESTER	10-27-15
Jane Richardson		30000 Pender Rd Winchester, Ca.	10-27-15
Michael Hinger		32326 Picasso Ct. Winchester, CA 92596	10-27-15
Suzanne Cruz		3225 Perigord Rd. Winchester, CA 92596	10-31-15
Eliseo Delgado		52271 Perigord Rd Winchester, CA 92556	10-31-15
Tanya Gordon		32152 PERBORD RD WINCHESTER CA 92596	10-31-15
KARLA PEREZ		32187 PERIGORD RD WINCHESTER CA 92596	10-31-15
Leah Dye		32159 Perigord Rd. Winchester 92596	10-31-2015

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
Mario Flores	Mario Flores	32425 PERIGORD RD. WINCHESTER CA 92586	10-25-2015
Heather Goodwin	Heather Goodwin	32453 Perigord Rd 92596	(951) 926-4717
Butch Parreno	Butch Parreno	32453 Perigord Rd 92596	951 926 4717
Lauren Preece	Lauren Preece	32440 Perigord Rd. 92596	10/25/2015
MARCELO WAKELING	Marcos Wakelings	32418 Perigord Rd 92596	10/25/2015
Michele Rushton	Michele Rushton	32390 Perigord Rd.	10-25-15
Miguel Concha	Miguel Concha	32371 Perigord Rd	10-25-15
Jim Jim	Jim Jim	32327 Perigord Rd	10-25-15
Jim Jim	Jim Jim	32327 Perigord Rd	10-25-15
Maria Gray	Maria Gray	32495 perigord Rd	10-26-15
Edward Collins	Edward Collins	32481 Perigord Rd	10/26/2015
Gail Collins	Gail Collins	32481 Perigord Rd.	10/26/2015
Sylvia Swan	Sylvia Swan	32498 perigord Rd	10/26/2015
Joe Swan	Joe Swan	32498 perigord Rd	10/26/2015
Margaret Concha	Margaret Concha	32376 Perigord Rd.	10-26-2015
Anthony Concha	Anthony Concha	32376 Perigord Rd.	10-26-2015

### Petition to Dismiss the Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA 945

<b>Petition summary and background</b>	We the residents, located in the area surrounding the proposed change of zoning described as the region west of Maddalena Road and south of Auld Road, as evidence by our signatures below hereby REJECT the General Plan Amendment No. 945 Intent to adopt a negative declaration made by the applicant Ashlee Lewis.
<b>Action petitioned for</b>	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to dismiss this proposed zoning change.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
VERNA J JONES	<i>Verna J. Jones</i>	32458 St. Martin St Winchester Ca 92596	10/27/15
NOEL D. JONES	<i>Noel Jones</i>	32458 St. Martin St Winchester Ca 92596	10/27/15
Ralph R. Morales	<i>Ralph R. Morales</i>	32480 SAINT MARTIN ST. WINCHESTER CA. 92596	10/27-2015
ROSE MARIE MORALES	<i>Rose Marie Morales</i>	32480 Saint Martin St Winchester, Ca. 92596	10-27-2015
Fred Bridges	<i>Fred Bridges</i>	32495 Perigord Rd Winchester Ca 92596	10/28/15
Matthew Lemesevo	<i>Matthew Lemesevo</i>	32313 Perigord Rd Winchester 92596	10/30/15
MARY TERESA	<i>Mary Teresa</i>	32355 Perigord Rd Winchester Ca 92596	10/31/15
KYLE LARA	<i>Kyle Lara</i>	32446 PERIGORD RD. WINCHESTER CA. 92596	10/31/15
GERALD DHE	<i>Gerald Dhe</i>	32159 PERIGORD RD WINCHESTER 92596	10/31/15
F. ARON CRANE	<i>F. Aron Crane</i>	32299 PORTUGAL RD WINCHESTER CA 92596	10/31/15
Rick VanDerLinden	<i>Rick VanDerLinden</i>	32285 Portugal Rd Winchester Ca. 92596	10/31/2015

# Petition to Dismiss the Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for GPA 945

**Petition summary and background**  
 We the residents, located in the area surrounding the proposed change of zoning, west of Maddalena Road and south of Auld Road, as evidence by our signatures below hereby **REJECT** the General Plan Amendment No. 945 Intent to adopt a negative declaration made by the applicant Ashlee Lewis

**Action petitioned for**  
 We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to ~~and~~ dismiss this proposed zoning change.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
Noah Rau	<i>Noah Rau</i>	32343 Auld Road Winchester, CA 92596	10-24-15
Jeanne M. Bender	<i>Jeanne M. Bender</i>	37595 Green Knolls Road Winchester, CA 92596	10-24-15
Rudy Adams	<i>Rudy Adams</i>	32515 Buena Ventura Rd Winchester, CA 92596	10-24-15
Coloric Adams	<i>Coloric Adams</i>	32515 Buena Ventura Rd Winchester, CA 92596	10-24-15
SPANSE GREEN	<i>Spanse Green</i>	32295 Buena Ventura Rd Winchester, CA 92596	10/24/15
Pam Green	<i>Pam Green</i>	32295 Buena Ventura Rd Winchester, CA 92596	10/24/15
Briame Yhien	<i>Briame Yhien</i>	32343 Auld Rd Winchester, CA 92596	10/24/15
Lauren Minkowski	<i>Lauren Minkowski</i>	37300 Poultry Rd Winchester, CA 92596	10/24/15
Charles Mathew	<i>Charles Mathew</i>	3255 Priscilla St Winchester, CA 92596	10-26-15
hans Mathew	<i>hans Mathew</i>	"	10-26-2015
Heather Carver	<i>Heather Carver</i>	32660 Priscilla St. Winchester, CA 92596	10/30/15
DAVID CARLER	<i>David Carler</i>	"	10-30-15



Corey Sullivan

32125 Buena Ventura Road, Winchester, CA 92596

(408) 202-8859

---

October 31, 2015

Riverside County Planning Department  
Attn: John Hildebrand  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

RE: General Plan Amendment NO. 945

Dear Mr. John Hildebrand:

I was deeply troubled to learn that the Riverside County Planning Commission is reviewing a proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) to Community Development (CD) in General Plan Amendment no. 945. My family and I fled the freeways and high density living of the San Francisco Bay Area just a few months ago to live here and we did not expect to have it follow us to our new home. As you can imagine, we are strongly against this proposal and urge the commission to consider the deep negative impact it will have on the immediate area.

At first thought, here are some of the immediate detriments of this proposed plan:

1. Increased traffic throughout the day and night
2. Pollution of the Tocalota Creek from runoff and discarded debris
3. Increased refuse and discarded debris along roads and private property
4. Heightened stress on livestock
5. Increased damage to roads and private property
6. Increase in the amount of noise
7. Greater light pollution and brightening of night time skies
8. The increased potential for traffic accidents around blind corners and difficult roads

Most of all, if this amendment is approved; it will be a gateway to further development and commercialization of the area and will ultimately be looked at as the beginning of the end for our community. Rather than considering our homes and land as future parking lots and imaging it is a fertile land for planted rows of streetlights, I would like to encourage the commission to think of this area as a gateway to the wine country, as the start to all things that the rest of the world has come to know our region for. In this other future, different than the one being proposed, the residents continue to beautify the area, add value to the land, increase its utility, provide for ourselves, maintain and improve our quality of life, and raise the value of the land beyond the boundaries of Auld and Pourroy Roads.

We are looking forward to learning of the commission's rejection of the proposed amendment in the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Sincerely,

Corey Sullivan  
32125 Buena Ventura Road,  
Winchester, CA 92596



Noah Rau, Brianne Yhlen  
32343 Auld Rd.  
Winchester, CA 92596  
APN: 964-050-007-7

November 1, 2015

Members of the Riverside County Planning Commission  
Attn: John Hildebrand, Project Planner  
Riverside County Planning Department  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**RE: Opposing General Plan Amendment No. 945**

Dear Mr. Hildebrand and Members of the Riverside County Planning Commission:

As home owners and residents of a property within the region described in the Notice of Public Hearing for General Plan Amendment No. 945, we appreciate this opportunity to provide comments.

The description for the region that would be re-zoned under General Plan Amendment No. 945 includes our property, however; our property is not included as noted on page 2 of your staff report. Unfortunately this note on page 2 is the only reference to our property in the staff report and incomplete Environmental Assessment because all other descriptions and references in the documentation assume that our property is still part of this proposal.

We were marketed the property as a rural residential horse property in July 2014 and we closed escrow on our property (APN 964-050-007) on September 10, 2014. This rural residential horse property was exactly what we were looking for. We were not informed of any ongoing zoning changes proposed to take place in the area until we heard about proposed GPA 975 from a neighbor on March 25, 2015. Upon hearing of this proposal, we conducted intense research over the next several weeks and discovered the proposed GPA 945 and the GPA 945D1 that was approved without our knowledge.

***Basis of Approval Recommendation:***

On page 3 of the staff report it is stated that there is a "New Circumstance" for a proposed Butterfield Stage Road re-alignment. We cannot see what this new circumstance could be because the report refers to Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 32379 that was approved back in July 2006 and is yet to be acted upon. This is certainly not a new circumstance; in fact the TPM No. 32379 is set to expire in just seven months. This proposed Butterfield Stage Road re-alignment would require initiation of eminent domain proceedings to acquire necessary property. More than nine years later, these proceedings have not been initiated and this leads us to believe that this proposal is a poor basis for an approval recommendation of GPA 945. Further, TPM No. 32379 should not have been a basis in the GPA 945D1 approval last year.

Noah Rau, Brianne Yhlen  
32343 Auld Rd.  
Winchester, CA 92596  
APN: 964-050-007-7

***Shortcomings of Staff Report:***

In addition to the faulty basis for recommending approval, the following are some of the items noted as false and improperly analyzed.

- On page 4 it is stated that *"GPA 945 creates a continuation of the Auld Road commercial corridor to Maddalena Road"*.

This is impossible with my rural residential property located between this proposal and GPA 945D1.

- On page 6 it is stated that *"The Amendment results in a logical extension of existing and future Commercial Retail development patterns along the Auld Road corridor, which supports the County's goals and vision."*

Leapfrogging a rural residential property and adding more commercial is **NOT** a logical extension of a commercial corridor!

- On page 8, Finding No. 2 states that *"The project site is surrounded by properties which have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Specific Plan to the north, Rural Residential (RR) to the east and south, and Commercial Retail (CR) to west."*

In order to get to commercial retail on the west, my property must be leapfrogged so this is incorrect and there is Rural Residential to the west.

- On page 9, Finding No. 10 states that *"Furthermore, this project will result in providing a nearly seamless continuation of commercial property on the south side of Auld Road, from Dickson Path on the west to Maddalena Road on the east."*

I strongly disagree that once again jumping over my property is a nearly seamless continuation of commercial property on the south side of Auld Road and it should have been stopped at Dickenson Path.

***Shortcomings of the Environmental Assessment No. 41773:***

The following are some of the items noted as improper statements and misleading information in the EA that does not properly investigate environmental impacts.

- Section II.A.2. *States that the proposed project site is bound by Dickenson Path in addition to Auld and Maddalena Roads.*

This is entirely false because my property lies between this site and Dickenson Path

- Section II.I.2. *States that Community Development is to the north and west of the proposed site.*

Noah Rau, Brianne Yhlen  
32343 Auld Rd.  
Winchester, CA 92596  
APN: 964-050-007-7

This is false since my property is located to the west and is rural residential.

- Section V.4.c. The finding states *"Given the existing Community Development Foundation Component (including commercial and residential designations) land use designations found to the east and the north of the subject site, there is a logical progression of Community Development within the area."*

There is not CD to the west as implied here since my property is rural residential A-1-5 making this not such a logical progression.

- Section V.28.b. The finding states *"Aside from the existing Light Agriculture zone to the east and south of the site, the amendment proposal is consistent with the more intense surrounding zoning designations with the Specific Plan (SP) zone to the north and General Commercial (C-1/CP) to the west. There will be no impacts"*

Again, there is Rural Residential to the west and the proposed site is surrounded by rural residential and residential community development.

***Current Use of our Property:***

We currently live and keep Arabian show horses on our property. We purchased this property specifically because we could enjoy our horses and a rural way of life with our children. Horses are extremely sensitive animals and react to visual or noise stimulus and can be dangerous by way of spooking or bolting when presented with scary or foreign things. Again, we purchased this property so we could enjoy it with our children and horses and it would be unsafe in a commercial setting. Not only is it dangerous for us as equestrians but our horses can develop health issues like ulcers from stressful environments. An increase in traffic, noise, or light can be cause for unnecessary stress which can lead to health concerns. Colic, mares miscarrying foals, ulcers, and weight loss are to name a few. We love and value the health and well-being of our horses as well as our family and friends who come to enjoy them with us. Keeping our horses in a construction zone and then a commercial setting would drastically alter their well-being. Any loss would be unacceptable.

***Conclusion:***

This proposed project has the real potential to cause impacts to our family and animals caused from re-zoning and subsequent development. Some of these potentially detrimental impacts would include noise, dust, fire danger, heavy equipment air pollution, topography change with drainage concerns, groundwater pollution, wildlife refuge, increased traffic congestion, increased crime, and light pollution.

Any or all of these environmental impacts would affect the health and well-being of our two young children and our beloved animals.

Riverside County Planning Department  
Attn: John Hildebrand  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

RE: General Plan Amendment NO. 945

Dear Mr. John Hildebrand:

As homeowners and residents on Pourroy Road, my Husband and I found it very disappointing to hear about the possible zone change proposed in GPA 945. We believe that the proposed expansion and reconfiguration, in conjunction with the proposed rezoning of the parcels referenced in GPA 945 from rural residential to commercial will have a significant negative impact on the character and quality of our community. Therefore we are in complete opposition of this projected change.

It has been four months since we took possession of our property and learned of the Pourroy Road / Butterfield Stage Highway expansion concept plan, AND rezoning of the aforementioned parcels. We still feel shocked and unable to fully express our disappointment at the realization that the people who formulated these propositions do not seem to have the best interest of the residents, who stand to lose the most, if the changes come to fruition.

Winchester's brand of the OLD WILD WEST is proud to be a Gateway community to Temecula's wine country. Why would one even consider losing this area's pervading rural landscape to yet another shopping center? The affected existing residential acreage parcels should remain designated as such for a reason; to act as a buffer between existing tract homes and the surrounding countryside. Creation of another shopping center will only add to the specter of flooding due to loss of natural terrain, as well as loss of habitat for native flora and fauna. This is your opportunity to decide now to stop sprawl and its associated increased traffic, noise and light pollution.

I hope we can keep our community as desirable estates that many homeowners, including myself, would love and have pride in calling home and be able to raise our children in what we still think is a rural environment. We implore you to act now to preserve Winchester's charm.

Kyle & Lauren Mikowski  
37300 Pourroy Rd. Winchester (2596  
858.775.1487