If you wish to speak, please complete a “SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION FORM” and give it to the Planning Director. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow interested parties to express their concerns. Please do not repeat information already given. If you have no additional information, but wish to be on record, simply give your name and address and state that you agree with the previous speaker(s).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you require reasonable accommodations please contact the TLMA Commission Secretary at (951) 955-7436 or e-mail at esarabia@rivco.org. Requests should be made 72 hours in advance or as soon as possible prior to the scheduled meeting. Alternative formats are available upon request.

1.0 CONSENT CALENDAR:

1.1 SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 34343 – Applicant: Vaughn Wilson – Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Rural Community – Estate Density Residential (RC-EDR) (2 acres min.) – Location: Northerly of Cotta Lane, easterly of Calle Alta, southerly of Capitol Street, and westerly of Anza Road – 5.05 Acres – Zoning: Residential Agricultural – 2½ acre minimum (R-A-2½) – Approved Project Description: Schedule “H” subdivision of 5.05 acres into two (2) residential lots with a minimum lot size of 2½ acres – REQUEST: Second Extension of Time Request for Tentative Parcel Map No. 34343, extending the expiration date to June 5, 2021. Project Planner: Gabriel Villalobos at (951) 955-6184 or email at gvillalo@rivco.org.

1.2 FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for PLOT PLAN NO. 18683 – Applicant: SBA 2012 TC Assets, LLC – First Supervisorial District – El Cerrito Zoning District – Temescal Canyon Area Plan: Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD-CR) (0.20-0.35 FAR) – Location: Southerly of Foster Road and westerly of Temescal Canyon Road – 2.2 Acres – Zoning: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) – Project Description: Plot Plan No. 18683, is for an unmanned telecommunications facility with a 70 foot monopalm, and a 230 sq. ft. equipment shelter, on a 1,200 sq. ft. lease area within a 2.2 acre pool/spa retail business – REQUEST: First Extension of Time Request for Plot Plan No. 18683, extending the expiration date to December 17, 2028. Project Planner: Gabriel Villalobos at (951) 955-6184 or email at gvillalo@rivco.org.

2.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS: CONTINUED ITEMS: 1:30 p.m. or as soon as possible thereafter:

NONE

3.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS: NEW ITEMS: 1:30 p.m. or as soon as possible thereafter:

NONE

4.0 SCOPING SESSION: 1:30 p.m. or soon as possible thereafter:

NONE

5.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS:
PROPOSED PROJECT

Case Number(s): PM34343
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area/District: Rancho California Area
Supervisors District: Third District
Project Planner: Gabriel Villalobos

Applicant(s):
Vaughn Wilson
c/o Jack Bishop

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 5.05 acres into 2 residential lots with a minimum lot size of acres. The project is located north of Cotta Ln, east of Calle Alta, south of Capitol St, and west of Anza Rd.

PROJECT RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL of the SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 34343, extending the expiration date and to reflect SB1185, AB333, AB208, and AB116 benefits to June 5, 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. 34343 was originally approved at Planning Commission on April 15, 2009. It proceeded to the Board of Supervisors along with Change of Zone No. 7382 where both applications were approved on June 5, 2012.

The First Extension of Time application was approved at the Director’s Hearing on August 7, 2017.

The Second Extension of Time was received June 5, 2018, ahead of the expiration date of June 5, 2018. The applicant and the County discussed conditions of approval and reached consensus on August 17, 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 are the recommended conditions of approval, and the correspondence from the Extension of Time applicant (August 17, 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 Director for approval.

State Bills
EFFECT OF Senate Bill No. 1185 (SB1185): On July 15, 2008, AB208 was signed into law, which grants a one-time extension to 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 to 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 to 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 to existing subdivision maps so developers can build immediately when the demand for housing goes up. It gives developers an automatic 24 month extension on maps approved after January 1, 2000 and that have not expired prior to 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 extension of time granted 1 year. This, 2nd extension will grant another 3 years. The remaining number of years available to extend this tentative map after this approval will be 2 years and will expire on June 5, 2023.

Therefore, upon an approval action by the Planning Director, 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 5, 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.
Extension of Time
Environmental Determination

Project Case Number: PM34343
Original E.A. Number: 40965
Extension of Time No.: 2nd EOT
Original Approval Date: June 5, 2012
Project Location: North of Cotta Ln, East of Calle Alta, South of Capitol St, West of Anza Rd
Project Description: Schedule H - subdivision of 5.05 acres into 2 residential lots with a minimum lot size of acres.

On June 5, 2012, 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:

- [ ] I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME, 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.

- [x] 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, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME, 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.

- [ ] 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, AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/INITIAL STUDY IS REQUIRED 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 WHETHER OR NOT THE EXTENSION OF TIME SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

- [ ] 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 NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME.

Signature: Gabriel Villalobos, Project Planner
Date: 8/22/14
For Charissa Leach, Assistant TLMA Director
Gabriel,

Regarding the Second Extension of Time for Parcel Map 34343

I have just one question, is this to be a standard one year Extension of Time that you will propose. We would certainly prefer that than a shorter time frame. That is until the June 5, 2019.

We are in agreement with the conditions proposed and accept the proposed Conditions of Approval as noted per your email Dated: Thursday August 16, 2018.

We thank you for your kind consideration in this matter.

Respectfully

Jack Bishop
Project Engineer
RE: SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No. 34343.

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.

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.

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
Director’s Hearing: September 24, 2018

PROPOSED PROJECT

Case Number(s): PP18683
Area Plan: Temescal Canyon
Zoning Area/District: El Cerrito District
Supervisorial District: First District
Project Planner: Gabriel Villalobos

Applicant(s):
SBA 2012 TC Assets, LLC
c/o Mary Graydon

Charissa Leach, P.E.
Assistant TLMA Director

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The applicant of the subject case has requested an extension of time to extend the lifespan of the Plot Plan No. 18683 which is for an unmanned telecommunications facility with a 70 foot monopalm and a 230 square foot equipment shelter. The project is located south of Foster Road and west of Temescal Canyon Road.

PROJECT RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL of the FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for PLOT PLAN NO. 18683, extending the expiration date to December 17, 2028, 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
Plot Plan No. 18683 was originally approved at Director’s Hearing on March 15, 2004. A Substantial Conformance to the Minor Plot Plan was applied for on November 13, 2008 and was administratively approved on December 17, 2008.

The First Extension of Time was received July 2, 2018, ahead of the expiration date of December 17, 2018. The applicant and the County discussed conditions of approval and reached consensus on August 24, 2018.

The County Planning Department, as part of the review of this Extension of Time request, recommends the addition of one (1) new condition 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 are the recommended conditions of approval, and the correspondence from the Extension of Time applicant (August 24, 2018) indicating the acceptance of the one (1) 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 Director for approval.

This 1st extension will grant 10 years. Therefore, upon an approval action by the Planning Director, subsequent receive and file action by the Planning Commission, and the conclusion of the 10-day appeal period, this Tentative Map’s expiration date will become December 17, 2028.

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 application 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 Plot Plan 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 Plot Plan has been found to be consistent with Ordinance No. 348 (Land Use), 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 Plot Plan are proposed in conjunction with this Extension of Time. All impacts have been analyzed in order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.
Extension of Time
Environmental Determination

Project Case Number: PP18683
Original E.A. Number: 39077
Extension of Time No.: 1st EOT
Original Approval Date: March 15, 2004
Project Location: South of Foster Road, West of Temescal Canyon Road
Project Description: Plot Plan No. 18683 proposes to construct an unmanned telecommunications facility with a 70 foot monopole, and a 230 square foot equipment shelter, on a 1,200 square foot lease area within a 2.2 acre pool/spa retail business.

On March 15, 2004, this Plot Plan 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:

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME, 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.

☒ 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, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME, 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.

☐ 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, AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/INITIAL STUDY IS REQUIRED 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 WHETHER OR NOT THE EXTENSION OF TIME SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

☐ 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 NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO APPROVAL OF THE EXTENSION OF TIME.

Signature: Gabriel Villalobos, Project Planner
Date: For Charissa Leach, Assistant TLMA Director
Hi Gabriele:

Thank you for taking the time with me to explain the time extension process for cell towers this afternoon. It is now clear that what we are requesting is a time extension for the lifespan of the tower which is a ten year term. SBA accepts the condition of approval pertaining to this.

If you should require additional information or have any questions, please advise.

Thank you.

Mary Graydon
Zoning Compliance Specialist

561.981.7341 + T
561.322.2862 + F

From: Villalobos, Gabriel [mailto:GVillalo@rivco.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 3:55 PM
To: Mary Graydon <MaGraydon@sbasite.com>
Subject: [External] Recommended Conditions for PP18683 1st EOT

Attn: SBA 2012 TC Assets, LLC
c/o Mary Graydon
8051 Congress Avenue
Boca Raton, FL 33487

RE: FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST for PLOT PLAN No. 18683.

The County Planning Department has determined it necessary to recommend the addition of one (1) new condition 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.

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
951-855-6184

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
ADVISORY NOTIFICATION DOCUMENT

The following notifications are included as part of the recommendation of approval for PP18683E01. They are intended to advise the applicant of various Federal, State and County regulations applicable to this entitlement and the subsequent development of the subject property.

Planning

Planning 1  Telcom – Entitlement Life

Pursuant to Riverside County Ordinance No. 348 (Land Use), a telecommunication facility shall have an initial approval period (life) of ten (10) years, which may be extended if a revised permit application is made and approved by the original approving officer or body. Such extensions, if approved, shall be in increments of ten (10) years. The determination as to the appropriateness of such extensions shall be made, in part, on adherence to the original conditions of approval and the number of complaints, if any, received by the County. In the case of collocated facilities, the permits of all collocaters shall be automatically extended until the last collocaters permit expires. In the event that this ten (10) year maximum life span provision is removed from Riverside County Ordinance No. 348 (Land Use), this condition of approval shall become null and void.