

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



**ITEM**  
1.11  
(ID # 7448)

**MEETING DATE:**  
Tuesday, July 17, 2018

**FROM :** TLMA-PLANNING:

**SUBJECT:** TRANSPORTATION & LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY/PLANNING: RECEIVE AND FILE THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S DECISION TO APPROVE THE THIRD EXTENSION OF TIME for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32379 – Applicant: Matthew Fagan Consulting Services – Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD:CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR) – Location: North of Mazoe St., east of Pourroy Rd., south of Auld Rd., and west of Dickson Path – 21.01 Acres – Zoning: General Commercial (C-1/C-P) – APPROVED PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Schedule E - subdivision of 21.01 acres into three (3) commercial lots, and the realignment to Butterfield Stage Road and Auld Road. The proposed parcels range in size from a minimum of 3.72 gross acres to a maximum of 10.97 gross acres – REQUEST: THIRD EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32379, extending the expiration date to June 14, 2021. [Applicant Fees 100%.]

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board of Supervisors:

1. **RECEIVE AND FILE** the Planning Commission's Notice of Decision for the above referenced case acted on by the Planning Commission on June 6, 2018. The Tentative Parcel Map No. 32379 will now expire on June 14, 2021.

**ACTION:** Consent

Charissa Leach, Assistant TLMA Director 7/3/2018

---

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

On motion of Supervisor Tavaglione, seconded by Supervisor Ashley and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter of approval is received and filed as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Washington, Perez and Ashley  
Nays: None  
Absent: None  
Date: July 17, 2018  
Page 1 of 3  
xc. Planning, Applicant ID# 7448

Kecia Harper-Ihem  
Clerk of the Board  
By   
Deputy

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

<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	<b>Current Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>Next Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>Total Cost:</b>	<b>Ongoing Cost</b>
<b>COST</b>	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
<b>NET COUNTY COST</b>	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b> Applicant Fees 100%			<b>Budget Adjustment:</b> N/A	
			<b>For Fiscal Year:</b> N/A	

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

**BACKGROUND:**

**Summary**

Tentative Parcel Map No. 32379 was originally approved by the Planning Commission on June 14, 2006. It proceeded to the Board of Supervisors where it was approved on August 15, 2006.

The First Extension of Time was approved by the Planning Commission on September 7, 2016.

The Second Extension of Time was received on April 20, 2017, ahead of the expiration date of June 14, 2017. The applicant and the County discussed conditions of approval and reached consensus on May 10, 2017.

The Third Extension of Time was received on March 26, 2018, ahead of the expiration date of June 14, 2018. The applicant and the County discussed conditions of approval and reached consensus on April 16, 2018.

The County Planning Department, as part of the review of this Extension of Time request, does not recommend the addition of any new conditions of approval, in order to be able to make a determination that the project does not adversely affect the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. The applicant was informed of this.

The Tentative Parcel Map also benefited from Senate Bill No. 1185 (SB1185), Assembly Bill No. 333 (AB333), Assembly Bill No. 208 (AB208), and Assembly Bill No. 116 (AB116), which granted statutory extensions of time for tentative maps statewide.

The Planning Commission heard the third extension of time for Tentative Parcel Map No. 32379 on June 6, 2018. The Planning Commission approved the project by a 4-0 vote (Commissioner Shaffer was absent).

**Board Action**

The Planning Commission's decision is final and no action by the Board of Supervisors is required unless the applicant or an interested person files a complete appeal application within 10 days of this notice appearing on the Board's agenda.

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

**Impact on Citizens and Businesses**

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

**Supplemental**

**Additional Fiscal Information**

All fees are paid by the applicant. There is no General Fund obligation.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**
- B. **PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

  
Scott Bruckner 7/6/2018



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER  
JUNE 6, 2018**

**I. AGENDA ITEM 1.11**

**THIRD EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32379** – Applicant: Matthew Fagan Consulting Services – Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Community Development: Commerical Retail (CD-CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR) – Location: Northerly of Mazoe Street, easterly of Pourroy Road, southerly of Auld Road, and westerly of Dickson Path – 21.01 Acres – Zoning: General Commercial (C-1/C-P) – Approved Project Description: Schedule “E” subdivision of 21.01 acres into three (3) commercial lots, and the realignment to Butterfield Stage Road and Auld Road. The proposed parcels range in size from a minimum of 3.72 gross acres to a maximum of 10.97 gross acres.

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Third Extension of Time Request for Tentative Parcel Map No. 32379, extending the expiration date to June 14, 2021.

**III. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

Motion by Commissioner Taylor-Berger, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Kroencke  
A vote of 4-0 (Commissioner Shaffer Absent)

Spoke in favor:


Matthew Fagan, Applicant’s Representative

Spoke in opposition:

Matthew Duarte, Interested Party, 1001 E. Morton Place, Suite A, Hemet, 92543

No one spoke in a neutral position.

**APPROVED** - Third Extension of Time Request for Tentative Parcel Map No. 32379, extending the expiration date to June 14, 2021.



**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
EXTENSION OF TIME REPORT**

Agenda Item No.:

1.11

Planning Commission Hearing: June 6, 2018

**PROPOSED PROJECT**

Case Number(s): PM32379

Applicant(s):

Area Plan: Southwest


Matthew Fagan Consulting Services

Zoning Area/District: Rancho California Area

c/o Matthew Fagan

Supervisory District: Third District

Project Planner: Gabriel Villalobos

  
Charissa Leach, P.E.  
Assistant TLMA Director

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION**

The applicant of the subject case has requested an extension of time to allow for the recordation of the final map to subdivide 21.01 acres into 3 commercial lots, and the realignment to Butterfield Stage Road and Auld Road. The proposed parcels range in size from a minimum of 3.72 gross acres to a maximum of 10.97 gross acres. The project is located north of Mazoe St, east of Pourroy Rd, south of Auld Rd, and west of Dickson Path.

**PROJECT RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVAL** of the **THIRD EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST** for **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 32379**, extending the expiration date and to reflect SB1185, AB333, AB208, and AB116 benefits to June 14, 2021, subject to all the previously approved and amended Conditions of Approval, with the applicant's consent.

**PROJECT LOCATION MAP**



Figure 1: Project Location Map

**PROJECT BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS**

**Background**

Tentative Parcel Map No. 32379 was originally approved at Planning Commission on June 14, 2006. It proceeded to the Board of Supervisors where it was approved on August 15, 2006.

The First Extension of Time was approved at the Planning Commission on September 7, 2016.

The Second Extension of Time was received April 20, 2017, ahead of the expiration date of June 14, 2017. The applicant and the County discussed conditions of approval and reached consensus on May 10, 2017.

The Third Extension of Time was received March 26, 2018, ahead of the expiration date of June 14, 2018. The applicant and the County discussed conditions of approval and reached consensus on April 16, 2018.

The County Planning Department, as part of the review of this Extension of Time request, recommends the addition of no new conditions of approval, in order to be able to make a determination that the project does not adversely affect the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. The applicant was informed of these recommended conditions and has agreed to accept them. Included in this staff report package is the correspondence from the Extension of Time applicant (April 16, 2018) indicating the acceptance of no new recommended conditions.

Unless specifically requested by the applicant, this Extension of Time request will not be discussed at the time it is presented to the Planning Commission as a consent calendar item.

**State Bills**

**EFFECT OF Senate Bill No. 1185 (SB1185):** On July 15, 2008, AB208 was signed into law, which grants a one-time extension of existing subdivision maps so developers can build immediately when the demand for housing goes up. It gives developers an automatic 12 month extension on previously approved subdivision maps set to expire between July 15, 2008 and January 1, 2011.

**EFFECT OF Assembly Bill No. 333 (AB333):** On July 15, 2009, AB333 was signed into law, which grants a one-time extension of existing subdivision maps so developers can build immediately when the demand for housing goes up. It gives developers an automatic 24 month extension on previously approved subdivision maps set to expire between July 15, 2009 and January 1, 2012.

**EFFECT OF Assembly Bill No. 208 (AB208):** On July 13, 2011, AB208 was signed into law, which grants a one-time extension of existing subdivision maps so developers can build immediately when the demand for housing goes up. It gives developers an automatic 24 month extension on previously approved subdivision maps set to expire between July 13, 2011 and January 1, 2014.

**EFFECT OF Assembly Bill No. 116 (AB116):** On July 11, 2013, AB116 was signed into law, which grants a one-time extension of existing subdivision maps so developers can build immediately when the demand for housing goes up. It gives developers an automatic 24 month extension on previously approved subdivision maps set to expire between January 1, 2000 and July 11, 2013.

**Riverside County Tentative Map Extensions**

Pursuant to County of Riverside Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations), Tentative Tract and Tentative Parcel Maps have an initial life-span approval of 3-years. Tentative Map extensions may be granted, upon a timely filed extension request and include 2 separate, 3-year extensions, for a total Tentative Map life-span of 9-years. As a result, the total number years a map may be extended is 6 years.

On September 12, 2017, the Board of Supervisors adopted an amendment to Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations), allowing for the 2 separate, 3-year extensions. Prior to the amendment, 5 separate, 1-year extensions, for a total Tentative Map life-span of 8-years, was permissible.

The 1st and 2nd extensions of time each granted 1 year for a total of 2 years. This, 3rd extension will grant another 3 years. The remaining number of years available to extend this tentative map after this approval will be 1 year and will expire on June 14, 2021.

Therefore, upon an approval action by the Planning Commission, subsequent receive and file action by the Board of Supervisors, and the conclusion of the 10-day appeal period, this Tentative Map's expiration date will become June 14, 2021. If a Final Map has not been recorded prior to this date, the next extension of time request must be filed 30-days prior to map expiration.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The subject case has conformed to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), and all impacts have been analyzed in order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. No changes to the approved map are proposed and as a result, no new environmental documentation is required prior to an Extension of Time approval.

**FINDINGS**


**In order for the County to approve a proposed project, the following findings are required to be made:**

*Extension of Time Findings*

1. This Tentative Parcel Map has been found to be consistent with the Riverside County General Plan, pursuant to the originally approved findings and conditions of approval. This Extension of Time proposes no changes to the map design and is therefore still found to be consistent.
2. This Tentative Parcel Map has been found to be consistent with Ordinance No. 348 (Land Use) and Ordinance No. 460 (Subdivision Regulations), pursuant to the originally approved findings and conditions of approval. This Extension of Time proposes no changes to the map design and is therefore still found to be consistent.
3. No changes to the approved Tentative Parcel Map are proposed in conjunction with this Extension of Time. All impacts have been analyzed in order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

# 3rd EOT for PM32379

## Vicinity Map



- Legend**
- Parcels
  - County Centerlines
  - Blueline Streams
  - City Areas

### Notes

"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.



752 Feet

376

0

REPORT PRINTED ON... 4/19/2018 2:35:50 PM

© Riverside County GIS





# Extension of Time Environmental Determination

Project Case Number: PM32379  
 Original E.A. Number: 39564  
 Extension of Time No.: 3<sup>rd</sup> EOT  
 Original Approval Date: June 14, 2006  
 Project Location: North of Mazoe St, East of Pourroy Rd, South of Auld Rd, and West of Dickson Path  
 Project Description: Schedule E - subdivision of 21.01 acres into 3 commercial lots, and the realignment to Butterfield Stage Road and Auld Road. The proposed parcels range in size from a minimum of 3.72 gross acres to a maximum of 10.97 gross acres.

On June 14, 2006, this Tentative Parcel Map and its original environmental assessment/environmental impact report was reviewed to determine: 1) whether any significant or potentially significant changes in the original proposal have occurred; 2) whether its environmental conditions or circumstances affecting the proposed development have changed. As a result of this evaluation, the following determination has been made:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, <b>NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME</b> , because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration and the project's original conditions of approval.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and there are one or more potentially significant environmental changes or other changes to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, <b>NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME</b> , because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration and revisions to the project's original conditions of approval which have been made and agreed to by the project proponent.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that there are one or more potentially significant environmental changes or other changes to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, which the project's original conditions of approval may not address, and for which additional required mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval cannot be determined at this time. Therefore, <b>AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/INITIAL STUDY IS REQUIRED</b> in order to determine what additional mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval, if any, may be needed, and whether or not at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 (necessitating a Supplemental or Subsequent E.I.R.) exist. Additionally, the environmental assessment/initial study shall be used to determine <b>WHETHER OR NOT THE EXTENSION OF TIME SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL</b> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the original project was determined to be exempt from CEQA, and the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, therefore <b>NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME</b> .

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gabriel Villalobos, Project Planner

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 For Charissa Leach, Assistant TLMA Director

**Villalobos, Gabriel**

---

**From:** Matthew Fagan <matthewfagan@roadrunner.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2018 10:33 AM  
**To:** Villalobos, Gabriel  
**Cc:** angie doves; Mark Swannie  
**Subject:** Re: Recommended Conditions for PM32379 3rd EOT

Gabriel:

Good morning.

I hope all is well.

We, as applicant are in concurrence with your e-mail regarding the conditions of approval.

Seeing that there are no new conditions of approval, we accept that fact.

We look toward to the approval process continuing at this time.

Could you please let me know what the next steps are?

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you.

Matthew Fagan  
**Matthew Fagan Consulting Services, Inc.**  
42011 Avenida Vista Ladera  
Temecula, CA 92591  
951-265-5428  
[matthewfagan@roadrunner.com](mailto:matthewfagan@roadrunner.com)

Work hard, Play hard, Laugh hard!!

---

**From:** "Villalobos, Gabriel" <[GVillalo@rivco.org](mailto:GVillalo@rivco.org)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 3, 2018 at 10:58 AM  
**To:** Matthew Fagan <[matthewfagan@roadrunner.com](mailto:matthewfagan@roadrunner.com)>  
**Subject:** Recommended Conditions for PM32379 3rd EOT

Attn: Matthew Fagan Consulting Services

c/o Matthew Fagan  
42011 Avenida Vista Ladera  
Temecula, CA 92591

RE: THIRD EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No. 32379.

The County Planning Department has determined it necessary to recommend the addition of **no new conditions of approval** in order to be able to make a determination that the project does not adversely affect the general health, safety and welfare of the public.

Please review the proposed conditions of approval attached in this correspondence. **If these conditions are acceptable, then submit a short written letter/memo/email that clearly references this case, the acceptance of each condition by name and number, and clearly state that you, the Extension of Time Applicant, accept these conditions.** This documentation will then be included in the staff report package. The attached document is a copy of the recommended conditions which are identified as follows:

If the addition of the conditions is not acceptable, please notify me so we can discuss your concerns. If the issue cannot be resolved, then I will direct you to contact the individual Department representative to discuss this matter further.

Once the conditions have been accepted, I will begin preparing the staff report package for the Planning Director's Hearing as a consent item. County Ordinance requires that conditions added thru the extension of time process are presented to and accepted by the applicant. If you, the EOT applicant, is unable to accept these conditions, the Planning Department will recommend denial of this extension of time request. An opportunity will, if requested, be provided for arguments to be made to the hearing body justifying why this request should be approved without the recommended conditions of approval.

I am eager to move this case forward and continue the extension of time process. If you have not contacted me within thirty (30) days, I will begin preparing this case with a recommendation of denial. I need one of two items to proceed:

- 1) Correspondence from you, the EOT applicant, accepting the recommended conditions per the directions provided above; or,
- 2) Correspondence from you, the EOT applicant, advising me of the concerns with the recommended conditions. If the concern still exists after our discussion, then direction on how to approach the issue will be given and additional time will be provided until the issue is resolved.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding this email, please feel free to contact me as indicated below.

**Gabriel Villalobos**  
Riverside County Planning  
4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501  
951-955-6184



**How are we doing? Click the Link and tell us**

**Confidentiality Disclaimer**

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the author's intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please delete all copies, both electronic and printed, and contact the author immediately.

**County of Riverside California**

**From:** albia miller <stopbuildinganything@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 17, 2018 8:19 AM  
**To:** COB

Dear Ms. Maxwell

Here are some opposition votes without text for Administration Action July 17, 2018

- 1.2 Low density Lake Mattheews Oppose Project in entirety of any density.
- 1.3 Oppose Lansing half are lots near Cole Avenue Leave the open spae andit will not inrease traffi and pollution.
- 1.4 Oppose extension of time to add 132 more residents to area near Cajalo Road BY Lansing.
- 1.5 Oppose Lansing turning 49 ares into 82 water draining residencies.
- 1.6 Oppose Bridge walk extension of time for 64 acres turned into 69 lots of more deimation of open space the home of wildlife.\
- 1.7 Oppose TTM 35815 turning 44 acres into 5 are mini farms next to the Santa Rosa Preserve.
- 1.8 Oppose TTM 31735 Small projects add more people and cars and then add to each other.
- 1.9 Is this a used are or an open space. Find an already existing struture and remodel.
- 1.10 Oppose TTM 33248 NOT MORE HOUSINGMINI FARMS in Temscual Canyon. That pours traffic onto I-15.
- 1.11 Oppose TTM 32379 You see the Temecula claiming they are helping traffic with Butterfield Stage Road when they and the County are taking advantage of the Road by building and the produets are high heat producing paved over large block buildings.
- 1.12 Oppose TTM 33145 turning 34 ares into 348 Condominiums with all the traffic that Domenigoni Parkway shall suffer in Winchester.  
Deny the time extension. This is catastrophic to the traffic from San Diego to Los Angeles to Riverside. Copper Skye needs to withdraw his development application and decrease the environmental damage suh a project would cause.
- 1.13 Oppose TTM 32151 Ranon Sevillas attak on Rancho California's District with 180 condos plus 5 to 8 houses per acre. This is creating high density of over capacity thru out the South Side of Riverside County or the wall to wall you all from Tijuana to Santa Barbara.
- 1.14 Oppose TTM 30976 West Sac River Developers turning 53 ares into 162 single family houses along Leon Road under the Winchester Specific Plan. Why did Winchester a rural horse property and agriculture and open space for wildlife refuge unpatriotically allow such an attack by developers of massive building projects? I am sure the community of Winchchester will not vote for people who voted this demise to the land.
- 1.15 Oppose TTM 30977 developer Winchester Hills needs to be cut off from owning land if this the atrocity that they do with it. Seize their land and place it in a preserve. They have stolen from the Earth 260 acres and making pollution and traffic in Winchester with many projects and this one is 416 houses. Not homes beause these people will drive to jobs everyday and never make it because of traffic on Winchester Road.

7/17/18 1.11

1.16 Oppose TTM 30877 What ever you add to Riverside area and this is 20 houses on ten acres will concentrate more pollution, traffic and water drain. This will decrease the visual of open horizons with drive ways, buildings, grass lawns and run off the wildlife. Plus add up the amount of materials needed to B.U.I.L.D.

1.17 Oppose TTM 30972 South of Hyway 74 72 acres into 91 lots. That is further loking out the open space on Hyway 74 and dereasing the Response times for First RESPONDERS because of too many people being allowed in Riverside County because of more building permits

1.18 Oppose TTM 20910 This will open land for more 20 acre farms. There are enough people living in rural Aguanga on a dangerous Hyway system. It is good that 102 acres will be used for breathing open spaces, however, etching away 93 acres for disruptive human activities is determiental to Aguanga's peace and quite.

1.19 Oppose TTM 34677 This is over crowding added to an area that should never been discovered by developers as people have to drive to necessary and unnecessary activities that they chose and they aren't smart enough to ride buses. Therefore, they create pollution and traffic and this will be from 73 ares into 200 overly dense housing.

1.20 Oppose Another attack near Domenigoni Parkway TTM 30807 which will bring in close to a thousand houses in the Winchester Specific Plan of Shame. Shame on the County for allowing the sell of land to developers especially these cut throat SR Conestoga high density cracker box house builders. What's going on with the Earthquake zoning the county keeps placing houses on? This is the tacky plan of years ago of Diamond Lake supply water for building on both sides of Domenigoni Parkway. If people would have voted on this density, they would have said NO.

1.21 Oppose TTM 37414 23 ARES INTO VERY HIGH DENSITY ALONG DOMENIGONI HYWAY This need to be unpermitted due to there not even being the final amount of High Density and probably it is apartments. How horrific!!!

1.22 Oppose TTM 34552 MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY HOUSING IN A DESERT THAT IS JUST SUCKING UP THE COLORADO RIVER, WELLS, RAIN WATER.

1.23 Oppose TTM 34553 More horror for Coachella Valley with Medium High Density Housing. Who wants to live in this triple Density Housing. I doubt if you an sell this. You are going to overload the electrical System even with the Desert Solar andgo back to Black Outs. You are going to stand in LINE FOR WATER.

ALBIA MILLER