

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



ITEM
15.1
(ID # 3605)

MEETING DATE:

Tuesday, March 7, 2017

FROM : TLMA-PLANNING:

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION & LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY/PLANNING: GENERAL PLAN INITIATION PROCEEDINGS FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1175 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy) – Applicant: Bob Brady – Representative: Bob Brady – First Supervisorial District – Mead Valley Area Plan – Good Hope Zoning Area – Zoning: R-R (Rural Residential) - Location: North of Highway 74, south of Mountain Avenue, east of Betty Road, and west of Marie Street – 6.59 gross acres – REQUEST: Adopt an order initiating the proceedings for General Plan Amendment No. 1175, that proposes to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and to amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (1 acre minimum) to Light Industrial (LI) (0.25 – 0.60 FAR), on two parcels, totaling 6.59 gross acres.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: The Planning Commission, General Plan Advisory Committee, and Staff recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

1. **Adopt** an order initiating proceedings for **General Plan Amendment No. 1175**, based on information provided by the applicant and comments received from the Planning Commission and General Plan Advisory Committee.

ACTION: Policy

Juan C. Flores, Director of Transportation & Land Management

2/27/2017

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Jeffries, seconded by Supervisor Ashley and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended to adopt an order initiating the proceedings to allow further review.

Ayes: Jeffries, Washington and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Tavaglione
Date: March 7, 2017
xc: Planning, Applicant

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board

By:
Deputy

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

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost
COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
NET COUNTY COST	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
SOURCE OF FUNDS: Deposit Based Funds 100%			Budget Adjustment:	No
			For Fiscal Year:	N/A

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: Approve

BACKGROUND:

Project Scope

General Plan Amendment No. 1175 is a General Plan Foundation Component Amendment to change the project site's Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Light Industrial (LI), on two parcels, totaling 6.59 gross acres. The project site is generally located north of Highway 74, south of Mountain Avenue, east of Betty Road, west of Marie Street, and is within the Mead Valley Area Plan. The application for this Foundation Component General Plan Amendment was submitted during the application window for the 2016 General Plan Review Cycle.

This Foundation Component General Plan Amendment application has no accompanying implementing project.

General Plan Initiation Process

Prior to a private application for a General Plan Regular Foundation Component Amendment being processed by the Planning Department, the application is required to go through the General Plan Initiation Process (GPIP) process. The GPIP process includes receiving comments on the proposed amendment from the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) and the Planning Commission. These comments are then provided to the Board of Supervisors. At this initial stage of the process, specific details of the Foundation General Plan Amendment and any accompanying implementing project are not considered, and public hearings are not required before the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. The GPIP process provides an opportunity for the applicant to hear comments related to his or her proposed project before embarking on the land use and environmental review process. At this time, the Board of Supervisors will only be considering whether to initiate proceedings for the proposed Foundation Component General Plan Amendment. If the Board of Supervisors adopts an order initiating proceedings for the proposed Amendment, the proposed Amendment will then go through the land use review process including applicable environmental review, Tribal consultation, and public hearings. The initiation of proceedings by the Board of Supervisors does not commit the County to a certain course of action and shall not imply any such amendment will be approved. The Board retains full discretion under the California

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

Environmental Quality Act when reviewing the proposed Amendment during the land use review process.

Justification for Foundation Component Amendment

Pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan, Chapter 11: Administration Element and Article II, Section 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348, related to General Plan Regular Foundation Component Amendments, specific findings are required to approve a Foundation Component Amendment. These include findings that new conditions or circumstances exist that justify modifying the General Plan, that the modification does not conflict with the overall County Vision and that the modification would not create an internal inconsistency among the other General Plan Elements. The application for Foundation Component Amendments requires the applicant to provide information describing a new condition or circumstance that justifies modifying the General Plan. Such information has been provided by the applicant and is included with this report package.

Planning Commission

This application was considered by the Planning Commission (PC) during a public meeting on October 19, 2016, Agenda Item 2.5, and the following comments were provided by the Planning Commissioners:

During the Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners discussed the proposed Foundation Component amendment. Given the location of the property adjacent to Highway 74, the surrounding area, and eventual use of the site as a contractor's storage yard, the Planning Commission felt the General Plan Amendment was appropriate.

General Plan Advisory Committee

This application was considered by the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) during a public meeting on August 18, 2016, Agenda Item 3.5, and was recommended for initiation to the Planning Commission by a majority, with one abstention.

During the GPAC meeting, the project applicant spoke on behalf of the project, providing additional details that the purpose of the General Plan Amendment was to make the site's Land Use and Zone consistent with each other, in order to establish a contractor's storage yard. GPAC members asked about access to the site. The applicant conveyed that there is an access easement from the north at Mountain Avenue, leading into the site, as well as direct access from Highway 74.

Impact on Citizens and Businesses

None at this time. Should the Board of Supervisors initiate this General Plan Foundation Component Amendment application, an appropriate level of land use review and environmental analysis will be conducted in conjunction with this amendment and with any implementing project.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL:

Additional Fiscal Information

N/A

Contract History and Price Reasonableness

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Exhibits

Attachment B – BOS Report Package

Attachment C – PC Report Package

Attachment D – BOS Report Package



Tina Grande, Principal Management Analyst 2/28/2017


**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
GPA01175
VICINITY/POLICY AREAS**

Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

Date Drawn: 07/15/2016
Vicinity Map



Zoning Area: Good Hope



Author: Vinnie Nguyen

DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2004, the County of Riverside adopted a new Uniform Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County. The new General Plan and zoning map designations differ from those provided for with the previous General Plan and zoning map. The County Planning Department office in Riverside at 654 PCH, 92509 Riverside, California 92506, is the official source of information regarding the current General Plan and zoning map. For more information, please contact the Planning Department at (951)938-4327 (Riverside County) or (951)221-0100 (City of Riverside).

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01175

LAND USE

Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

Date Drawn: 07/15/2016
Exhibit 1



Zoning Area: Good Hope

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 951/945-3200 (Western County) or in Palm Desert at (760)963-8277 (Eastern County) or Website <http://www.countyofriverside.org>


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01175

EXISTING ZONING


Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

Date Drawn: 07/15/2016
Exhibit 2



Zoning Area: Good Hope

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)863-6277 (Eastern County) or Website <http://planning.rctd.ca.gov>

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


GPA01175

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1


Date Drawn: 07/15/2016

Exhibit 6



Zoning Area: Good Hope

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.ocplma.org>

BOS

Report Package

Meeting Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2017



RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

I. AGENDA ITEM 2.5

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1175 (FOUNDATION AND ENTITLEMENT/POLICY) –
Applicant: Bob Brady – Representative: Bob Brady – First Supervisorial District – Mead Valley Area Plan – Good Hope Zoning Area – Zoning: R-R (Rural Residential) – Location: North of Highway 74, south of Mountain Avenue, east of Betty Road, and west of Marie Street – 6.59 gross acres.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Light Industrial (LI), on two parcels, totaling 6.59 gross acres.

III. MEETING SUMMARY:

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

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

Spoke in favor of the proposal:

- ✓ Bob Brady, Applicant's Representative, 31959 Willow Wood Ct., Lake Elsinore 92532
- ✓ John (not sure of last name), Applicant, 24795 Highway 74, Perris 92570

No one spoke in a neutral position or in opposition.

IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES:

None

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

Public Comments: Closed

A vote of 4.0 (Commissioner Valdivia was absent)

RECOMMENDS THE ITEM MOVE FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

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.

ENDANGERED HABITATS LEAGUE

DEDICATED TO ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE LAND USE



October 17, 2016

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Planning Commission
County of Riverside
4080 Lemon St
Riverside CA 92501

RE: Items 2.1 – 2.12: General Plan Initiation Proceedings, October 19, 2016

Dear Chair and Members of the Commission

Endangered Habitats League (EHL) appreciates the opportunity to submit written testimony on the General Plan Initiation Proceedings. We served on the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) but, in some cases, EHL positions have been refined since the GPAC votes.

Proposals before you that do not have compelling planning merit and that do not reflect significant changes in circumstances should not move forward to full environmental review. The burden of proof is upon the applicant and/or Planning Department to affirmatively establish such facts.

General comments

EHL is concerned that the Planning Department has not provided 1) the most basic information as to whether more intensive uses are justified or 2) guidelines to determine whether the proposals – individually or collectively – move the County in the right direction.

Basic and necessary information includes the *housing capacity* present but unbuilt in the County and Cities' General Plans. Prior information indicates that there is a huge *overcapacity* of housing that argues against all but the most strategic increases. Other missing information includes the cumulative traffic implications of the proposed General Plan amendments. We urge you to request such information before considering these proposals.

Factors in assessing proposals should include whether the jobs-housing balance is improved or worsened, whether the greater intensity of use will be served by transit now or realistically in the future, whether vehicles miles traveled would be below current averages and put greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on a lowered trajectory, whether the new development will be subject to high fire hazard, and whether it conflicts with the MSHCP. While we hope that the Planning Department will offer its professional

guidance, if not, the Commission should independently formulate a series of *guiding principles* for GPA initiation. A piecemeal approach is not adequate.

EHL's recommendations are based upon compelling planning rationale, jobs-housing balance, transit availability, vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions, the folly of putting more and more homes in the path of wildfire, and biological considerations. In some cases, we have identified missing information needed for justification or suggested modifications. We hope that this Commission will take a hard look at the County's future and chart a more sustainable path for the County's present and future citizens than simply perpetuating current trends.

Also, we are disappointed in the staff reports for these items. As best I can tell, there is only a brief staff recommendation and complete deferral to applicants for justification in terms of the requisite General Plan findings. In contrast, during the last GPA cycle, staff provided its own independent and reasoned analyses, and its recommendations were grounded in facts and discussion. This was far more valuable.

Specific comments

2.1 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1167 – Southwest Area Plan – Santa Rosa Plateau Policy Area and Walker Basin Policy Area –573 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend a portion of the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Open Space (OS) to Community Development (CD) and to change its Land Use Designation from Recreation (R) to Commercial Retail (CR) for the purpose of establishing a small commercial support area and the creation of a Specific Plan

Support initiation

This proposal is consistent with the General Plan as revised

2.2 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1169 – Elsinore Area Plan – Temescal Zoning District – ZONE: Natural Assets (NA), Watercourse, Watershed, and Conservation Areas (W-1), and Rural Residential (R-R) – LOCATION: Generally located North of I-15, east of Canyon Circle, and surrounding Corona Lake – PROJECT SIZE: 548 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend and reconfigure portions of the project site's General Plan Foundation Components from Open Space (OS) and Rural (RUR) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designations from Rural (RUR) and Rural Residential (RR) to Conservation (C), Medium High Density Residential (MHDR), and High Density Residential (HDR)

More information needed

The project has the positive potential to shift density from natural lands, consolidate development at relatively high densities, and protect significant open space. After obtaining more information from the applicant, we now concur that

MSHCP consistency can be achieved – and even produce net biological benefits with some redesign.

However a case has not been made this is a priority location for additional housing capacity, in terms of ameliorating jobs-housing imbalance, having access to current or future transit, and/or reducing average per capita vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions. *Simply being near a freeway or being adjacent to similar development are insufficient planning rationales.*

If a more compelling planning case can be made, we would support initiation under the condition that alternatives considered include a site design that not only achieves MSHCP consistency but enhances biological resources and riparian connectivity around the lake.

2.3 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1172 – Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan – Woodcrest Zoning District – ZONE: Residential- Agriculture (R-A) – Location: Northerly of Van Buren Boulevard, southerly of Iris Avenue, easterly of Gamble, and westerly of Chicago Avenue – PROJECT SIZE: 1.87 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site’s Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Commercial Retail (CR), on one parcel

More information needed

The Planning Department should provide an objective determination of whether additional commercial retail capacity beyond that already in the General Plan is needed in this location.

2.4 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1173 – Mead Valley Area Plan – Mead Valley Zoning District – ZONE: Light Agriculture (A-1-1) – LOCATION: Generally located east of Day Street, north of Nance Street, west of Decker Road, and south of Oleander Avenue – PROJECT SIZE: 19.16 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend a 4.2 acre portion of the project site’s General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (1 acre minimum) to Light Industrial (LI), on one parcel

Support initiation

The changes proposed reduce conflicts between residential and business park uses.

2.5 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1175– Mead Valley Area Plan – Good Hope Zoning Area – Zoning : R-R (Rural Residential) – Location: North of Highway 74, south of Mountain Avenue, east of Betty Road, and west of Marie Street – 6.59 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site’s General Plan Foundation

Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Light Industrial (LI), on two parcels

More information needed

The Planning Department should provide an objective determination of whether additional light industrial capacity beyond that already in the General Plan is needed in this location.

2.6 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1185 – Temescal Valley Area Plan – Glen Ivy Zoning Area – ZONE: Controlled Development (W-2) and (W-2-10), One-Family Dwellings (R-1), General Commercial (C-1/C-P), and Mineral Resources & Related Manufacturing (M-R-A) – LOCATION: Generally located southwest of I-15 Freeway, south of Glen Ivy Road, and northeast of the Cleveland National Forest – PROJECT SIZE: 82.5 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site’s General Plan Foundation Component from Rural (R) and Open Space (OS) to Community Development (CD), and amend its Land Use Designations from Rural Mountainous (RM), Mineral Resources (MR), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Commercial Tourist (CT) to Mixed Use Area (MUA) for the purpose of establishing a Specific Plan over the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort, on six parcels

Oppose initiation unless modified

We understand that staff has proposed the use of a flexible Mixed Use Area designation for the entire site. In any case, while the eventual substitution of a Specific Plan for the current mix of low-density rural and commercial uses has the potential to consolidate development and create natural open space, the current site design fails. We are concerned that the proposed medium density “resort housing” lacks planning justification. There has been no showing that increased housing capacity in this location advances any of the planning goals outlined above. Instead, the “Resort/Wellness Retreat” should go forward *absent* the adjacent housing or, at a minimum, consolidate lesser development at higher density on a *much* smaller footprint immediately adjacent to the resort. This is far more consistent with actual “resort housing” than the suburban tracts proposed. Such a design would also enhance the surrounding Conserved Habitat and increase the amenity value of the resort.

2.7 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1189 – Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan – Lake Mathews Zoning District – ZONE: Light Agriculture (A-1-5) and Residential Agriculture (R-A-1) – LOCATION: North of Cajalco Road, west of La Sierra, south of Tin Mine Road, and east of Eagle Canyon Road – PROJECT SIZE: 36 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site’s General Plan Foundation Component from Open Space (OS) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Conservation Habitat (CH) to Commercial Retail (CR) and Low Density Residential (LDR), on two parcels

Oppose initiation unless modified

According to the applicant, the Open Space Conservation Habitat was applied in error and the property is not part of the MSHCP preserve. If correct, this justifies the initiation of a GPA. However, the proposal for Community Development and a mix of low density residential and commercial retail is excessive and out of character with surrounding Rural. Instead, a Technical Amendment can be processed that simply corrects the current designation.

2.8 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1192 — Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan – Lake Mathews Zoning District – ZONE: Residential Agricultural (R-A-5) – LOCATION: Generally located northeast of Van Buren Boulevard, east of Firethorn Avenue, and west of Regency Ranch Road – PROJECT SIZE: 10.3 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Commercial Retail (CR), on three parcels

More information needed

The Planning Department should provide an objective determination of whether additional commercial retail capacity beyond that already in the General Plan is needed in this location.

2.9 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1193 – Elsinore Area Plan – Cleveland Zoning Area – ZONE: Rural Residential (R-R) – LOCATION: Generally located north of Saint Gallen Way, west of Calle De Lobo, south of Cleveland National Forest, and east of Calle De Companero – PROJECT SIZE: 57.12 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Open Space (OS) to Rural (R) and amend its Land Use Designation from Rural (RUR) to Rural Residential (RR), on one parcel

Oppose initiation

This is a meritless proposal to change properly designated Open Space-Rural to Rural residential, increasing the density by a factor of four. Open Space Rural was correctly applied due to constraints such as severe fire hazard. Please don't put more and more life and property at risk of wildfire.

2.10 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1196 – Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan – Mead Valley Zoning District – ZONE: Light Agriculture (A-1-1) and Residential Agriculture (R-A-1) – POLICY AREA: Cajalco Wood – LOCATION: South of Markham Street, east of Wood Road, west of Luck Lane, and north of Cajalco Road – PROJECT SIZE: 238.5 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community

Development (CD) and to amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR) and Medium Density Residential (MDR), on 14 parcels

More information needed

This is a proposal to replace a dysfunction Rural Community designation with Community Development within Mead Valley. It could be considered “infill” of sorts that uses urbanized land more efficiently. However, a strong planning rationale has not been made in terms of this being a priority location for additional housing capacity, ameliorating jobs-housing imbalance, having access to current or future transit, and/or reducing average per capita vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions. If this case can be made, then we would support initiation.

2.11 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1198 – Mead Valley Area Plan – Mead Valley Zoning District – ZONE: Light Agriculture (A-1-1) – LOCATION: North of Oakwood Street, south of Cajalco Expressway, east of Tyler Road, and west of Seaton Avenue – PROJECT SIZE: 23 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site’s General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and to amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), on one parcel

More information needed

This is a proposal to replace a dysfunction Rural Community designation with Community Development within Mead Valley. It could be considered “infill” of sorts that uses urbanized land more efficiently. However, a strong planning rationale has not been made in terms of this being a priority location for additional housing capacity, ameliorating jobs-housing imbalance, having access to current or future transit, and/or reducing average per capita vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions. If this case can be made, then we would support initiation.

2.12 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1200 – Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan – Woodcrest Zoning District – ZONE: Residential Agricultural (R-A) – LOCATION: North of Krameria Avenue, south of Van Buren Boulevard, west of Porter Avenue, and east of Gardner Avenue – PROJECT SIZE: 1.91 gross acres – REQUEST: Proposal to amend the project site’s General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and to amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Light Industrial (LI), on one parcel.

Support initiation

This is a proposal to conform the existing land use, which appears compatible with the surrounding area.

Thank you for considering our views.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dan Silver". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "D" and "S".

Dan Silver
Executive Director


PC

Report Package

Meeting Date: Wednesday, October 19, 2016

Agenda Item No.: 2.5
Area Plan: Mead Valley
Supervisorial District: First
Project Planner: John Earle Hildebrand III

General Plan Amendment No. 1175
Property Owner: John and Kelly Channel
Applicant: John and Kelly Channel
Engineer/Representative: Bob Brady


Steve Weiss, AICP
Planning Director

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: General Plan Amendment No. 1175 is a General Plan Regular Foundation Component Amendment to change the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and to amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (1 acre minimum) to Light Industrial (LI) (0.25 – 0.60 FAR), on two parcels, totaling 6.59 gross acres. The application for this Foundation General Plan Amendment was submitted during the application window for the 2016 General Plan Review Cycle.

LOCATION: North of Highway 74, South of Mountain Avenue, East of Betty Road, and west of Marie Street.

PROJECT APNs: 342-120-051 and 342-120-038

GENERAL PLAN INITIATION PROCESS (GPIP): Prior to a private application for a General Plan Regular Foundation Component Amendment being processed by the Planning Department, the application is required to go through the GPIP process. This process includes receiving comments on the proposed amendment from the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) and the Planning Commission. These comments are then provided to the Board of Supervisors. At this initial stage of the process, specific details of the Foundation General Plan Amendment and any accompanying implementing project are not considered, and public hearings are not required before the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors will only be considering whether to initiate proceedings for the proposed Foundation General Plan Amendment. If the Board of Supervisors adopts an order initiating proceedings for the proposed Amendment, the proposed Amendment will then go through the land use review process including applicable environmental review, Tribal consultation, and public hearings. The initiation of proceedings by the Board of Supervisors does not commit the County to a certain course of action and shall not imply any such amendment will be approved. The Board retains full discretion under the California Environmental Quality Act when reviewing the proposed Amendment during the land use review process.

JUSTIFICATION FOR FOUNDATION COMPONENT AMENDMENT – APPLICANT PROVIDED:
Pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan, Chapter 11: Administration Element, "Required and Optional Findings" subsection, evidence demonstrating new conditions or circumstances is required to justify a Foundation Component Amendment. Article II, Section 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348 related to General Plan Foundation Component Amendments – Regular, provides further details regarding the General Plan Initiation ("GPIP") process and restates the requirement to provide new circumstances or conditions as consideration for a Foundation Component General Plan Amendment. Each Foundation Component Amendment application includes information describing a new condition or circumstance, which has been provided by the applicant, and is restated below:

The fact that the County has initiated the Highway 74 Corridor Study for the area including this property demonstrates that new conditions and circumstances exist. Since Highway 74 was significantly improved as a major transportation corridor between the 1-15 and 1-215 and the cities of Lake Elsinore and Perris, traffic counts have increased and created opportunities for higher intensity residential, commercial and industrial and uses. The development opportunities for the properties adjacent to and in the Highway 74 corridor have change from the Rural Community designation that allows limited development to an area that is more characteristic of the Community Development designation. The improved traffic capacity and safety of Highway 74 encourages and supports suburban development that is continuing to occur from Lake Elsinore along Highway 74 towards Perris and from Perris to Lake Elsinore. Riverside County has been one of the fastest growing areas in the state and the vast majority of this growth has been occurring in the west and southwest areas of the County which includes this area and subject property. This trend will continue and growth will continue along the section of the Highway 74 corridor. The Community Development section of Chapter 3 of the General Plan (LU-55) recognizes and acknowledges that future growth should occur in areas designated Community Development in the General Plan Foundation Component. Throughout the history of mankind, growth has occurred along major transportation corridors and routes including waterways, railways and roadways. The Highway 74 corridor is a major transportation route between Lake Elsinore and Perris which provides a connection between two other major transportation routes: the 1-15 and the 1-215. Growth will continue to occur and should be encouraged along the corridor between these nodes where it can be accommodated. The RCIP Vision Statement in Chapter 3 of the General Plan (LU-55) states in part:

1. New growth patterns no longer reflect a pattern of random sprawl. Rather, they follow a framework of transportation and open space corridors, with concentrations of development that fit into that framework. In other words, important open space and transportation corridors define growth areas.

The Highway 74 corridor area with its improvements as a major transportation corridor has already defined as a growth area and should be so recognized in the General Plan with the Community Development Land Use Foundation Component designation.

GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION: This application was considered by the General Plan Advisory Committee ("GPAC") during a public meeting on August 18, 2016 and was unanimously recommended for initiation to the Planning Commission.

During the meeting, the applicant spoke on behalf of his business and provided further details about their proposed project and business, which includes a contractor's storage yard. GPAC members asked about access to the site. The applicant conveyed that there is an access easement from the north at Mountain Avenue, leading into the site, as well as from Highway 74.

PROJECT SITE INFORMATION:


- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Existing Foundation Component: | Rural Community (RC) |
| 2. Proposed Foundation Component: | Community Development (CD) |
| 3. Existing General Plan Designation: | Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) |
| 4. Proposed General Plan Designation: | Light Industrial (LI) |
| 5. Surrounding General Plan Designations: | North, south, east, and west - Very Low Density |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 6. Existing Zoning Classification: | Residential (VLDR)
R-R (Rural Residential) |
| 7. Surrounding Zoning Classifications: | North and west – R-R (Rural Residential), south
and east M-SC (Manufacturing-Service
Commercial) |
| 8. Existing Land Use: | Residential and Vacant Land |
| 9. Surrounding Land Uses: | Residential, Light Agriculture, Land Vacant Land |
| 10. Project Size (Gross Acres): | 6.59 |

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the information provided with the initial application package and discussions about the project during the GPAC meeting, the Planning Director recommends the adoption of an order initiating proceedings for General Plan Amendment No. 1175 and seeks comments from the Planning Commission on the amendment which will be provided to the Board of Supervisors. The initiation of proceedings by the Board of Supervisors for the amendment of the General Plan, or any element thereof, shall not imply any such amendment will be approved.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. During the time of Planning Commission staff report preparation, no public correspondence in support or opposition had been received.
2. The project site is not located within:
 - a. MSHCP criteria cell or conservation boundary; or
 - b. Agricultural preserve; or
 - c. A half-mile of a fault line or fault zone.
3. The project site is located within:
 - a. The City of Perris sphere of influence; and
 - b. March Air Reserve airport influence area; and
 - c. A special flood hazard area; and
 - d. Moderate fire hazard area; and
 - e. State Responsibility Area for fire protection service.



RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT COMMITTEE
MINUTE ORDER
AUGUST 18, 2016**

I. AGENDA ITEM 3.5

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1175 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy) – Applicant: Bob Brady – Representative: Bob Brady – First Supervisorial District – Mead Valley Area Plan – Good Hope Zoning Area – Zoning: R-R (Rural Residential) - Location: North of Highway 74, South of Mountain Avenue, East of Betty Road, and west of Marie Street – 6.59 gross acres – **REQUEST:** Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Light Industrial (LI), on two parcels, totaling 6.59 gross acres – PROJECT PLANNER: John Hildebrand at (951) 955-1888 or email jhildebr@rctlma.org – APNs: 342-120-051 and 342-120-038.

II. GPAC ACTION:

Motion by Ms. Gutierrez
Second by Mr. Cousins

All voted to move this forward.

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.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

A PUBLIC MEETING has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION to consider the project shown below:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1175 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy) – Applicant: Bob Brady – Representative: Bob Brady – First Supervisorial District – Mead Valley Area Plan – Good Hope Zoning Area – Zoning: R-R (Rural Residential) - Location: North of Highway 74, South of Mountain Avenue, East of Betty Road, and west of Marie Street – 6.59 gross acres – **REQUEST:** Proposal to amend the project site's General Plan Foundation Component from Rural Community (RC) to Community Development (CD) and amend its Land Use Designation from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Light Industrial (LI), on two parcels, totaling 6.59 gross acres – **PROJECT PLANNER:** John Hildebrand at (951) 955-1888 or email jhildebr@rctlma.org – APNs: 342-120-051 and 342-120-038.

TIME OF MEETING: 9:00am (or as soon as possible thereafter)
DATE OF MEETING: **Wednesday, October 19, 2016**
PLACE OF MEETING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER
BOARD CHAMBERS, 1ST FLOOR
4080 LEMON STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Project Planner John Earle Hildebrand III at (951) 955-1888 or e-mail jhildebr@rctlma.org, or go to the County Planning Department's Planning Commission agenda web page at: <http://planning.rctlma.org/PublicHearings.aspx>


The case file for the proposed project may be viewed Monday through Friday, from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. at the County of Riverside Planning Department office, located at 4080 Lemon St. 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on the proposed project may do so in writing between the date of this notice and the public meeting; or, may appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public meeting will be submitted to the Planning Commission, who will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

Be advised that as a result of public meetings and comment, the Planning Commission may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Attn: John Earle Hildebrand III
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409



GPAC

Report Package

Meeting Date: Thursday, August 18, 2016



RIVERSIDE COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE GPIP REPORT

August 18, 2016

Foundation GPA No.: 1185
Supervisory District: First
Area Plan: Temescal Canyon
Zoning Area/District: Glen Ivy Area
Property Owner(s): GOCO Hospitality California, Inc.
Project Representative(s): T&B Planning, Inc.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposal to reconfigure the project site's General Plan Land Use Designations of Commercial Tourist (CT), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Rural Mountainous (RM) for the purpose of establishing a Specific Plan over the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort, on six parcels, totaling 82.5 gross acres.

LOCATION: Generally located southwest of I-15 Freeway, south of Glen Ivy Road, and northeast of the Cleveland National Forest.

PROJECT APNs: 290-040-033, 290-040-034, 290-040-073, 290-040-074, 290-090-025, and 290-090-026




Figure 1: Project Location Map

PROJECT DETAILS: This General Plan application is a proposal to reconfigure the project site's General Plan Land Use Designations of Commercial Tourist (CT), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Rural Mountainous (RM) for the purpose of establishing a Specific Plan over the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort, on six parcels, totaling 82.5 gross acres.

LAND USE CHANGE DISCUSSION – APPLICANT PROVIDED: See attached document.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX:

General Information:

Project Area (Gross Acres):	82.5
Number of Parcels:	6
Sphere of Influence:	Yes – City of Corona
Policy Area:	No
Overlay:	No

Land Use and Zoning:

Existing Foundation Component:	Rural (R), Open Space (OS), and Community Development (CD)
Proposed Foundation Component:	Rural (R), Open Space (OS), and Community Development (CD)
Existing General Plan Land Use:	Rural Mountainous (RM), Mineral Resources (MR), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Commercial Tourist (CT)
Proposed General Plan Land Use:	Rural Mountainous (RM), Mineral Resources (MR), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Commercial Tourist (CT)
Surrounding General Plan Land Use	
North:	Recreation (R), Medium Density Residential (MDR), and Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)
East:	Mineral Resources (MR)
South:	Conservation (C)
West:	Conservation (C)
Existing Zoning Classification:	
	R-1 (One-Family Dwelling), W-2 and W-2-10 (Controlled Development Areas, and C-1/C-P (General Commercial)
Change of Zone Required:	Yes
Surrounding Zoning Classification	
North:	SP (Specific Plan) – Mountain Springs (SP00221)

East:	M-R-A (Mineral Resources & Related Manufacturing)
South:	SP (Specific Plan) – Mountain Springs (SP00221)
West:	SP (Specific Plan) – Mountain Springs (SP00221)
Existing Development and Use:	Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort and Vacant Land
Surrounding Development and Use	
North:	Residential
East:	Mining operations
South:	Vacant – Cleveland National Forest
West:	Vacant – Cleveland National Forest

Environmental Information:

WRCMSHCP Criteria Cell:	GPA01185 is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) plan area but not within a MSHCP Criteria Cell. The MSHCP does not describe conservation outside of Criteria Cells. Conservation may be required outside of Criteria Cells for species that are not adequately covered by the MSHCP or species whose conservation objectives have not been met. All projects within the MSHCP Plan Area must be in compliance with the MSHCP.
CVMSHCP Conservation Boundary:	No
Airport Influence Area ("AIA"):	No
Agricultural Preserve:	No
Farmland Importance:	Yes – Other Lands Unique Farmland Urban-Built Up Land
Fire Hazard Area:	Yes – Very High
Fire Responsibility Area:	State Responsibility Area and Local Responsibility Area
Special Flood Hazard Area:	Yes – RCFC
Liquefaction Area:	Yes – Low, Moderate, and Very Low
Subsidence Area:	Yes – Susceptible
Fault Line:	Yes – Within a ½ mile of Elsinore Fault
Fault Zone:	Yes – Within a ½ mile of Elsinore Fault and County Fault Zones
Paleontological Sensitivity:	Yes – High Sensitivity

Utility Information:

Water Service:	Temescal Valley Water District (Verify Service)
Sewer Service:	Temescal Valley Water District (Verify Service)

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01185

VICINITY/POLICY AREAS

Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

Date Drawn: 07/22/2016
Vicinity Map



Zoning Area: Glen Ivy

Author: Vinnie Nguyen



DISCLAIMER: On or about 7/20/16, the County of Riverside, through its County Planning Department, has provided this map to the public for informational purposes only. The map is not intended to be used for any legal or financial purposes. The County Planning Department is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this map. For more information, please contact the County Planning Department at (951) 952-5400. The County Planning Department is located at 17000 Lakeview Dr., Riverside, CA 92504.


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01185

LAND USE


Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

Date Drawn: 07/22/2016
Exhibit 1



Zoning Area: Glen Ivy

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)863-6277 (Eastern County) or Website <http://planning.riversideca.gov>


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01185

Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

EXISTING ZONING

Date Drawn: 07/22/2016
Exhibit 2



Zoning Area: Glen Ivy

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.rctdms.ca.gov>

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


GPA01185

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Supervisor: Jeffries
District 1

Date Drawn: 07/22/2016

Exhibit 6



Zoning Area: Glen Ivy

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)865-8277 (Eastern County) or Website <http://riverside.ca.gov>






FIGURE 1
GLEN IVY HOT SPRINGS RESORT WELLNESS RETREAT




GLEN IVY HOT SPRINGS RESORT WELLNESS RETREAT

FIGURE 2



Source: Google Earth (2016), BLS/CA (2016)

GLEN IVY HOT SPRINGS RESORT WELLNESS RETREAT SPECIFIC PLAN (PROPOSED) FIGURE 3




LEGEND
General Plan Land Use Designations

Estate Residential (EDR)	Light Industrial (LI)
Rural Community - Estate Residential (RC-EDR)	Business Park (BP)
Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)	Public Facilities (PF)
Rural Community - Very Low Density Residential (RC-VLDR)	Rural Residential (RR)
Low Density Residential (LDR)	Rural Mountainous (RM)
Rural Community - Low Density Residential (RC-LDR)	Conservation (OS-C)
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Conservation Habitat (OS-CH)
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	Open Space Recreation (OS-R)
High Density Residential (HDR)	Open Space Rural (OS-RUR)
Commercial Retail (CR)	Water (OS-W)
Commercial Tourist (CT)	Mineral Resources (OS-MR)
Community Center (CC)	CITY

GLEN IVY HOT SPRINGS RESORT WELLNESS RETREAT

FIGURE 4





DISTANCE TO:

- ① Existing Water Line (65 ft.)
- ② Existing Sewer Line (0 ft.)
- ③ Existing County Maintained Street (850 ft.)

LEGEND

- Project Boundary
- County Maintained Streets

WATER

PRESSURE ZONE 1320

- Existing 14" Water Line
- Existing 20" Water Line

PRESSURE ZONE 1490

- Existing 8" Water Line
- Existing 16" Water Line


SEWER

- Existing 8" Sewer Line
- Existing 15" Sewer Line

GLEN IVY HOT SPRINGS RESORT WELLNESS RETREAT

FIGURE 5

EXISTING PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE



RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Steve Weiss, AICP
Planning Director

GPA01185

APPLICATION FOR FOUNDATION COMPONENT AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

APPLICATION INFORMATION:

Applicant Name: GOCO Hospitality California, Inc.

Contact Person: David Wickline and Josephine Leung E-Mail: david.wickline@gocohospitality.com
josephine.leung@gocohospitality.com

Mailing Address: 25000 Glen Ivy Road
Corona Street CA 92883
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (707) 874-3890 Fax No: ()

Engineer/Representative Name: T&B Planning, Inc.

Contact Person: Joel Morse E-Mail: jmorse@tbplanning.com

Mailing Address: 17542 East 17th Street, Suite 100
Tustin Street CA 92780
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 279-1800 x 114 Fax No: (951) 279-4380

Property Owner Name: GOCO Hospitality California, Inc.

Contact Person: Cristin Stier E-Mail: Cristin.Stier@glenivy.com

Mailing Address: 25000 Glen Ivy Road
Corona Street CA 92883
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 277-3529 x 1154 Fax No: ()

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 El Duna Court, Suite H
Palm Desert, California 92211
(760) 863-8277 · Fax (760) 863-7555

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

Check this box if additional persons or entities have an ownership interest in the subject property(ies) in addition to that indicated above; and attach a separate sheet that references the General Plan Amendment type and number and list those names, mailing addresses, phone and fax numbers, and email addresses; and provide signatures of those persons or entities having an interest in the real property(ies) involved in this application.

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent, and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and in accordance with Govt. Code Section 65105, acknowledge that in the performance of their functions, planning agency personnel may enter upon any land and make examinations and surveys, provided that the entries, examinations, and surveys do not interfere with the use of the land by those persons lawfully entitled to the possession thereof.

(If an authorized agent signs, the agent must submit a letter signed by the owner(s) indicating authority to sign on the owner(s)'s behalf, and if this application is submitted electronically, the "wet-signed" signatures must be submitted to the Planning Department after submittal but before the General Plan Amendment is ready for public hearing.)

LEUNG JOSEPHINE HOK MAN

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

[Signature]
SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

Cristen Stier

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

[Signature]
SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The applicant authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary. Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of this application, the applicant will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be **NO** refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

APPLICATION FOR FOUNDATION COMPONENT AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 290-040-033, -034, -073, -074 and 290-090-025, -026

Approximate Gross Acreage: 82.5 acres

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Santa Ana Mountains, South of Trilogy Parkway, East of Santa Ana Mountains, West of Coldwater Creek

Existing General Plan Foundation Component(s): Rural, Community Development, and Open Space

Proposed General Plan Foundation Component(s): Community Development-SP and Open Space

Existing General Plan Land Use Designation(s): RUR-RM, CD-LDR, CD-CT, OS-MR, OS-C

Proposed General Plan Land Use Designation(s): Community Development SP (MDR, CT, OS-R, OS-C)

General Plan Policy Area(s) (if any): Temescal Canyon Area Plan

Existing Zoning Classification(s): W-2-10, W-2, R-1, C-1/CP, M-R-A, SP

Provide details of the proposed General Plan Amendment (attach separate pages if needed):

The proposed Foundation General Plan Amendment would amend the site's existing 32.6-acre Rural Foundation, 47.1-acre Community Development Foundation, and 2.8-acre Open Space Foundation to 68.6 acres of Community Development Foundation and 13.9 acres of Open Space Foundation.

Are there previous development application(s) filed on the same site: Yes No

If yes, provide Application No(s). PP09062
(e.g. Tentative Parcel Map, Zone Change, etc.)

Initial Study (EA) No. (if known) Unknown EIR No. (if applicable): N/A

Have any special studies or reports, such as a traffic study, biological report, archaeological report, geological or geotechnical reports, been prepared for the subject property? Yes No

If yes, indicate the type of report(s) and provide signed copy(ies): N/A

Name of Company or District serving the area the project site is located (if none, write "none.")	Are facilities/services available at the project site?	Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Electric Company	Southern California Edison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gas Company	Southern California Gas Company	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone Company	Telepacific	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Company/District	Temescal Valley Water District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

APPLICATION FOR FOUNDATION COMPONENT AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Name of Company or District serving the area the project site is located (if none, write "none.")		Are facilities/services available at the project site?	
Sewer District	Temescal Valley Water District	Yes	No
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If "No," how far away are the nearest facilities/services? (No. of feet/miles):

Under existing conditions, the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort maintains private wells and a septic system for water and sewer services. The nearest water point-of-connection is located approximately 65 feet from the northwest corner of the Project site. The nearest sewer point-of-connection abuts the northeast corner of the Project site.

Is the Foundation Component General Plan Amendment located within any of the following watersheds?

- Santa Ana River/San Jacinto Valley
- Santa Margarita River
- Whitewater River

Please refer to Riverside County's Map My County website to determine if the subdivision is located within any of these watersheds (using the Geographic Layer – Watershed)
(http://webintprod.agency.tima.co.riverside.ca.us/MMC_Viewer/Custom/disclaimer/Default.htm)

If any of these watersheds are checked, click on the adjacent hyperlink to open the applicable Checklist Form. Complete the form and attach a copy as part of this application submittal package.

HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the applicant for any development project to consult specified state-prepared lists of hazardous waste sites and submit a signed statement to the local agency indicating whether the project is located on or near an identified site. Under the statute, no application shall be accepted as complete without this signed statement.

I (we) certify that I (we) have investigated our project with respect to its location on or near an identified hazardous waste site and that my (our) answers are true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge. My (Our) investigation has shown that:

- The project is not located on or near an identified hazardous waste site.
- The project is located on or near an identified hazardous waste site. Please list the location of the hazardous waste site(s) on an attached sheet.

Owner/Representative (1) *Curtis Stur* Date 5/26/2016
 Owner/Representative (2) *[Signature]* Date 5/26/2016

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

II. GENERAL PLAN FOUNDATION COMPONENT AMENDMENT JUSTIFICATION:

Pursuant to the Riverside County General Plan, Chapter 11: Administration Element, "Required and Optional Findings" subsection, evidence demonstrating new conditions or circumstances is required to justify a Foundation Component Amendment. Provide details of the new conditions or circumstances that would satisfy these required Foundation Component Amendment findings.
(Please be specific. Attach separate pages if needed.):

See attached Justification Text and Graphics.

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

III. OTHER TYPES OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS:

Would the proposed Foundation Component Amendment result in a conflict with any part of the Riverside County General Plan? If so, describe in detail the conflict. (Attach separate pages if needed.)

See attached Justification Text and Graphics.

NOTES:

1. Please see the 2016 property owner initiated Regular General Plan Foundation Component Amendment (FGPA) Process approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors on March 8, 2016.
2. Most Riverside County entitlement application fees are Deposit Based Fees ("DBF"). The FGPA initial application filing fee is \$10,000.00. This application fee includes the review of the FGPA through the GPIP process only. Each case is unique; therefore, additional funds may be requested should unanticipated circumstances arise during the course of the GPIP review process.

Furthermore:

- o If an accompanying implementing project application is submitted concurrently, additional fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 348, which are specified on the Planning Department website and based upon the application type, shall be required upon submittal.
 - o Should the FGPA application be initiated by the Board of Supervisors at the conclusion of the GPIP process, additional General Plan Amendment fees, to complete the adoption process, shall be required.
3. Application submittal items a for Foundation General Plan Amendment:
 - o This completed application form.
 - o Application filing fees.
 - o Site map showing the project area and extent.
 - o Any additional maps/plans relevant to illustrate the project area location.

REGULAR GENERAL PLAN REVIEW CYCLE FOUNDATION AMENDMENT FINDINGS

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 290-040-033, 034, 073, 074 AND 290-090-025, 026

GLEN IVY HOT SPRINGS RESORT WELLNESS RETREAT
APPLICANT/OWNER: GOCO HOSPITALITY CALIFORNIA, INC.

Location:

Located within the Temescal Valley and nestled at the base of the Santa Ana Mountains, the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat FGPA (herein "Project") consists of approximately 82.5 acres including the 20-acre historic Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort. The remaining 62.5 acres consist of agricultural groves, a variety of vacant structures and out-buildings, one water tank and undeveloped hillsides.

Existing General Plan Foundation Designations:

This site's existing General Plan Designations are "Rural Mountainous" (32.6 acres), "Community Development – Low Density Residential" (30.8 acres), "Community Development – Commercial Tourist" (16.3 acres), "Open Space – Conservation" (1.8 acres), and "Open Space – Mineral" (0.9 acres) in the configuration shown on Figure 1, *Foundation GPA*.

Proposed General Plan Foundation Designations:

The proposed Foundation Component Amendment (proposed Project) would amend the General Plan designations to Community Development-Specific Plan (68.6 acres) and Open Space – Conservation (13.9 acres) in the configuration shown on Figure 1, *Foundation GPA*. The proposed FGPA would eliminate the RM and OS-C designation of the foreground hillside to allow for development of the flatter areas between the foreground hill and the preserved hillsides to the west and south designated Open Space-Conservation. The 25% slope areas within the proposed CD-SP designation would be preserved in accordance with County hillside development regulations as part of the anticipated Implementing Specific Plan project design.

Implementing Project:

This Regular General Plan Review Cycle Foundation Amendment is the first necessary step in the expansion of the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort into the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat, and upon General Plan Initiation, would be followed by the submittal of the implementing Specific Plan project.

Established in 1861, the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort currently employs approximately 150 local residents and draws over 160,000 annual visitors to this unique resource in southwest Riverside County, with its natural hot spring mineral springs, mud baths and other amenities. The transformation of the existing resort into the GOCO Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat would preserve the hillsides while increasing employment to approximately 300 local residents, introducing additional land uses and a variety of wellness resort and retreat facilities and accommodations including wellness center, approximately 90 guest rooms, and boutique retail shops along with attached and detached single family homes, orchards, and other recreational amenities. Figure 3, *Conceptual Land Use Plan*, illustrates the Specific Plan conceptual design for the GOCO Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat.

Regular General Plan Review Cycle Foundation Amendment Justification

Pursuant to the Administration Element (Chapter 11) of the Riverside County General Plan, Subsection 3 of the *Required and Optional Findings* section, a Regular General Plan Review Cycle Foundation General

REGULAR GENERAL PLAN REVIEW CYCLE FOUNDATION AMENDMENT FINDINGS

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 290-040-033, 034, 073, 074 AND 290-090-025, 026

Plan Amendment may be approved only if it can be supported by all three portions of the following finding:

The foundation change is based on ample evidence that: (1) new conditions or circumstances disclosed during the review process justify modifying the General Plan; (2) that the modifications do not conflict with the overall Riverside County Vision; and (3) that they would not create an internal inconsistency among the elements of the General Plan.

Findings:

- 1) Circumstances and conditions have changed such that the project area no longer meets the intent of the Rural Foundation Component General Plan Designation as reflected by the General Plan Principle statements contained on page LU-47 of the 2015 General Plan, which states in part that "Rural land use designations should be established to accommodate a rural lifestyle generally within existing rural towns and rural residential neighborhoods....." (Figure 4, *Surrounding Land Uses*):
 - a. The Rural designation is not consistent with the General Plan Principles because:
 - i. The site is not within an existing rural town or rural residential neighborhood;
 - ii. The Rural designation on this site is the only Rural designation in the vicinity of the site and is not part of a larger existing rural residential neighborhood;
 - iii. The site is adjacent to neighborhoods with Community Development Foundation Component (SP) residential densities to the north, rather than Rural neighborhoods and densities;
 - a. The adjacent, fully developed 823 acre Trilogy community consists of 1,571 homes at an average residential density of 6 dwelling units per acre (Community Development – MHDR) rather than a Rural neighborhood density;
 - iv. The existing Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort is within the Community Development Foundation and attracts over 160,000 guests per year to this site and makes establishment of a "rural lifestyle" or "rural residential neighborhood" impractical in this area.
 - v. The Foundation Component designation to the south, east and west is Open Space (OS-C and OS-M), making establishment of a "rural lifestyle" or "rural residential neighborhood" impractical in this area.
 - b. Circumstances and conditions have changed such that the project area no longer meets the General Plan intent for the location of the Rural Mountainous General Plan Designation, which states (Page LU-48) that the Rural Mountainous (RM) land use designation "applies to remote areas that are completely or partially surrounded by slopes greater than 25% and do not have both county-maintained access and access to community sewer and water systems."
 - i. The site does not meet the definition of "remote" stated above and therefore does not meet the General Plan criteria for designation as Rural Mountainous because:

REGULAR GENERAL PLAN REVIEW CYCLE FOUNDATION AMENDMENT FINDINGS

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 290-040-033, 034, 073, 074 AND 290-090-025, 026

- a. The site is not "surrounded or partially surrounded" by slopes greater than 25%; as shown in Figure 2, *Proposed Foundation Amendment/Slope Analysis*, the site has slopes of greater than 25% located only to the south and west;
 - b. The site has access to County maintained Warm Springs Drive, which is within 852 feet of the site along an existing private road – Glen Ivy Road (Figure 5, *Existing Public Infrastructure*);
 - c. The site has access to existing domestic water lines maintained by the Temescal Valley Water District. An existing 8 inch water line is located in Glen Eagles Drive within the Trilogy community, within 65 feet of the sites northwest corner(Figure 5, *Existing Public Infrastructure*);
 - d. The site has access to existing sewer lines maintained by the Temescal Valley Water District. An existing 8 inch sewer line is located at the property boundary at Glen Ivy Road (Figure 5, *Existing Public Infrastructure*);
 - e. The site has improved County and State maintained access to the I-15 freeway to the north and south from the fully improved interchanges at Temescal Canyon Road (1/2 mile to the north) and Indian Truck Trail (2.25 miles to the south) see Figure 4, *Surrounding Land Uses*.
- 2) The proposed Project is consistent with the Riverside County Integration Plan (RCIP) Vision as demonstrated by the following analysis:
- a. The proposed Project is consistent with the RCIP Vision statement (p. V-10) which requires that expansion of existing development be accompanied by required public improvements because the proposed Project would allow for the planned expansion of the existing Glen Ivy Resort, which would include the construction of the appropriate public improvements, including but not necessarily limited to public roadways, domestic water and sanitary sewer lines.
 - b. The proposed Project is consistent with the RCIP Vision statement (p.V-10) which requires that future redevelopment revitalize the surrounding community and further contribute to the community's growth, because the proposed Project would allow for the planned expansion of the existing Glen Ivy Resort into a world class wellness retreat and resort. Such an expansion would create additional employment (150 new jobs), occupancy tax revenue (approximately \$1.3 million), housing, retail, and recreational opportunities which will contribute to the quality of life and growth of the Temescal Valley.
 - c. The RCIP Vision, as described in the subsection "Our Communities and Their Neighborhoods" (p.V-14), requires that development occur only where public facilities and services that meet acceptable level-of-service standards are available, or can be provided for at the time of development. The proposed Project is consistent with this RCIP Vision because the project site has or can provide at the time of development, access to County-maintained roadways, public water infrastructure, public sewer infrastructure, and access to freeway facilities.

REGULAR GENERAL PLAN REVIEW CYCLE FOUNDATION AMENDMENT FINDINGS

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 290-040-033, 034, 073, 074 AND 290-090-025, 026

- d. The proposed Project is consistent with the RCIP Vision, as described in the subsection "Healthy Communities" (p. V-16), which requires that residents be provided with a wide range of physical and cultural opportunities, because the Project would allow for the expansion and revitalization of the historic Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort into a world class wellness retreat offering unique physical and cultural opportunities.
 - e. The proposed Project is consistent with the RCIP Vision, as described in the subsection "Conservation and Open Space Resource System" (p. V-17), which requires that voluntary conservation occur on private land, because the proposed Project would result in the designation of 13.9 acres of the site comprising the foothills of the Santa Ana Mountains adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest as Open Space – Conservation. The designation would ensure the preservation and protection of this area of the site and buffer development on the site from the adjacent Santa Ana Mountains and National Forest.
 - f. The RCIP Vision, as described in the subsection "Sustainability and Global Environmental Stewardship" (p. V-19), requires that land use polices foster communities where a mixture of land uses provide healthy recreation, healthy food options, accessible bicycle trails, accessible footpaths, and are well-connected to surrounding land uses. The proposed Project is consistent with this RCIP Vision because the proposed Project would allow for the creation of the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat, where healthy recreational opportunities, such as trail hiking and spa treatments, will complement sustainable on-site organic gardens and orchards providing farm-to-table dining experiences.
 - g. The RCIP Vision, as described in the subsection "Jobs and the Economy" (V-20), recognizes that emerging and expanding employment sectors, such as the hospitality industry, are receiving renewed emphasis in job training and investment focus. The proposed Project is consistent with this RCIP Vision development of the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat would result in the creation of approximately 150 new permanent jobs in the hospitality sector and would generate approximately \$1.3 million per year in room occupancy taxes, as well as retail sales tax.
 - h. The RCIP Vision, as described in the subsection "Plan Integration" (p. V-22), requires that flexible planning tools such as mixed use zoning, incentives for creative use of land, overlay zoning, and flexible use of open space are more commonly used. The proposed Project is consistent with this RCIP Vision because the Community Development – Specific Plan designation allows for the use of a Specific Plan which would allow for the full integration of the land uses anticipated for the site, including high quality resort residential, resort accommodations, wellness center, organic, small-scale agriculture, specialty retail, and passive recreational amenities.
- 3) The proposed Project would not create internal inconsistency among other elements of the Riverside County General Plan, as demonstrated by the following analysis:
- a. The proposed Project is consistent with the Land Use Element and would not introduce incompatible land uses or land uses that would conflict with or degrade the integrity of

REGULAR GENERAL PLAN REVIEW CYCLE FOUNDATION AMENDMENT FINDINGS

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 290-040-033, 034, 073, 074 AND 290-090-025, 026

nearby land uses because the proposed Project would result in the Community Development Foundation Component Designation which is a logical extension of the existing on site designation and designation to the north and a logical extension of the existing Open Space Foundation designation to the immediate south.

- b. The proposed Project is consistent with the Circulation Element because, in accordance with the Temescal Canyon Area Plan Circulation Plan and Trails and Bikeway System, there are no planned or existing County-maintained roadway, trail, or bicycle facilities located within the boundary of the Project site which would be eliminated by the proposed Project. Furthermore, the proposed Project would provide for the creation of the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat which would include improved roadway, trail, and bicycle facilities on the site and access to trails in adjacent open space areas.
- c. The proposed Project is consistent with the Multipurpose Open Space Element because implementation of the proposed Project would result in an additional 13.9 acres designated as Open Space – Conservation, and would adequately buffer the developed portions of the site from the Cleveland National Forest.
- d. The proposed Project is consistent with the Safety Element because while the proposed Project would result in the potential for additional development of the site, any such development will be required to meet all County and State requirements necessary to minimize and/or avoid natural and man-made hazards located on the site.
- e. The proposed Project is consistent with the Noise Element because the site is not located in an area identified as susceptible to substantial noise hazards on Figure N-1, *Common Noise Sources and Levels*, of the County's General Plan.
- f. The proposed Project is consistent with the Air Quality Element because the Project would allow for the development of the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat, and the creation of 150 new jobs in the Temescal Valley. These new jobs would improve the Riverside County jobs to housing ratio by locating residents closer to job opportunities, decreasing commute times and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- g. The proposed Project is consistent with the Healthy Communities Element because the Project would allow for the development of the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort Wellness Retreat which would educate guests of the importance of overall health and well-being, promote physical activity and access to healthy foods, promote the production and distribution of locally grown organic food, and provide a unique recreational retreat to County residents.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

A PUBLIC MEETING has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE to consider the project shown below:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1185 (Foundation and Entitlement/Policy) –APPLICANT: Goco Hospitality California, Inc. – **ENGINEER/REPRESENTATIVE:** T&B Planning – First Supervisorial District – Temescal Valley Area Plan – Glen Ivy Zoning Area – **ZONE:** Controlled Development (W-2) and (W-2-10), One-Family Dwellings (R-1), General Commercial (C-1/C-P), and Mineral Resources & Related Manufacturing (M-R-A) – **LOCATION:** Generally located southwest of I-15 Freeway, south of Glen Ivy Road, and northeast of the Cleveland National Forest – **PROJECT SIZE:** 82.5 gross acres – **REQUEST:** Proposal to reconfigure the project site's General Plan Land Use Designations of Commercial Tourist (CT), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Rural Mountainous (RM) for the purpose of establishing a Specific Plan over the Glen Ivy Hot Springs Resort, on six parcels, totaling 82.5 gross acres – **PROJECT PLANNER:** John Hildebrand at (951) 955-1888 or email jhildebr@rctlma.org – **APNs:** 290-040-033, 290-040-034, 290-040-073, 290-040-074, 290-090-025, and 290-090-026.

TIME OF MEETING: 1:00pm (or as soon as possible thereafter)
DATE OF MEETING: Thursday, August 18, 2016
PLACE OF MEETING: Riverside County Flood Control
1995 Market Street
Riverside, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact John Hildebrand at (951) 955-1888 or e-mail jhildebr@rctlma.org, or go to the County Planning Department's GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE agenda web page at:
<http://planning.rctlma.org/PublicHearings/GeneralPlanAdvisoryCommittee.aspx>


The case file for the proposed project may be viewed Monday through Friday, from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. at the Planning Department office, located at 4080 Lemon St. 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.

Any person wishing to comment on the proposed project may do so in writing between the date of this notice and the public meeting; or, may appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public meeting will be submitted to the GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE, who will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

Be advised that as a result of public meetings and comment, the GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Attn: John Hildebrand
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409



ENDANGERED HABITATS LEAGUE

DEDICATED TO ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE LAND USE



March 3, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

The Hon. John Tavaglione, Chair
Riverside County Board of Supervisors
4080 Lemon St.
Riverside CA 92501

RE: Items 15.1 and 15.2, General Plan Initiation Proceedings, March 7, 2017

Dear Chairman Tavaglione and Members of the Board:

Endangered Habitats League (EHL) appreciates the opportunity to submit written testimony on the General Plan Initiation Proceedings. We were honored to serve on the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) which reviewed these proposals. Proposals that do not have compelling planning merit and that do not reflect significant changes in circumstances should not move forward to full environmental review.

General comments

Prior to your consideration of initiating environmental review, EHL urges the Planning Department to provide: 1) the basic information necessary to determine whether the more intensive proposed uses are justified, and 2) guidelines to assess whether the proposals – individually or collectively – move the County in the right planning direction.

Basic and necessary information includes the *housing capacity* present but unbuilt in the County and Cities' General Plans. Prior information indicates that there is a huge *overcapacity* of housing that argues against all but the most strategic increases. Other missing information includes the cumulative traffic implications of the proposed General Plan amendments. We urge you to request such information.

Factors in assessing proposals should include whether the jobs-housing balance is improved or worsened, whether the greater intensity of use will be served by transit now or realistically in the future, whether vehicles miles traveled would be below current averages and put greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on a lowered trajectory, proximity of infrastructure and services, whether the new development will be subject to high fire hazard, and whether it conflicts with the MSHCP or otherwise impacts intact natural lands. We hope that the Planning Department will offer its professional guidance. If not, your Board should independently formulate *guiding principles* for GPA initiation. A piecemeal approach is not adequate.

EHL's recommendations are based upon presence of a planning rationale, jobs-housing balance, transit availability, vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions, the folly of putting more and more homes in the path of wildfire, and biological considerations. In some cases, we have identified missing information or suggested modifications. We hope that your Board will take a hard look at the County's future and chart a more sustainable path for the County's present and future citizens than simply perpetuating current trends.

Also, the staff reports for these items are brief and inappropriately defer to the applicants for the requisite findings, rather than providing independent staff analysis.

Specific comments

Item 15.1, GPA 1175 (Mead Valley) 7 acres — More information needed

The Planning Department should provide an objective determination of whether additional light industrial capacity beyond that already in the General Plan is needed in this location.

Item 15.2, GPA 1185 (Temescal) 83 acres — Oppose initiation unless modified

We understand that staff has proposed the use of a flexible Mixed Use Area designation for the entire site. In any case, while the eventual substitution of a Specific Plan for the current mix of low-density rural and commercial uses has the potential to consolidate development and create natural open space, *the current site design fails*. We are also very concerned that the proposed medium density "resort housing" lacks planning justification. *There has been no showing that increased housing capacity in this location advances any of the planning goals outlined above*. Instead, the "Resort/Wellness Retreat" should go forward *absent* the adjacent housing or, at a minimum, consolidate lesser development at higher density on *a much* smaller footprint immediately adjacent to the resort. This is far more consistent with actual "resort housing" than the suburban tracts proposed. Such a design would also enhance the surrounding Conserved Habitat and increase the amenity value of the resort.

Thank you for considering our views.

Yours truly,



Dan Silver
Executive Director

Aparicio, Ashley

From: Dan Silver <dsilverla@me.com>
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 10:38 AM
To: John Tavaglione; Kevin Jeffries; Marion Ashley; district3@rcbos.org; John Benoit; cob@rcbos.org
Cc: Johnson, George; Perez, Juan; Weiss, Steven; Scott Hildebrandt; Bowie, Desiree; Clack, Shellie; Olivia Barnes; John Field; Bob Magee; Pradetto, Joe; OBalderrama@rcbos.org
Subject: Items 15.1 and 15.2, General Plan Initiation Proceedings, March 7 2017
Attachments: EHL-Items15.1,15.2-GPIPs-BoS-3.7.17.pdf

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

March 3, 2017

The Hon John Tavaglione, Chair
Riverside County Board of Supervisors
4080 Lemon St
Riverside CA 92501

RE: Items 15.1 and 15.2, General Plan Initiation Proceedings, March 7 2017

Dear Chairman Tavaglione and Members of the Board:

Endangered Habitats League appreciates the opportunity to submit the enclosed written testimony.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,
Dan Silver

Dan Silver, Executive Director
Endangered Habitats League
8424 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite A 592
Los Angeles, CA 90069-4267

213-804-2750
dsilverla@me.com
www.ehleague.org

**Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Request to Speak**

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium),
Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject
to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME: BOB BRADY

Address: P.O. Box 1172
(only if follow-up mail response requested)

City: LAKE ELSINORE **Zip:** 92531

Phone #: 951-775-2506

Date: 3/7/17 **Agenda #** 15.1

PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:

Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:

Support **Oppose** **Neutral**

Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed
for "Appeal", please state separately your position on
the appeal below:

Support **Oppose** **Neutral**

I give my 3 minutes to: _____

BOARD RULES

Requests to Address Board on "Agenda" Items:

You may request to be heard on a published agenda item. Requests to be heard must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board before the scheduled meeting time.

Requests to Address Board on items that are "NOT" on the Agenda:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of these rules, member of the public shall have the right to address the Board during the mid-morning "Oral Communications" segment of the published agenda. Said purpose for address must pertain to issues which are under the direct jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. YOUR TIME WILL BE LIMITED TO THREE (3) MINUTES.

Power Point Presentations/Printed Material:

Speakers who intend to conduct a formalized Power Point presentation or provide printed material must notify the Clerk of the Board's Office by 12 noon on the Monday preceding the Tuesday Board meeting, insuring that the Clerk's Office has sufficient copies of all printed materials and at least one (1) copy of the Power Point CD. Copies of printed material given to the Clerk (by Monday noon deadline) will be provided to each Supervisor. If you have the need to use the overhead "Elmo" projector at the Board meeting, please insure your material is clear and with proper contrast, notifying the Clerk well ahead of the meeting, of your intent to use the Elmo.

Individual Speaker Limits:

Individual speakers are limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes. Please step up to the podium when the Chairman calls your name and begin speaking immediately. Pull the microphone to your mouth so that the Board, audience, and audio recording system hear you clearly. Once you start speaking, the "green" podium light will light. The "yellow" light will come on when you have one (1) minute remaining. When you have 30 seconds remaining, the "yellow" light will begin flash, indicating you must quickly wrap up your comments. Your time is up when the "red" light flashes. The Chairman adheres to a strict three (3) minutes per speaker. **Note: If you intend to give your time to a "Group/Organized Presentation", please state so clearly at the very bottom of the reverse side of this form.**

Group/Organized Presentations:

Group/organized presentations with more than one (1) speaker will be limited to nine (9) minutes at the Chairman's discretion. The organizer of the presentation will automatically receive the first three (3) minutes, with the remaining six (6) minutes relinquished by other speakers, as requested by them on a completed "Request to Speak" form, and clearly indicated at the front bottom of the form.

Addressing the Board & Acknowledgement by Chairman:

The Chairman will determine what order the speakers will address the Board, and will call on all speakers in pairs. The first speaker should immediately step to the podium and begin addressing the Board. The second speaker should take up a position in one of the chamber aisles in order to quickly step up to the podium after the preceding speaker. This is to afford an efficient and timely Board meeting, giving all attendees the opportunity to make their case. Speakers are prohibited from making personal attacks, and/or using coarse, crude, profane or vulgar language while speaking to the Board members, staff, the general public and/or meeting participants. Such behavior, at the discretion of the Board Chairman may result in removal from the Board Chambers by Sheriff Deputies.