## AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING • RIVERSIDE COUNTY •
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER
FIRST FLOOR BOARD CHAMBERS
4080 LEMON STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

If you wish to speak, please complete a “SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION FORM” and give it to the Hearing Secretary. 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).

Should an applicant or any interested party wish to present a PowerPoint presentation, or electronic or digital material, it must be provided by the Project Planner 48-hours in advance of the meeting.

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

### CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

#### SALUTE TO THE FLAG

### 1.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

1.1 NONE

### 2.0 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT INITIATION PROCEEDINGS: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter. (Presentation available upon Commissioners’ request)

2.1 NONE
3.0 PUBLIC HEARING – CONTINUED ITEMS: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter:


3.2 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 975 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Mary Etta Bollman – Engineer/Representative: David Jeffers Consulting, Inc. – Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Area – Southwest Area Plan – Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Northerly of Buena Ventura Road, southerly of Auld Road, easterly of Pourroy Road, and westerly of Borel Road – 73.65 acres – Zoning: Light Agriculture 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) – REQUEST: The applicant proposes to amend the General Plan Foundation Component and Land Use designations of the subject site from Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) to Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre) on approximately 73.65 acres. Continued from April 15, 2015. Project Planner: Larry Ross at (951) 955-9294 or email lross@rctlma.org.

4.0 PUBLIC HEARING - NEW ITEMS: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter:

4.1 NONE

5.0 WORKSHOPS:

5.1 UPDATE OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 960, EIR NO. 521, AND DRAFT CLIMATE ACTION PLAN – Kristi Lovelady, Principal Planner at (951) 955-0781 or email klovelad@rctlma.org.

6.0 ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA

7.0 DIRECTOR’S REPORT

8.0 COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT
STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The applicant proposes to amend the General Plan Foundation Component and Land use designations of the subject site from Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) to Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP) on approximately 151.47 acres. The application was submitted during the permitted time period to request foundation changes in 2008.

Change of Zone No. 7855 proposes to change the zoning on the 151.47 acre site from Heavy Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) to Industrial Park (IP).

The project is located south of Stowe Road, north of Marvin Hull Road, east of El Callado, and west of California Avenue.

BACKGROUND:

The project is requesting a Foundation Level change. The application was submitted February 14, 2008. The application for the change was submitted during the permitted window in 2008 and is therefore consistent with the ‘Certainty System’ as outlined in the General Plan.

The proposed General Plan Amendment was before the Planning Commission on February 3, 2010 and before the Board of Supervisors on April 20, 2010 as part of the General Plan Initiation process (GPIP). The project was initiated by the Board. Staff recommended approval of the initiation.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

March 25, 2015

On January 21, 2015, the project was continued by the Planning Commission to April 15, 2015 to allow the applicant to contact the surrounding community. In the intervening time, it was decided that workshop would be given to the Planning Commission on the Community of Winchester Community Plan. In order to accommodate the workshop, the applicant is requesting a further continuance to June 17, 2015.
POTENTIAL ISSUES OF CONCERN:

Highway 79 realignment

The applicant’s justification for the change from Rural Community: Estate Density Residential designation to Community Development: Business Park is that it makes sense as a result of the proposed Highway 79 realignment. The current CETAP (Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process) proposal for the realignment of Highway 79 has frontage along the project’s western border. Currently the realignment project is undergoing environmental review, and is subject to change.

The City of Hemet’s adopted Land Use Plan, last revised 6/10/14, it shows the alignment going through the project site and the placement of a metro station near or in the project site and designating the project site as Business Park.

In 2012 the Community of Winchester completed a Land Use Study, in the exhibit from that study “Community of Winchester Land Use Study, August 2012” it shows a land use designation of Business Park for the eastern portion of the project site. When the study was commissioned, there were a number of realignments proposed for Highway 79, but most have been eliminated for one reason or another. However, most of the proposed realignments that were considered in the Winchester Land Use Study either fronted on the project site or bisected the project site. And in context for the Winchester Land Use Study as whole, the designation of Business Park made sense because of the realignment of Highway 79 and other factors involved in the Winchester Land Use Study.

Regardless of the final footprint of the realignment, it is clear that the project site will have some frontage on Highway 79 and as a result has some justification for the proposed change. As that the realignment was not contemplated in the adopted 2003 General Plan, it constitutes a change in circumstances that can be considered for a Foundation Element change. When considered in isolation, the proposed Business Park designation in the middle of large area of large lot residential designations does not have the appearance of sequential planning, but when taken in context of planning for a major highway corridor it does. It is further supported by the vision for both the City of Hemet and the Community of Winchester for the project site to be changed to Community Development: Business Park.

Airport Compatibility
The Airport Land Use Commission has found that while industrial uses are more compatible with the airport than residential uses, that this change is not inherently less compatible than the existing condition. The Commission found the project consistent as proposed, but reserves its authority to review when an actual ground disturbing project is submitted. In other words, the proposed project is better that what is on the ground now or what could built in the future under the current land use designation, however the Commission is still concerned about potential industrial uses that could be a hazard to aircraft since no land use proposal accompanies the project. Such uses could include those that would have ponds that would attract birds, or uses that would cause glare or some other distraction or physical hazard to aircraft.

SB-18 Tribal Consultation
The Pechanga Tribe, through State required SB-18 consultation, has requested that any implementing project within the project area contact the Pechanga Tribe while processing any required entitlements. They additionally request to participate in all future CEQA analysis.
Highway 79 Policy Area
The current proposal is consistent with the General Plan’s Highway 79 Policy Area. The policy area requires that residential development be proposed at 9% below the mid-point of the existing designation due to transportation infrastructure and capacity deficiencies. The proposed project is changing away from residential to Business Park, thus the policy does not apply.

General Plan Findings
In order to support a proposed General Plan Amendment it must be established that the proposal satisfies certain required findings. The Administration Element of the General Plan and Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348 explain that there are four categories of amendments, Technical, Entitlement/Policy, Foundation, and Agriculture. Each category has distinct required findings that must be made by the Board of Supervisors at a noticed public hearing.

General Plan Amendment No. 973 falls into the Foundation Component- Regular category, because the request to change foundations was made during the permitted 5 year (now 8 year) General Plan Review Cycle as outlined the General Plan.

The Administration Element of the General Plan explains that two findings must be made to justify a Foundation Component- Regular amendment. Further, the Administrative Element of the General Plan explains that an Entitlement/Policy Amendment requires that three findings must be made to justify an Entitlement/Policy Amendment. As the proposed project is changing from one foundation to another, and from one designation to another, both sets of findings must be made. The five required findings are:

a. The proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with:
   (1) The Riverside County Vision.
   (2) Any General Plan Principal set forth in General Plan Appendix B.

b. The proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with any Foundation Component Designation in the General Plan.

c. The proposed amendment would either contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the General Plan or, at a minimum would not be detrimental to them.

d. The change would not create an internal inconsistency among the elements of the General Plan.

e. That there are new conditions or special circumstances that were disclosed during the review process that were unanticipated in preparing the General Plan and subsequently justify modifying the General Plan.

Consideration Analysis:

The first required finding per the General Plan Administrative Element explains that proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with either the Riverside County Vision or any General Plan principal as set forth in General Plan Appendix B.

The General Plan envisioned the area as Estate Density Residential. However, this was prior to considering the realignment of Highway 79 and urbanization of the surrounding areas. This urbanization can be seen in the forward planning documents produced by the City of Hemet and the Town of
Winchester. The County General Plan vision discusses many concepts; they are broken into categories including housing, population growth, community, transportation, etc. The project has been reviewed against these visions and staff has determined that they are consistent with them. More specifically, to select a few key concepts, the Livable Centers portion of the Riverside County Vision states that there be a mix of uses in an area. The Business Park designation breaks up the Estate Density Residential surrounding the project site. The Employment portion of the Riverside County Vision states that gainful employment is one of the most basic individual needs, and Business Park designated property provides for potential wide variety of employment opportunities for the future. Therefore, there is no conflict with the Riverside County Vision.

Principals in General Plan Appendix B consist of seven categories of principals; these categories of principals include Community Development, Environmental Protection, Transportation, Community Design, Agricultural, Rural Development, and Economic Development. The project has been reviewed against these categories and the principals within them and staff has determined that the project is consistent with those principals. There are three principals that are of special note and they specifically apply to this project.

The first principal of note is within the Community Development category, the principal is regional issues:

We must cooperate regionally to deal with the issues of mobility, transportation systems development, traffic congestion reduction, clear air, clean water, watershed management and habitat linkages. The County should coordinate with the cities, other local and regional agencies, and Indian nations to the maximum extent practicable to provide a comprehensive guide to economic and physical development, transportation and multipurpose open space in the entire County.

This project is consistent with both the General Plans for the City of Hemet and the Community Plan for the town of Winchester and shows a shared vision between these two entities which facilitates cooperation.

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

Balanced growth is achieved in more than one way by:

Ensuring a balance of jobs, housing and services within communities.

The immediate area surround the project site is primarily rural residential in nature, with a variety of lot sizes. Going out two to three miles there are a few opportunities for commercial and industrial, but they are of small acreage and as a result any projects going in will be of a small scale and small impact. The proposed project will bring more balance between jobs, housing, and services within this community by increasing both the number of jobs and potentially the amount of services depending on what types of uses ultimately go into the project site.

The third principal of note is within the Economic Development category, the principal is Land and Development Activity:

Establish sufficient acreage of well distributed industrial sites and business park uses, so that workers and employers have more locational options in the County and, because of
convenience, allow a choice of making shorter commutes.

151 acres is sufficient acreage to have a viable business park site, and this site, when projects come in under the proposed general plan designation, will provide jobs to the local community.

Therefore, based upon the above there is no conflict with the General Plan Principals in Appendix B.

**The second required finding per the General Plan Administrative Element** states that the proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with any Foundation Component Designation in the General Plan.

Upon changing the Foundation from Rural Community to Community Development, the designation change from Estate Density Residential to Business Park is consistent with Community Development Foundation. Once foundation change to Community Development has been changed, no further changes will be needed and therefore there will not be any conflict with any Foundation Component Designation in the General Plan.

**The third required finding per the General Plan Administrative Element** states that the proposed amendment would either contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the General Plan or, at a minimum would not be detrimental to them.

One of the main purposes of the General Plan is for the logical development of the County. And it was anticipated that this type of change, like the proposed project, would be coming to the area as reflected in the Land Use Concept for the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan:

The Land Use Plan reflects a significant shift from the existing rural character to a more urban/suburban/rural mix focused around unique cores. The impetus for this shift is the Diamond Valley Lake and the recreational opportunities it presents. In addition, the transit opportunities presented by the rail line, State Route 74, and State Route 79 create natural crossroads to expand upon.

Therefore based upon the above, the proposed project contributes to the purposes of the General Plan.

**The fourth required finding per the General Plan Administrative Element** is that the change would not create an internal inconsistency among the elements of the General Plan.

The County General Plan consists of nine elements; these elements include Vision, Land Use, Circulation, Multipurpose Open Space, etc. The project has been reviewed against these elements and staff has determined that the project is consistent with them and it causes no internal inconsistency among the elements. As mentioned above, the Land Use Concept of the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan anticipated this type of change; it just was not anticipated at the project site because the realignment was not considered at the time of adoption of the General Plan in 2003. Further, there are no specific policies or overlays that would prohibit the proposed change, and therefore no inconstancies would be created.

**The fifth required finding per the General Plan Administrative Element** is that there are new conditions or special circumstances that were disclosed during the review process that were unanticipated in preparing the General Plan and subsequently justify modifying the General Plan.
The new condition that occurred that was unanticipated during the preparation of the General Plan is the realignment of Highway 79 and potential impacts that would occur as a result of that realignment. The special circumstance is that the realignment will create a corridor where one did not exist before, and would create an opportunity of residents of this area to have local jobs since an insufficient number of business park acres exist in the area as reflected in both the City of Hemet General Plan and the Community of Winchester Community Plan. Therefore, this change justifies modifying the General Plan.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

1. Existing General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): Rural Community: Estate Density Residential
2. Proposed General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP)
4. Existing Zoning (Ex. #2): Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10)
5. Proposed Zoning (Ex. #2): Industrial Park (IP)
6. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #2): Light Agriculture 2 ½ acre minimum (A-1-2 ½) and Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) to the north, Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) to the south, Controlled Development Area Mobile homes (W-2-M 2 ½) to the east, and Light Agriculture 5 acre minimum (A-1-5) and Rural Residential (R-R) to the west.
7. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1): Large lot single family homes, agriculture, and vacant land.
8. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1): Large lot single family homes, agriculture, and vacant land.
9. Project Data: Total Acreage: 151.47
10. Environmental Concerns: See attached environmental assessment

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2015-001** recommending adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 973 to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors;

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:**
ADOPT a NEGATIVE DECLARATION for ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41802, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

TENTATIVELY APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 973, amending the Land Use Designation for the subject property from Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) to Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP) in accordance with the General Plan Land Use Exhibit; based on the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and, pending final adoption of the General Plan Amendment Resolution by the Board of Supervisors; and,

TENTATIVELY APPROVE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7855, amending the zoning classification for the subject property from Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) to Industrial Park (IP) in accordance with the Zoning Exhibit; based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and, pending Ordinance adoption by the Board of Supervisors.

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

1. The project site is designated Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) on the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan.

2. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Rural Community: Estate Density Residential to the north, east and south. Rural Community: Estate Density Residential and Rural: Rural Residential to the west.

3. As that the required findings for a Foundation Change – Regular and Entitlement/Policy Change are substantially the same in both the Administrative Element of the General Plan and Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of Ordinance No. 348 that the project is consistent with both the General Plan and Ordinance No. 348.

4. Based upon staff analysis the proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with the Riverside County Vision. The project further the Riverside County Vision for Livable Centers by breaking the residential homogeneity of the area and thus providing a variety of uses. The project also further the Riverside County Vision for Employment by providing the potential for a variety of employment opportunities for the project site.

5. Based upon staff analysis the proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with the Principals in General Plan Appendix B. The project further the Riverside County General Plan principals for regional issues by cooperating regionally with the visions of both the City of Hemet and the Town of Winchester for the project site. The project also further the Riverside County General Plan principals for Community Variety, Choice and Balance by changing the designation to Business Park thus creating the potential for more jobs which would increase the job to home ratio and improve the community. The final principal that further the general plan principals is the principal of Land and Development Activity principal. The Land and Development Activity principal is to "establish sufficient acreage of well distributed industrial sites and business park uses, so that workers and employers have more locational options in the County and, because of convenience, allow a choice of making shorter commutes." The proposed project is 151 acres, which is sufficient acreage for a viable business park use. Also, there are no other business park designations within several miles of the site, and the few that are 5 to 10 miles away are not of
sufficient size to be viable. And because of this, the project would be fulfilling the principal by giving more locational options to workers and employers. Therefore, based upon the above there is no conflict with General Plan Principals in General Plan Appendix B.

6. The proposed change does not involve a change in or conflict with any Foundation Component Designation in the General Plan. Upon changing the Foundation from Rural Community to Community Development, the designation change from Estate Density Residential to Business Park is consistent with Community Development Foundation. Once foundation change to Community Development has been changed, no further changes will be needed.

7. The proposed amendment would either contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the General Plan or, at a minimum would not be detrimental to them. One of the main purposes of the General Plan is for the logical development of the County. And it was anticipated that this type of change, like the proposed project, would be coming to the area as reflected in the Land Use Concept for the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan:

The Land Use Plan reflects a significant shift from the existing rural character to a more urban/suburban/rural mix focused around unique cores. The impetus for this shift is the Diamond Valley Lake and the recreational opportunities it presents. In addition, the transit opportunities presented by the rail line, State Route 74, and State Route 79 create natural crossroads to expand upon.

Therefore based upon the above, the proposed project contributes to the purposes of the General Plan.

8. The proposed project change would not create an internal inconsistency among the elements of the General Plan. The County General Plan consists of nine elements; these elements include Vision, Land Use, Circulation, Multipurpose Open Space, etc. The project has been reviewed against these elements and staff has determined that the project is consistent with them and it causes no internal inconsistency among the elements. As mentioned above, the Land Use Concept of the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan anticipated this type of change; it just was not anticipated at the project site because the realignment was not considered at the time of adoption of the General Plan in 2003. Further, there are no specific policies or overlays that would prohibit the proposed change, and therefore no inconstancies would be created.

9. There are new conditions or special circumstances that were disclosed during the review process that were unanticipated in preparing the General Plan and subsequently justify modifying the General Plan. The new condition that occurred that was unanticipated during the preparation of the General Plan is the realignment of Highway 79 and the impacts that would occur as a result of that realignment. The special circumstance is that the realignment will create a corridor where one did not exist before, and would create an opportunity of residents of this area to have local jobs since an insufficient number business park acres exist in the area as reflected in both the City of Hemet General Plan and the Community of Winchester Community Plan. This change justifies modifying the General Plan.

10. The zoning for the subject site is Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10).

11. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Light Agriculture 2 ½ acre minimum (A-1-2 ½) and Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) to the north, Heavy Agriculture 10
acre minimum (A-2-10) to the south, Controlled Development Area Mobile homes (W-2-M 2½) to the east, and Light Agriculture 5 acre minimum (A-1-5) and Rural Residential (R-R) to the west.

12. The proposed Business Park Land Use Designation and the proposed Industrial Park zoning are consistent. The Business Park land use designation allows for employee-intensive uses, including research and development, technology centers, corporate and support office uses, "clean" industry and supporting retail uses. Building intensity ranges from 0.25 to 0.6 floor area ratio (FAR). Industrial Park zoning allows for research and development, technology centers, corporate and support office uses, "clean" industry and supporting retail uses. Therefore, the Business Park Land Use Designation and the Industrial Park zoning are consistent.

13. This project is not located within a Criteria Area of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

14. Environmental Assessment No. 41802 did not identify any potentially significant impacts.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the proposed Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP) Land Use Designation, and with all other elements of the Riverside County General Plan.

2. The proposed project is consistent with the proposed Industrial Park (IP) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.

3. The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.

4. The proposed project is compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.

5. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

6. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP).

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

1. As of this writing, no letters, in support have been received. Three letters of opposition to the project were received during the Airport Land Use Commission hearings and all are dated January of 2011.

2. The project site is not located within:
   a. The city of Hemet sphere of influence;
   b. An area drainage plan, or dam inundation area;
   c. California Gnatcatcher, Quino Checkerspot Butterfly habitat; or
   d. High fire area.

3. The project site is located within:
   a. The Valley Wide Recreation and Parks District;
   b. The southern portion of the project is within a mapped 100-year flood plain;
   c. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area; and
d. Both high and moderate areas of liquefaction.

The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 465260004, 465260002, 465260005, 465270001, 465270002, 465270003, 465270004, 465260001, 465260006, and 465260003.
RESOLUTION

RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2015-001

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section(s) 65350/65450 et. seq., public hearings were held before the Riverside County Planning Commission in Riverside, California on January 21, 2015, to consider the above-referenced matter; and,

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

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

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

ADOPTION of the Negative Declaration environmental document, Environmental Assessment No. 41802; and

ADOPTION of General Plan Amendment No. 973
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Justification for Amendment: (attachment to page 5 of 8)
APNs: 465-260-001 & All

The subject site is an assemblage of 10 parcels totaling approximately 152 acres of land located just east of a major arterial highway (Winchester Road) and bounded by Stowe Road on the north, El Callado on the west and Grand Avenue on the south. The consensus owners of the assemblage feel that, over the next several years, the area should slowly grow and change slightly in life-style as the properties to the southwest have. The properties to the southwest area currently designated “LDR” in the Community Development Foundation of the General Plan. As those LDR properties develop they will bring Schedule “A” type improvements to the area that will spread to the subject site. The roadway network around the assemblage has dedications in place allowing for Schedule “A” improvements without additional dedications for “backbone” infrastructure.

Simply stated the owners of the assemblage feel the area is changing and that their 152 acres should be granted a foundation change as was granted to their neighbors to the southwest.
Community of Winchester

Figure 4 - Adjacent Land Use Planning
CETAP
Fact Sheet

BACKGROUND: Western Riverside County is expected to grow by more than 1 million residents in the next 25 years, stressing our roads, utilities, schools and homes. Riverside County’s Blueprint for Tomorrow maps out a comprehensive plan to meet future transportation, conservation and housing needs.

The transportation element of the Blueprint, called the Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP), will identify four possible new highway routes as well as public transit opportunities. Two of the routes are entirely within Riverside County, while two would connect to adjacent counties (inter-county corridors).

The two routes proposed within Riverside County (internal corridors) are:
- Winchester to Temecula (North – South)
- Hemet to Corona/Lake Elsinore (East – West)

Environmental impact studies for the two internal were released for public review in July 2002.

GOAL: To improve traffic flow within Riverside County and provide better access to jobs, homes and public facilities.

DECISION PROCESS:
- Decision of a final route for each corridor is needed to preserve right-of-way for future construction of the new highways
- Environmental documents will provide the basis for the decisions
- The public had 119 days to review environmental documents and submit written comments
- RCTC held public hearings in August 2002, December 2002 and January 2003 on the environmental documents for the internal corridors; public hearings for the inter-county corridors will be held following the completion of their environmental studies
- RCTC will choose the locally-preferred alternative for the two internal corridors following review of public input
- Approval of the final routes will be made by RCTC, and state and federal agencies

BENEFITS:
- Commuters in corridor areas will get as much as 1½ to 2 hours more per week to spend with their families
- Internal corridors will save Riverside County residents as much as $40-70 million per year in transportation costs
- Less traffic means less stress for motorists
- Better access to jobs, homes and public facilities
Figure 1 - Highway 79 Re-alignment Alternatives
I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: The General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Foundation Component and Land use designations of the subject site from Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) to Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP) on approximately 151.47 acres. The application was submitted during the permitted time period to request foundation changes in 2008. Change of Zone No. 7855 proposes to change the zoning on the 151.47 acre site from Heavy Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) to Industrial Park (IP).

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

C. Total Project Area: 151.47 acres

- Residential Acres: n/a
- Commercial Acres: n/a
- Industrial Acres: 151.47
- Lots: n/a
- Lots: 1
- Units: n/a
- Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: n/a
- Est. No. of Employees: n/a
- Projected No. of Residents: n/a

D. Assessor’s Parcel No(s): 465260004, 465260002, 465260005, 465270001, 465270002, 465270003, 465270004, 465260001, 465260006, and 465260003.

E. Street References: South of Stowe Road, North of Marvin Hull Road, east of El Callido, and west of California Avenue.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Section 23, Township 5 South, Range 2 West

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: Large lot single family homes, agriculture, and vacant land.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. Land Use: Once the project is approved, the project is consistent with the provisions of the Land Use Element.

2. Circulation: The project is consistent with the Highway 79 policy area provisions, and all other policies of the Circulation Element.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space**: The project is consistent with the policies of the Open Space Element.

4. **Safety**: The project is consistent with the policies of the Safety Element.

5. **Noise**: The project is consistent with the policies of the Noise Element.

6. **Housing**: The project is consistent with the policies of the Housing Element.

7. **Air Quality**: The project is consistent with the policies of the Air Quality Element.

B. **General Plan Area Plan(s)**: Harvest Valley/Winchester

C. **Foundation Component(s)**: Rural Community

D. **Land Use Designation(s)**: Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size)

E. **Overlay(s), if any**: N/A

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

G. **Adjacent and Surrounding**:

1. **Area Plan(s)**: Harvest Valley/Winchester to the north, south, east and west

2. **Foundation Component(s)**: Rural Community to the north, west, east and south.

3. **Land Use Designation(s)**: Rural Community: Estate Density Residential to the north, east and south. Rural Community: Estate Density Residential and Rural: Rural Residential to the west.

4. **Overlay(s), if any**: None.

5. **Policy Area(s), if any**: Highway 79 Policy Area to the north, south, east, and west.

H. **Adopted Specific Plan Information**

1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any**: N/A

2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any**: N/A

I. **Existing Zoning**: Heavy Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10).

J. **Proposed Zoning, if any**: Industrial Park (IP).

K. **Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning**: zoned Light Agriculture 2 ½ acre minimum (A-1-2 ½) and Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) to the north, Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) to the south, Controlled Development Area Mobile homes (W-2-M 2 ½) to the east, and Light Agriculture 5 acre minimum (A-1-5) and Rural Residential (R-R) to the west.
III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below ( x ) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture & Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Other:
- Other:
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

☐ I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An ADDENDUM to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

☐ I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

☐ I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR.
or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Signature

December 1, 2014

Date

Larry Ross, project planner

For Juan C Perez, Interim Planning Director

Printed Name
V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the project. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS Would the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scenic Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure 9 in the Southwest Area Plan- "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project is not located along any scenic highway corridors in the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area plan. The two closest Scenic Highway Corridors are Interstate 215 and Highway 74. This project will not impact any scenic highway corridors.

The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to scenic resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

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

a) The proposed project is located within Zone b of the Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area according to figure 6 in the Southwest Area Plan section of the General Plan. However, the project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts.

The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to scenic resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to scenic resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES** Would the project

4. Agriculture

   a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or

   [Box checked: No]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 &quot;Right-to-Farm&quot;)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is located within an area of designated "local importance" and "other lands" in the General Plan. Farmland of Local Importance is either currently producing, or has the capability of production, but does not meet the criteria of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland. The California State Department of Conservation makes these designations based on soil types and land use designations. However, the current Land Use designations for the property do not permit commercial agricultural use. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) There are no Williamson Act contracts on the site. The zoning on the property is zoned Heavy Agricultural 10 Acre Minimum which is intended for intense agricultural uses and the General Plan has a Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) designation which is intended primarily for large lot single family residential with possible limited agriculture and animal keeping. As a result, the current zoning is inconsistent with the General Plan. However, the proposed general plan designation and proposed zoning will be consistent with each other. Therefore, with the change to the general plan and zoning there will be no conflicts with agricultural zoning. There are no substantial impacts.

c-d) The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts to neighboring agriculturally zoned properties. There are no substantial impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

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

| b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The County has no forest land zoning, nor is the property forested. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**AIR QUALITY Would the project**

6. **Air Quality Impacts**

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

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook

Findings of Fact:

a-f) The proposed land use change would result in an intensification of the use on the site, in terms of building and traffic trips. However, the amount of the increase is too speculative to provide a detailed analysis at this stage. This is a programmatic level CEQA analysis. The General Plan includes
assumptions that could be used to estimate floor to area ratio, but the new water quality requirements for the State’s mandated Low Impact Development (LID) standards will result in a lower density yield on development of all designations. The proposed change will eliminate residential and create industrial, thus decreasing the population for the area, thus not impacting the local Air Quality Management Plans. There are no point source emitters within 1 mile of the proposed site. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts to air quality. At this stage, the impacts are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** Would the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Wildlife &amp; Vegetation</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

b) The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12). The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

c) The proposed project does not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

d) The proposed project does not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

e) The proposed project does not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the
California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The proposed project
does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no
potential for any impacts to biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan
designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property.
Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on
the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is
submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing
potential impacts. Therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

f) The proposed project does not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands
as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool,
coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. The proposed
project does not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural
community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of
Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The proposed project does not provide the
opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts to
biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site,
which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development
proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated
with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent
review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the
impacts are less than significant.

g) The proposed project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological
resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The proposed project does not provide
the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts
to biological resources. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site,
which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development
proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated
with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent
review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the
impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Historic Resources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Alter or destroy an historic site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:
a-b) Based on aerial maps, there are no historic sites on the property. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential ground disturbing cultural impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

9. Archaeological Resources
   a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.
   b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?
   c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
   d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts. As a result, no site specific archeological studies were requested. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

Additionally, the Pechanga Tribe, through State required SB-18 consultation, has requested that any implementing project within the project area contact the Pechanga Tribe while processing any required entitlements. The Pechanga Tribe also wanted to go on record that they consider the project site a “Traditional Cultural Property(TCP).” They additionally request to participate in all future CEQA analysis.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

10. Paleontological Resources
   a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?
Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity"

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan the project is in an area of high sensitivity (high B) and small portions are low sensitivity on the eastern side of the site. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts at this stage. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Without ground disturbance the project's impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

GEOLOGY AND SOILS  Would the project

11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones
   a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?
   b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments

Findings of Fact:

a-b) According to the General Plan, there are no map fault zones within or near the project site. There are no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone
   a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction"
Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, the majority of project site is mapped as areas of high liquefaction potential, with the northwest portion of the site mapped as moderate liquefaction potential. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts at this stage. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore the project’s impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

13. Ground-shaking Zone
   a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking? □ □ ☒ □

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map,” and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk)

Findings of Fact:

a) Every project in California has some degree of potential exposure to significant ground shaking. The proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. This will include adherence to the California Building code, Title 24, which will mitigate to some degree, the potential for ground shaking impacts. Therefore the project’s impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

14. Landslide Risk
   a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards? □ □ □ ☒

Source: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 “Regions Underlain by Steep Slope”
Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is generally flat and based on exhibit S-5 from the General Plan, there are no steep slopes that could potentially result in landslides. There will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

15. Ground Subsidence
   a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 “Documented Subsidence Areas Map”

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, Figure S-7, the site is in an area potentially susceptible to subsidence. For the purposes of a stand-alone General Plan Amendment, the indicated level of subsidence does not preclude the potential development of the property at any level. Therefore, there are no substantial impacts based on the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

16. Other Geologic Hazards
   a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?


Findings of Fact:

a) Diamond Valley Lake is located about 1.9 miles to the east of the project site. The project site is not located within a Dam Inundation zone for Diamond Valley Lake. Based on the above, the potential for seiche or inundation is considered low. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing
potential impacts. As that no human occupation or ground disturbance is proposed with this project the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

17. Slopes
   a) Change topography or ground surface relief features? □ □ □ □ □
   b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet? □ □ □ □ □
   c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems? □ □ □ □ □

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project proposes no grading or construction of any kind, therefore there are no potential impacts to or from slopes. As was previously explained, the site is generally flat. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

18. Soils
   a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? □ □ □ □ □
   b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? □ □ □ □ □
   c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? □ □ □ □ □

Source: Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:
a-c) The project proposes no grading or construction of any kind; therefore there are no potential impacts to soils or septic tanks. The project proposes to increase the intensity of the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore there is no impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

---

**19. Erosion**

  a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?
  
  b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?

**Source:** Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection

**Findings of Fact:**

a-b) The project proposes no grading or construction of any kind; therefore there are no potential impacts to or from erosion. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore there is no impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

---

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

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

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

**Findings of Fact:**

a) According to General Plan figure S-8 the project is not located in an area of high wind erosion. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is
submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore there is no impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

|☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

Source: Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a.-b.) The proposed project is a General Plan Amendment only, there is no ground disturbance proposed. The proposed amendment will increase the potential intensity of the site, which would have an increase in potential impacts because there could be more traffic trips in the area (traffic trips are the largest generator of greenhouse gasses in this area). However, this CEQA analysis is intended to be a programmatic CEQA level review. Any future implementing project on this site will be required to comply with California’s AB-32 greenhouse gas reduction requirement. At this stage, it is too speculative to review the specific potential impacts as the size of the proposed development (implementing project) is not known. Additionally, many of the identified potential mitigation for GHG impacts are implemented at the construction level of development. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore the project’s impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

|☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?  ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Source:  Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b, d-e) The project proposes no grading or construction of any kind; therefore there are no potential impacts that could result from the transportation of hazardous materials; nor will the proposed change in land use density result in an increased potential for generating anything hazardous. The site is not listed as a hazardous materials site. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project has no impact.

c) The project will result in higher development intensity of the site than was proposed in the General Plan in 2003. The increase in intensity may result in an overburden of streets previously identified as evacuation routes for other projects. However, the Transportation Department will require any future development proposals on the site to add mitigation to those projects to assure the streets will accommodate adequate emergency provisions. Therefore, the project has no significant impact.

Mitigation:  No mitigation is required

Monitoring:  No monitoring is required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Airports</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings of Fact:

a-d) Based on the General Plan, figure S-19, the project is located within the Hemet Ryan Airport Influence area, and a portion of the site is the Transition Area (the outer 330 feet of Area II). The project was reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission on February 10, 2011 and was found consistent with the plan. Therefore the project is consistent with Airport Master Plans. The project would not result in a safety for people working or residing in the area as that the project is consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project has no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

24. Hazardous Fire Area

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to General Plan Figure S-11 the project is not located within a Wildfire Susceptibility Area. The project is not within a high fire area, and the project is not located within a state fire responsibility area. As that the project proposes no physical changes to the property, therefore it will not expose people or structures to any risk. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project has no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

25. Water Quality Impacts

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b)</th>
<th>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors or odors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Riverside County Flood Control District Review, GIS database.

**Findings of Fact:**

a-h) The southeast corner of project is located within a mapped flood zone. However, the project proposes no grading or construction of any kind; therefore there are no potential impacts to or from flood hazards. There is no land alteration proposed at this time that would alter any flows, violate any standards, impact ground water resources, create any runoff, or require any BMP’s. No additional study of the current conditions was performed at this time because the proposed General Plan Amendment is not proposing any ground alteration at this time. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts which will include a hydrology analysis. Therefore the project has no impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required
26. **Floodplains**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA - Not Applicable ☒</td>
<td>U - Generally Unsuitable ☐</td>
<td>R - Restricted ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?

c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?

d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood letter dated September 22, 2010, GIS database

**Findings of Fact:**

a, b, d) The southeast corner of the project is located within a flood zone. The project proposes no grading or construction of any kind; therefore there are no potential impacts to or from flood hazards. There is no land alteration proposed at this time that would alter any flows, violate any standards, impact ground water resources, create any runoff, or require any BMP’s. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project has no impact.

c) The project is not within a dam inundation area, and the project does not propose any structures and would not expose people injury or death involving flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project has a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required
planned land use of an area?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials, City of Hemet General Plan Land Use Plan

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project will result in changes to the Land Use patterns in the area. The area is currently designated for residential uses with a 2 acre minimum lot size. The General Plan when it was adopted in 2003 did not anticipate the realignment of Highway 79 through or adjacent to the proposed project site.

The City of Hemet in anticipation of expanding its borders in the future has planned the project site in its General Plan adopted January 24, 2012 and surrounding area as Business Park as a result of the proposed highway 79 realignment. They also anticipate a Metrolink station to be placed in the project site or somewhere near the project site.

The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. For these reasons, the Land Use and zoning impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

28. Planning

a) Be consistent with the site’s existing or proposed zoning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?

c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?

d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Findings of Fact:
The project includes a Change of Zone to insure the General Plan and zoning are consistent. The project is consistent with the City of Hemet’s General Plan. The proposed Land Use change is consistent with all policies of the General Plan and will not be dividing the physical arrangement of any communities. As previously stated, the potential impacts in this Environmental Assessment are being evaluated for the Land Use only. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. For these reasons, the Land Use and zoning impacts are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the project

29. Mineral Resources
   a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?
      - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
      - ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
      - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
      - ☒ No Impact
   b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
      - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
      - ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
      - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
      - ☒ No Impact
   c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?
      - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
      - ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
      - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
      - ☒ No Impact
   d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?
      - ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
      - ☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
      - ☐ Less Than Significant Impact
      - ☒ No Impact

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 “Mineral Resources Area”, GIS

**Findings of Fact:**

a-d) According to the General Plan figure OS-5 the project is in MRZ-3a, which means that the project site is located in an area known to have mineral resources, but the significance of the deposit is undetermined. However, the project proposes no grading or construction of any kind; therefore there are no potential impacts to or from mineral resources. There are no known mines on or near the site. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>Would the project result in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings**

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

- NA - Not Applicable
- A - Generally Acceptable
- B - Conditionally Acceptable
- C - Generally Unacceptable
- D - Land Use Discouraged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. Airport Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 “Airport Locations,” County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

**Findings of Fact:**

a-b) According to the General Plan, Figure S-19, the project is located within an airport influence area. As that the project site is currently vacant land and large lot residential and that the project proposes no physical changes to the property, therefore it will not expose people to excessive noise levels. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project has no impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31. Railroad Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 “Circulation Plan”, GIS database, On-site Inspection

**Findings of Fact:**

The south-east portion of the project is located near a railroad, however the proposed project does not provide the opportunity for physical disturbance of the property; therefore, there is no potential for any impacts from railroad noise. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is
submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, there is no significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

### 32. Highway Noise

| Source: Project Application Materials |

Findings of Fact:

The project site is currently approximately 2,500 feet from Highway 79 and directly adjacent to Marvin Hull Road. The proposed highway 79 re-alignment would either bisect the site or run along the western edge of the site and bring substantially more noise than the current levels. However, it is unknown at this time what type of use will go in at this project site, it may or may not have sensitive receptors that would be impacted by highway noise. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, there is no significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

### 33. Other Noise

| Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database |

Findings of Fact:

The project is not located near any other source of potential noise, therefore, there will be no impacts from other noise.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

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

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

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

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? □ □ ✗ □

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Table N-1 ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure"); Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-d) The project proposes no grading or construction of any kind. With no structures proposed on the site, and no expressed use permitted, no additional noise analysis is required at this time. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project will not cause significant impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

35. Housing

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? □ □ ✗ □

b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income? □ □ □ ✗

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? □ □ ✗ □

d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area? □ □ □ ✗

e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? □ □ ✗ □

f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? □ □ □ ✗

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element
Findings of Fact:

a-f) The project site is not in a redevelopment area. There are currently few residential structures on the subject site, so no or little displacement will occur. The proposed project will change the Land Use to Business Park, thus potentially adding a demand for additional housing through the creation of jobs. The proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project will not cause significant impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

**PUBLIC SERVICES** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Fire Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

The project would result in an increased need for all public services, including fire. However, the costs associated with the increased need are addressed through the County's Development Impact Fees which would be required of all development on the subject site. As such, the impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

| 37. Sheriff Services |    |    | ☒ |    |

Source: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The project would result in an increased need for all public services, including the Sheriff. However, the costs associated with the increased need are addressed through the County's Development Impact Fees which would be required of all development on the subject site. As such, the impacts would be less than significant.
### Mitigation
- No mitigation is required

### Monitoring
- No monitoring is required

#### 38. Schools

**Source:** GIS database

**Findings of Fact:**
The project would not result in an increased need for schools. As such, the impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

#### 39. Libraries

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan

**Findings of Fact:**
The project would not result in an increased need for books and materials for libraries. As such, the impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

#### 40. Health Services

**Source:** Riverside County General Plan

**Findings of Fact:**
The project would result in an increased need for all public services, including the Heath services. However, health care is generally driven by market forces and any increase in population is generally addressed through market demand forces. As such, the impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

### RECREATION

#### 41. Parks and Recreation

- Would the project include recreational facilities or

  a) No

  b) Yes

  c) No impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Is the project located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

**Findings of Fact:**

a-c) The project site is located within the Valley Wide Recreation and Park District. There are no trails or parks proposed or required near the site. Quimby fees are not required on industrial development. There will be no impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

### 42. Recreational Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

**Findings of Fact:**

See 41.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

#### 43. Circulation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Riverside County General Plan, Highway 79 Policy

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is located within the Highway 79 Policy Area of the General Plan. The current proposal is consistent with the General Plan’s Highway 79 Policy Area. The policy area requires that residential development be proposed at 9% below the mid-point of the existing designation due to transportation infrastructure and capacity deficiencies. The proposed project is changing away from residential to Business Park, thus the policy does not apply. The details of the implementing will drive the consistency with any other circulation plans, the Land Use change, by itself, is consistent with the circulation plans.

b) The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. As previously explained, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

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

e-i) The project is not proposing any development at the time, therefore there are no design changes to the streets or roads that may increase hazard due to road design. The increase in density will create a need to evaluate the impacts to the existing street design; however, the potential impacts
would be too speculative at this stage, because the actual level of impact from the implementing development is not known at this time. The proposed change does not conflict with any adopted policies regarding public transit, bikeways or pedestrian access because the site is rural today, and the proposed change will maintain the rural nature of the area. The efficiency of transit will not change, and therefore not impact any policies regarding transit or other alternative means of travel. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Bike Trails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source: Riverside County General Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings of Fact:**

See 41.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Project Materials

**Findings of Fact:**

a-b) The project is not proposing any construction at this time. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. An assessment of the availability of water to service the area will be required prior to the approval of an implementing project. This will include a commitment from the water purveyor in that area to provide water to the site (beyond that which already exists). Many of the homes in the area currently use well water. The increase intensity will likely require connection to a public water system, the construction of which will have potential impacts. However, at this stage, the specific size and need of water infrastructure to the area would be too speculative to analyze.
the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the project’s impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

46. Sewer
   a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
   b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

Source: Project Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project is not proposing any construction at this time. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher intensity of development on the property. The homes near project site are currently using septic systems. Specific permitting is required prior to the use of any septic system or sewer system. At this stage, the specific size and need of sewer infrastructure to the area would be too speculative to analyze. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

47. Solid Waste
   a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
   b) Does the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
Source: Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project is not proposing any construction at this time. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher level of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and EA shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Electricity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Natural gas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Communications systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Storm water drainage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Street lighting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Other governmental services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-g) The project is not proposing any construction at this time. At this stage, the specific size and need of infrastructure to the area would be too speculative to analyze. However, the proposed project will change the General Plan designation for the site, which could eventually lead to a higher intensity of development on the property. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

49. Energy Conservation
   a) Would the project conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans?

   [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]
Source:

Findings of Fact:

a) The County has no specific energy conservation plans that would conflict with the project.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

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

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The proposal will increase the density of the area, which could potentially impact CEQA study areas cumulatively. At this stage, the specific level of changes is not known, as there is no construction proposed with this project. Once a development proposal or land use application to subsequently subdivide, grade, or build on the property associated with General Plan Amendment No. 973 and Change of Zone No. 7855 is submitted, a subsequent review and Environmental Assessment shall be prepared assessing potential impacts.

52. Does the project have environmental effects that will

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have environmental effects that will
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**Source:** Staff review, project application

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

**VI. EARLIER ANALYSES**

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

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

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

**VII. AUTHORITIES CITED**
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EA for GPA00945D1
LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
INITIAL CASE TRANSMITTAL
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

DATE: August 25, 2010

TO:
Riv. Co. Transportation Dept.
Riv. Co. Flood Control District
Riv. Co. Fire Department

Riv. Co. Dept. of Bldg. & Safety - Grading
Regional Parks & Open Space District.
Riv. Co. Environmental Programs Dept.
P.D. Geology Section-D. Jones
P.D. Trails Section-K. Lovelady
P.D. Landscaping Section-R. Dyo
P.D. Archaeology Section-L. Mouriquand
Eastern Information Center (UCR)


NOTE: This project is a stand-alone General Plan Land Use amendment, no implementing project is proposed. Please provide a comment letter from your department.

Please review the attached map(s) and/or exhibit(s) for the above-described project. This case is scheduled for a LDC meeting on September 30, 2010. All LDC Members please have draft conditions in the Land Management System on or before the above date. If it is determined that the attached map(s) and/or exhibit(s) are not acceptable, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing on or before the above date. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing.

All other transmitted entities, please have your comments, questions and recommendations to the Planning Department on or before the above date. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this project, please do not hesitate to contact Jeff Horn, Project Planner, at (951) 955-4641 or email at JHORN@rtlma.org / MAILSTOP# 1070.

COMMENTS:

DATE: __________________________ SIGNATURE: __________________________

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: __________________________

TELEPHONE: __________________________

If you do not include this transmittal in your response, please include a reference to the case number and project planner’s name. Thank you.

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\GPA00973\Administrative\GPA00973_LDC Initial Transmittal Form.doc
Good Morning Mr. Ross:

Sorry for the last minute response. This property is located within Valley-Wide’s jurisdiction and therefore will be subject to pay quimby fees at the current rate at time of development. Additionally, if the applicant is requesting streetscape landscaping or basin maintenance to be performed by Valley-Wide, a CFD annexation into the Winchester LMD will be required prior to map approval or grading. We have no additional concerns at this time.

Please call me at 951-654-1505 if you have any questions.

Regards,

Loretta
RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
September 22, 2010

Riverside County
Planning Department
County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92501

Attention: Jeff Horn, Project Planner

Dear Mr. Horn:

Re: General Plan Amendment 00973
Area: Winchester

We have reviewed this case and have the following comments:

Our review indicates that the topography of the site is relatively flat with a mild slope that directs runoff southerly. The site is subject to sheet flow runoff from the hills to the north. These flows eventually reach Salt Creek Channel. A majority of the properties are shown within the Zone X shaded floodplain limits as delineated on Panel No. 06065C – 2080G and 2085G of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued in conjunction with the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Some flood control facilities will be required to fully develop to the implied density.

Questions concerning this matter may be referred to Eric Russell of this office at 951.955.1211.

Very truly yours,

MEKBIB DEGAGA
Engineering Project Manager

EWR:blj
LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
INITIAL CASE TRANSMITTAL
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

DATE: August 25, 2010

TO:
Riv. Co. Transportation Dept.
Riv. Co. Flood Control District
Riv. Co. Fire Department

Riv. Co. Dept. of Bldg. & Safety - Grading
Regional Parks & Open Space District.
Riv. Co. Environmental Programs Dept.
P.D. Geology Section-D. Jones

P.D. Trails Section-K. Lovelady
P.D. Landscaping Section-R. Dyo
P.D. Archaeology Section-L. Mouriquand


NOTE: This project is a stand-alone General Plan Land Use amendment, no implementing project is proposed. Please provide a comment letter from your department.

Please review the attached map(s) and/or exhibit(s) for the above-described project. This case is scheduled for a LDC meeting on September 30, 2010. All LDC Members please have draft conditions in the Land Management System on or before the above date. If it is determined that the attached map(s) and/or exhibit(s) are not acceptable, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing on or before the above date. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing.

All other transmitted entities, please have your comments, questions and recommendations to the Planning Department on or before the above date. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this project, please do not hesitate to contact Matt Strake, Project Planner, at (951) 855-4641 or email at JHORN@rctima.org / MAILSTOP# 1070.

COMMENTS: (EO and AEP studies may be required)

DATE: 9/27/10

SIGNATURE:

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE:

TELEPHONE: 

If you do not include this transmittal in your response, please include a reference to the case number and project planner’s name. Thank you.

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\GPA00973\Administrative\GPA00973_LDC Initial Transmittal Form.doc
February 10, 2011

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

RE: AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION (ALUC) DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
File No.: ZAP1021HR10
Related File No.: GPA00973 (General Plan Amendment)

Dear Ms. Harrison:

On February 10, 2011, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), by a 5-1 vote, found the above-referenced general plan amendment CONSISTENT with the 1992 Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (HRACALUP).

The general plan amendment is described as follows: A proposal to amend the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan’s land use designation on a 151.5-acre site located southerly of Stowe Road, easterly of El Callado, and northerly of Grand Avenue (within the unincorporated community of Winchester) from Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) to Business Park (BP).

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

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

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

Sincerely,

RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Edward C. Cooper, Director

JGJG: bks

Attachments: Notice of Airport in Vicinity

cc: ALUC Staff
    David Jeffers Consulting (Representative)
    Leo and Betty Wesselink (Stowe Road address) (Owner)
Sharon Haagsma (Owner)
Larry and Jannette Curti (Redlands) (Owner)
Marianne and Brooke Atkins, c/o Sharon Haagsma (Owner)
Unified Aircraft Service (Owner)
John and Karla Brewer (Owner)
Terry and Carolyn Dean (Neighboring Property Owner)
Joann Houk (Neighboring Property Owner)
Scott and Sandra Smith (Neighboring Property Owner)
Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation (Attn.: Chad Davies)
NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you. Business & Professions Code Section 11010 (b) (13)(A)
January 12, 2011

Ms. Tamara Harrison  
County of Riverside Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street 
Riverside, CA 92501 

Re: General Plan Amendment No. 00973 

Dear Ms. Harrison: 

I would like to go on record as opposing the above action for the following reasons: 

I am a homeowner located directly across El Collado Road (4.19 acres on the Southwest corner of El Collado and Milan Roads). 

I am very concerned about this type of business operation coming into this quiet neighborhood. I cannot imagine that a Business Park would be the best use of their beautiful property, given the remote location in among homes on all sides. 

Some of the issues from my perspective would be the added traffic and resultant noise and dust that would be generated. This would also affect the air quality, which is already not the best. Many of the neighbors also have animals which would be affected by this. 

One of the things that I have enjoyed most is the beautiful view of the San Jacinto Mountains from both my kitchen and living room windows. I cannot imagine looking out at a mass of concrete block buildings instead. I had expected that some type of residential development would go in there at some point. 

Last, but certainly not least, is the effect all of this would most likely have on our property values, which we had hoped would be already at the bottom. But, in all honesty, I don’t know who would want to buy there if this project is completed. 

Respectfully submitted, 

Joann Houk 
33895 Milan Road 
Winchester, CA 92596 
(951-764-8284)
January 10, 2011

Scott & Sandra Smith
34240 Stowe Road
Winchester, CA 92596

Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
4080 Lemon Street, 14th Floor
Riverside, California 92501
Attn: Tamara Harrison

Dear Ms. Harrison,

My wife and I are writing to you regarding the proposed re-zoning per County Case Nos. GPA 00973 (General Plan Amendment). The proposal to amend the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan's Land use designation on the 151.5-acre site, located southerly of Stowe Road, easterly of El Callado, and northerly of Grand Avenue within the unincorporated community of Winchester from Rural Community (EDR-RC) to Business Park (BP) is a BAD idea. My wife and I run a small horse ranch directly north of the proposed re-zoning site (literally across the street) and the proposed re-zoning would cause an increase in the local traffic, danger to our animals and further devalue our existing home values which have already taken a severe decrease in value from the recession. We moved out here in 2005 specifically because of the rural area which was a nice area for us and our animals. The proposed re-zoning would inevitably change the nature of our area in a negative way. If in the event the proposed business park were to have nicer businesses, they would be opposed to having a horse ranch directly opposite them and would complain and try to get us to move or re-zone our area forcing us out. In another event, the business could be industrial in nature and would de-value our property — and probably still not want to be opposite a horse ranch. So in either case, there is not a situation where the proposed land use re-zoning would not be harmful to us. We respectfully strongly urge you and those who make the decisions regarding land use to NOT change the proposed zoning in our area. Thank you,

Sincerely,

Scott W. Smith, CPA
January 12, 2011

Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
C/O: Russell Brady and or John Guerin
4080 Lemon St. 14th. Floor
Riverside, Ca. 92501

In regards to: Riverside County Case Nos. GPA 00973
Subject: Proposed General Plan amendment for 151.5 acre site

Dear Sirs,

We are writing this letter to say that we are impelled to oppose the proposal to rezone the above noted property from Estate Density Residential with 2 acre minimum lot sizes to Business Park zoning.

The entire area under the General Plan is zoned Estate Density Residential, this zone change would be placed in the middle of a residential area. This would be spot zoning and would appear to have a potential negative impact on the residences in the area. We believe this action is normally considered illegal unless as in some occasions the exception was made in the best interest of the community. This would be where a park or community center would be proposed. It would not normally be for the benefit of individual investors or self serving an individual, but for the community good.

In addition to the above, our concerns would be at least if not more as follows:

1. The potential traffic impact on the residential area. The added commercial traffic could be substantial. No traffic studies have been presented that we are aware of.

2. The increased density upon the area in question, especially in consideration of the future airport runway adjustments.

3. The impact on the air quality of the area.

4. The potential negative impact on the residences in regards to property values, quality of life issues, effects upon animal life at residences.

5. No developmental plans and or environmental impact studies have been presented.

We do request that careful consideration be given this zone change request as at this juncture, it would appear to not be in the best interest of the community and it would have a negative impact. It clearly goes against the General Plan for this area, it was this General Plan that encouraged many of the owner to invest into their homes and land.

Respectfully,

Terry and Carolyn Dean

Cc. Tamara Harrison, Riverside County Planning Department fax: 951-955-1811
June 14, 2011

Ms. Halimah Shenghur  
County of Riverside  
4080 Lemon St. – 12th Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

RE: Change in “Applicant” for General Plan Amendment Applications

Dear Ms. Shenghur,

Per your request today at the County offices, we are sending this to initiate changes to the “Applicants” for the General Plan Amendment applications for GPAs 00925, 00926, 00928, 00973, 00974, 00975, 00977, 00978 and 00983.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc. is currently listed as applicant for the above cases and we now would like each “Applicant” to be changed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>New Applicant Name and Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00925</td>
<td>Mr. Paul Attyah / Lubec Properties, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>908 South Granville Avenue #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 310.562.5153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00926</td>
<td>Andy and Cindy Domenigoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31851 Winchester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 951.926.6924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00928</td>
<td>Michael and Hennie Monteleone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35245 Briggs Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murrieta 92563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 951.538.6543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #</td>
<td>New Applicant Name and Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00973</td>
<td>Leo and Betty Wesselink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 00983</td>
<td>9590 Nacimiento Lake Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Robles, CA 93446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 805.238.5222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00974</td>
<td>Neal Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33121 Christine Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 949.285.5973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00975</td>
<td>Mary Etta Bollman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32573 Auld Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 951.283.2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00977</td>
<td>Norm Gritton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27245 Highway 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perris, CA 92570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 951.315.5130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA 00978</td>
<td>J. Foster Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30100 Los Alamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murrieta, CA 92563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 951.202.5509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Halimah Shengur
June 14, 2011
Page 3 of 3

Thank you for transferring the Applicant’s name and address to those listed above. All future requests for additional County fees should be sent to the new applicant with a copy to David Jeffers Consulting, Inc. who is now only the “Representative” of the new applicants.

Should you have any questions or need additional information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

DAVID JEFFERS CONSULTING, INC.

[Signature]

David T. Jeffers, AICP

cc: Mr. Paul Attyah
    Andy and Cindy Domenigoni
    Michael and Hennie Monteleone
    Leo and Betty Wesselink
    Neal Smith
    Mary Etta Bollman
    Norm Gritton
    J. Foster Collins

DTJ/w
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

SECTIONS I, II, AND VI BELOW MUST BE COMPLETED FOR ANY AMENDMENT TO THE AREA PLAN MAPS OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

FOR OTHER TYPES OF AMENDMENTS, PLEASE CONSULT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF FOR ASSISTANCE PRIOR TO COMPLETING THE APPLICATION.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: GPA00973 DATE SUBMITTED: revised 10/8/08

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: Leo Wesselink E-Mail: none

Mailing Address: 9600 Nacimiento Lake Dr. 34475 Steele Road

Rancho Robles, CA 93446 Winchester, CA 92396

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (805) 238-5222 Fax No: (805) 238-9222

Engineer/Representative's Name: David Jeffers Consulting, Inc. E-Mail: dtj@attglobal.net

Mailing Address: 19 Spectrum Point Dr., Ste 609

Lake Forest, CA 92630

City Street ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (949) 586-5778 Fax No: (949) 586-5527

Property Owner’s Name: (see attached list) E-Mail: 

Mailing Address: (see attached list)

Street

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (___) _______ Fax No: (___) _______ 

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Leo Wesselink

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT  

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner’s behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)  

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)  

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor’s Parcel Number(s):

Section: ___________________  Township: ___________________  Range: ___________________

Approximate Gross Acreage: ___________________

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of ___________________, South of ___________________, East of ___________________, West of ___________________.

Form 255-1019 (08/27/07)
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

(See attached signature pages)

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)   SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)   SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 465-260-001 & -002

Section: N1/2, SW1/4 23   Township: 5S   Range: 2W

Approximate Gross Acreage: 62.1

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue, South of Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Hull Road.
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.

__________________________  ____________________________
PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT  SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

(See attached signature pages)

__________________________  ____________________________
PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)  SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

__________________________  ____________________________
PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)  SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 465-270-001 & -002

Section: S1/2, SW1/4 23  Township: 5S  Range: 2W

Approximate Gross Acreage: 40

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue, South of Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Hull Road
County of Riverside
Transportation and Land Management Agency
Planning Department

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:
Supplement to the Application for Amendment to the County of Riverside
General Plan Amendment – Foundation Component Amendment

We certify that we are the record owners or authorized agent of the parcels listed below
and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of our knowledge.

APNs: 465-260-01, & -002; 465-270-001 & -002;

Larry L. Curli - Signature

Marianne Tadema AKA Marianne Atkins - Signature

Sharon Haagom - Signature

Louis A. Curli - Signature

Richard N. Haagom - Signature

Ruth-Ann Mow - Signature

Brooke Atkins - Signature

Chad Atkins - Signature

This document is being signed in counterpart
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County of Riverside  
Transportation and Land Management Agency  
Planning Department

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:  
Supplement to the Application for Amendment to the County of Riverside  
General Plan Amendment – Foundation Component Amendment

We certify that we are the record owners or authorized agent of the parcels listed below and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of our knowledge.

APNs: 465-260-001, & -002; 465-270-001 & -002;

Larry L. Curti - Signature  
Marianne Tadema AKA Marianne Atkins - Signature  
Sharon Haagsma - Signature  
Louis A. Curti - Signature  
Richard N. Haagsma - Signature  
Ruth-Ann Mouw - Signature  
Brooke Atkins - Signature  
Chad Atkins - Signature

This document is being signed in counterpart  
20F3
County of Riverside  
Transportation and Land Management Agency  
Planning Department  

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:  
Supplement to the Application for Amendment to the County of Riverside  
General Plan Amendment – Foundation Component Amendment  

We certify that we are the record owners or authorized agent of the parcels listed below and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of our knowledge.

APNs: 465-260-001, & -002; 465-270-001 & -002;

______________________________  Signature  
Larry L. Curti  

______________________________  Signature  
Marianne Tadema AKA Marianne Atkins  

______________________________  Signature  
Sharon Haagsma  

______________________________  Signature  
Louis A. Curti  

______________________________  Signature  
Richard N. Haagsma  

______________________________  Signature  
Ruth Ann Mow  

______________________________  Signature  
Brooke Atkins  

______________________________  Signature  
Chad Atkins  

This document is being signed in counterpart.
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring moneys 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.  

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT  

[Signature]

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Unified Aircraft Services, Inc.  

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)  

[Signature]

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)  

[Signature]  

[President]

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 465-280-003

Section: N1/2, SW1/4, 23  Township: 58  Range: 2W

Approximate Gross Acres:

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue, South of Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Hull Road

Form 285-1919 (08/27/07)
CORPORATE RESOLUTION

RE: ZONING CHANGE FOR “STOWE ROAD”

I certify that:

I am the fully qualified and acting President/CEO of Unified Aircraft Services, Inc. a California Corporation. A corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of California, and authorized to transact business in the State of California, having its principal place of business located at: 1571 South Lilac, Bloomington, California. The following is a true and correct copy of the resolution duly adopted by the Board of Directors of the Corporation at the special meeting duly held on February 8, 2008 and entered in the minutes of such meeting in the minute book of the corporation:

“RESOLVED: That the corporation is authorized to obtain “DJC”, DAVID JEFFERS CONSULTING, INC. services for zoning changes pertinent to the subject property on Stowe Road, in Hemet, California and that Benjamin C. Warren, the President/CEO, of Unified Aircraft Services, Inc. is hereby authorized to execute any and all documents on behalf of the Corporation.”

By:  

President Ben C. Warren

By:  

Secretary Verdala L. Warren
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Karla J. Brewer

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

John L. Brewer

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 465-260-004

Section: N1/2, SW1/4, 23 Township: 58 Range: 2W

Approximate Gross Acreage: 9.71

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue, South of Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Huli Road

Form 296-1019 (06/27/07)
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.

[Signature]

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Betty Wesselink

[Signature]

Leo F. Wesselink

[Signature]

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 465-280-005

Section: N1/2, SW1/4, 23 Township: 5S Range: 2W

Approximate Gross Acreage: 9.69

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue, South of Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Hill Road.
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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 signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner’s behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Betty R. Wesselink

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor’s Parcel Number(s): 485-280-006

Section: N1/2, SW1/4, 23 Township: 5S Range: 2W

Approximate Gross Acreage:

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue, South of
Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Hull Road.
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

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.

AUTHORIZED FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below 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 your application, you 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.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

David Jaffers Consulting, Inc.

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. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are not acceptable.

Curti Family Trust - Lame  M. Curti

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 466-270-003 & 004
Section: S1/2, SW1/4  Township: 55
Approximate Gross Acreage: 30.54
General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Grand Avenue
Stowe Rd., East of El Callado, West of Marvin Hull Road

Form 256-1019 (08/27/07)
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Thomas Brothers map, edition year, page number, and coordinates: 2006 pg. 839 H&J - 4 & 5

Existing Zoning Classification(s): A-2-10

Existing Land Use Designation(s): Rural Community - EDR

Proposal (describe the details of the proposed general plan amendment):

To change the General Plan from Rural Community - (EDR-RC) to Community Development Foundation - Low Density Residential (LDR).

Related cases filed in conjunction with this request:

None

Has there been previous development applications (parcel maps, zone changes, plot plans, etc.) filed on the project site? Yes ☐ No ☑

Case Nos.

E.A. Nos. (if known) ___________________________ E.I.R. Nos. (if applicable): ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Company or District serving the area the project site is located (if none, write &quot;none.&quot; )</th>
<th>Are facilities/services available at the project site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Company</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Company</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Company</td>
<td>local provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Company/District</td>
<td>EMWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer District</td>
<td>EMWD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is water service available at the project site: Yes ☐ No ☑

If "No," how far away are the nearest available water line(s)? (No of feet/miles) 1 mile

Is sewer service available at the site? Yes ☐ No ☑

If "No," how far away are the nearest available sewer line(s)? (No. of feet/miles) 1 mile

Is the project site located in a Recreation and Park District or County Service Area authorized to collect fees for park and recreational services? Yes ☑ No ☐

Is the project site located within 8.5 miles of March Air Reserve Base? Yes ☐ No ☑
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Which one of the following watersheds is the project site located within (refer to Riverside County GIS for watershed location)? (Check answer):

☐ Santa Ana River  ☐ Santa Margarita River  ☑ San Jacinto River  ☐ Colorado River

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) [Signature]  Date 2/13/08
Owner/Representative (2)  Date

NOTE: An 8½" x 11" legible reduction of the proposal must accompany application.

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE AREA PLAN MAPS OF THE GENERAL PLAN:

AREA PLAN MAP PROPOSED FOR AMENDMENT (Please name):

Harvest Valley/Winchester

EXISTING DESIGNATION(S): EDR-RC

PROPOSED DESIGNATION(S): LDR - Community Development Foundation
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
and
INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A PUBLIC HEARING has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use and Subdivision Ordinance Nos. 348 460, before the RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION to consider the project shown below:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 973, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7855 – Intent to Adopt Negative Declaration – Applicant: Betty and Leo Wesslink – Engineer/Representative: David Jeffers Consulting, Inc. – Third/Third Supervisorial District – Hemet-San Jacinto Zoning District – Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan – Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) and Highway 79 Policy Area – Location: South of Stowe Road, north of Marvin Hull Road, east of El Callado, and west of California Avenue – 151.47 Acres – Zoning: Heavy Agriculture 10 acre minimum (A-2-10) – REQUEST: This General Plan Amendment is to amend the General Plan Foundation Component and Land Use designations of the subject site from Rural Community: Estate Density Residential (RC:EDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) to Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP) on approximately 151.47 acres. The application was submitted during the permitted time period to request foundation changes in 2008. Change of Zone No. 7855 proposes to change the zoning on the 151.47 acre site from Heavy Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (A-2-10) to Industrial Park (IP). (Legislative)

TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 am or as soon as possible thereafter
JANUARY 21, 2014
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER
BOARD CHAMBERS, 1ST FLOOR
4080 LEMON STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Project Planner, Larry Ross, at 951-955-9294 or email lross@rctima.org or go to the County Planning Department’s Planning Commission agenda web page at http://planning.rctima.org/PublicHearings.aspx

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a negative declaration. The Planning Commission will consider the proposed project and the proposed negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

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

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings 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: Larry Ross
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
PROPERTY OWNERS CERTIFICATION FORM

I, VINNIE NGUYEN, certify that on December 2, 2014,

The attached property owners list was prepared by Riverside County GIS,

APN (s) or case numbers CZ07855 / GPA00973 For

Company or Individual’s Name RCIT - GIS

Distance buffered 600'

Pursuant to application requirements furnished by the Riverside County Planning Department. Said list is a complete and true compilation of the owners of the subject property and all other property owners within 600 feet of the property involved, or if that area yields less than 25 different owners, all property owners within a notification area expanded to yield a minimum of 25 different owners, to a maximum notification area of 2,400 feet from the project boundaries, based upon the latest equalized assessment rolls. If the project is a subdivision with identified off-site access/improvements, said list includes a complete and true compilation of the names and mailing addresses of the owners of all property that is adjacent to the proposed off-site improvement/alignment.

I further certify that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that incorrect or incomplete information may be grounds for rejection or denial of the application.

TITLE GIS Analyst

ADDRESS: 4080 Lemon Street 2nd Floor

Riverside, Ca. 92502

TELEPHONE NUMBER (8 a.m. – 5 p.m.): (951) 955-8158

[Stamp: checked by]
ASMT: 465080005, APN: 465060005
STONE STAR RIVERSIDE
12671 HIGH BLUFF DR NO 150
SAN DIEGO CA 92130

ASMT: 465080007, APN: 465080007
6241 SOFTWIND PL
ALTA LOMA CA 91737

ASMT: 465080012, APN: 465080012
MICAELA LOPEZ, ETAL
6321 FRANK AVE
MIRA LOMA CA 91752

ASMT: 465080013, APN: 465080013
SANDRA FISH, ETAL
34090 STOWE RD
HEMET, CA. 92545

ASMT: 465080014, APN: 465080014
ZAHUR AHMAD
17898 CAJALCO RD
PERRIS CA 92570

ASMT: 465080018, APN: 465080018
MARIA ANGULO
9400 DEARBORN AVE
SOUTH GATE CA 90280

ASMT: 465080019, APN: 465080019
SANDRA SMITH, ETAL
34240 STOWE RD
HEMET, CA. 92545

ASMT: 465080020, APN: 465080020
CAROLYN DEAN, ETAL
P O BOX 520
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465150002, APN: 465150002
JOANN RICHARDS
9762 PACI AVE
TUJUNGA CA 91042

ASMT: 465150007, APN: 465150007
NOREEN MEZA, ETAL
34524 SIMPSON RD
HEMET, CA. 92545

ASMT: 465150008, APN: 465150008
RIETKERK FAMILY PROP
C/O ROBERT J RIE KERK
5232 IVYWOOD DR
LA PALMA CA 90623

ASMT: 465150009, APN: 465150009
C MATTESON, ETAL
C/O PATRICIA A MATTESON
1740 ALMOND TREE ST
HEMET CA 92545

ASMT: 465150015, APN: 465150015
STEVEN YU
17508 MARENGO DR
ROWLAND HEIGHTS CA 91748

ASMT: 465250001, APN: 465250001
DIANA WILCOX, ETAL
27700 AVALON RD
HEMET, CA. 92545
ASMT: 465250002, APN: 465250002
MARIETTA KEYS, ETAL
42325 STETSON AVE
HEMET CA 92544

ASMT: 465250004, APN: 465260004
KARLA BREWER, ETAL
PMB NO 232
3507 W STETSON AVE STE F
HEMET CA 92545

ASMT: 465250010, APN: 465250010
I KAY
648 BYNNER DR
SAN PEDRO CA 90732

ASMT: 465260005, APN: 465260005
BETTY WESSELINK, ETAL
9590 NAIMIENTO LAKE DR
PASO ROBLES CA 93446

ASMT: 465250011, APN: 465250011
BETH EISENBARTH, ETAL
P O BOX 2220
SUN CITY CA 92586

ASMT: 465260006, APN: 465260006
BETTY WESSELINK, ETAL
9590 NACIMIENTO LAKE DR
PASO ROBLES CA 93446

ASMT: 465250013, APN: 465250013
IRMA FELIX, ETAL
2773 POPLAR ST
RIALTO CA 92376

ASMT: 465260007, APN: 465260007
AVALON SCHADEGG, ETAL
9792 CATHERINE AVE
GARDEN GROVE CA 92841

ASMT: 465250014, APN: 465250014
ERIKA HILL, ETAL
34510 MARVIN HULL RD
WINCHESTER, CA. 92596

ASMT: 465270002, APN: 465270002
SHARON HAAGSMA, ETAL
C/O SHARON HAAGSMA
74837 PEPPERTREE DR
PALM DESERT CA 92260

ASMT: 465250020, APN: 465250020
WILLIAM KERR, ETAL
P O BOX 1060
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465270004, APN: 465270004
JANNETTE CURTI, ETAL
1718 SMILEY RIDGE
REDLANDS CA 92373

ASMT: 465260003, APN: 465260003
UNIFIED AIRCRAFT SERV
P O BOX 728
RIALTO CA 92377

ASMT: 465270005, APN: 465270005
SMITH CHARLES E LIVING TRUST
C/O CHARLES E SMITH
40475 VIA FRANCISCO
MURRIETA CA 92562
ASMT: 465270006, APN: 465270006
RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COM!
PO BOX 12008
RIVERSIDE CA 92502

ASMT: 4652800023, APN: 4652800023
JENNIFER LEW
15 HAGGERSTON AISLE
IRVINE CA 92603

ASMT: 465270008, APN: 465270008
GOLDEN DIAMOND
3761 SERENITY ST
HEMET CA 92545

ASMT: 4652900009, APN: 4652900009
DOROTHY TODD, ETAL
732 CORRIDA DR
COVINA CA 91724

ASMT: 465270009, APN: 465270009
RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONT
1995 MARKET ST
RIVERSIDE CA 92501

ASMT: 465290016, APN: 465290016
ESTHER MITCHELL, ETAL
33955 STOWE RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465280013, APN: 465280013
STEVEN WAGNER
27591 SMITH RD
HEMET, CA. 92545

ASMT: 465320012, APN: 465320012
LIEN NGUYEN, ETAL
33875 MILAN RD
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465280014, APN: 465280014
BARBARA BABY, ETAL
P O BOX 845
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465320013, APN: 465320013
JOANN HOUK
489 GREENWOOD DR
MEADOW VISTA CA 95722

ASMT: 465280015, APN: 465280015
DANA VUJICIC, ETAL
27660 AVALON ST
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465320015, APN: 465320015
MARY COSTELLO, ETAL
P O BOX 752
WINCHESTER CA 92596

ASMT: 465280016, APN: 465280016
GEMA VIERSTRA, ETAL
P O BOX 219
MURRIETA CA 92564

ASMT: 465320016, APN: 465320016
DIRK MEREDITH, ETAL
P O BOX 247
WINCHESTER CA 92596
ASMT: 465320017, APN: 465320017
CHRISTINE LEWIS
8111 SAN HILARIO CIR
BUENA PARK CA  90620

ASMT: 465320018, APN: 465320018
ENRIQUETA WATSON
33970 GRAND AVE
WINCHESTER CA  92596
Brooke Atkins
1351 San Elijo Ave.
Cardiff By The Sea, CA 92007

Chad Atkins
625 Marine St.
La Jolla, CA 92037

Larry Curti
P.O. Box 2030
Redlands, CA 92373

Marianne Tadema
AKA Marianne Atkins
8176 Grapewin St.
Corona, CA 91720

Sharon Haagsma
74637 Peppertree
Palm Desert, CA 92660

Richard Haagsma
8643 Eucalyptus Ave.
Ontario, CA 91761

Louis Curti
309 E. Mariposa
Redlands, CA 92373

Ruth-Ann Mouw
7585 Noon Rd.
Lynden, WA 98264

Leo and Betty Wesselink
9590 Nacimiento Lake Dr.
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Benjamin C. Warren
United Aircraft Service
P.O. Box 728
Rialto, CA 92377

John and Karla Brewer
3507 West Stetson Ave.
Ste. F PMB#232
Hemet, CA 92545

Larry and Janette Curti
P.O. Box 2030
Redlands, CA 92373

Owners labels GPA00973
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTN: Michael McCoy</td>
<td>Riverside Transit Agency 1825 3rd St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 59968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside, CA 92517-1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
<td>2244 Walnut Grove Ave., Rm 312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemead, CA 91770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Town Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet Unified School District</td>
<td>2350 W. Latham Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hemet, CA 92545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley-Wide Recreation &amp; Park District</td>
<td>901 W. Esplanade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jacinto, CA 92582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pechanga Cultural Resource Dept</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temecula, CA 92593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Municipal Water District</td>
<td>ATTN: Elizabeth Lovsted 2270 Trumble Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 8300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perris, CA 92570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann Houk</td>
<td>33895 Milan Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott &amp; Sandra Smith</td>
<td>34240 Stowe Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Betty and Leo Wesslink</td>
<td>9590 Nacimiento Lake Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Robles, CA 93446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer: Dave Jeffers</td>
<td>19 Spectrum Pointe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Forest, CA 92545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry and Carolyn Dean</td>
<td>34150 Stowe Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester, CA 92596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Betty and Leo Wesslink</td>
<td>9590 Nacimiento Lake Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Robles, CA 93446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer: Dave Jeffers</td>
<td>19 Spectrum Pointe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Forest, CA 92545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: □ Office of Planning and Research (OPR)  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA  95812-3044  
☑ County of Riverside County Clerk

FROM:  Riverside County Planning Department  
☑ 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor  
P. O. Box 1400  
Riverside, CA  92502-1409  
☐ 38686 El Cerrito Road  
Palm Desert, California  92211

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code.

EA41802, General Plan Amendment No. 973, and Change of Zone No. 7855

Project Title/Case Numbers
Larry Ross, Principal Planner  951-956-9294
County Contact Person  Phone Number

N/A

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to the State Clearinghouse)

Betty and Lea Wessing  9580 Nacimiento Lake Drive, Paso Robles, CA  93446
Project Applicant  Address

The project is located south of Stowe Road, north of Marvin Hull Road, east of El Callado, and west of California Avenue.

Project Location

The General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Foundation Component of the subject site from Rural Community, Estate Density Residential (RCDR) (2 acre minimum lot size) to Community Development: Business Park (CD:BP) on approximately 151.47 acres. Change of Zone No. 7855 proposes to change the zoning on the 151.47 acre site from Heavy Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (H-2-10) to Industrial Park (IP).

Project Description

This is to advise that the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, as the lead agency, has approved the above-referenced project on ______, and has made the following determinations regarding that project:

1. The project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ($2,181.25 + $50.00) and reflect the independent judgment of the Lead Agency.
3. Mitigation measures WERE NOT made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan/Program WAS NOT adopted.
5. A statement of Mitigation Considerations WAS NOT adopted for the project.
6. Findings were made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the Negative Declaration, with comments, responses, and record of project approval is available to the general public at: Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.

________________________________  __________________________________  _________________________
Signature  Title  Date

Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR: ________________________________

DM/08  Revised 12/03/2014
Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside County\GPW00973G\PC-BOS Hearings\DH-PC\NDD Form for GPW00973.docx

Please charge deposit fee case #: ZEA41800  ZCFG05149

FOR COUNTY CLERK’S USE ONLY
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project/Case Number: GPA No. 973, CZ No. 7855 and EA No. 41802

Based on the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION (see Environmental Assessment).

COMPLETED/REVIEWED BY:

By: Larry Ross Title: Principal Planner Date: December 1, 2014

Applicant/Project Sponsor: Betty and Leo Wesslink Date Submitted: February 14, 2008

ADOPTED BY: Board of Supervisors

Person Verifying Adoption: ____________________________ Date: ______________

The Negative Declaration may be examined, along with documents referenced in the initial study, if any, at:

Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501

For additional information, please contact Larry Ross at (951) 955-9294.

Revised: 10/16/07
Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\GPA00973\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\DH-PC\Negative Declaration for GPA00973.docx
Received from: WESSELINK LEO AND BETTY $64.00
paid by: CK 3355
   CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME FOR EA41802
paid towards: CFG05149 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
   at parcel:
      appl type: CFG3

By ____________________________ Feb 15, 2008 09:03
MBRASWEL posting date Feb 15, 2008

Account Code Description Amount
658353120100208100 CF&G TRUST: RECORD FEES $64.00

Overpayments of less than $5.00 will not be refunded!
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The applicant proposes to amend the General Plan Component and Land Use designations of the subject site from Rural: Rural Residential (RUR:RR) (5 acre minimum lot size) to Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD:MDR) (2-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre) on approximately 73.65 acres. The application was submitted during the permitted time period to request foundation changes in 2008.

The project is located northerly Buena Ventura Road, southerly of Auld Road, and easterly of Pourroy Road, and westerly of Borel Road.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

On April 15, 2015, the project was continued by the Planning Commission to June 17th to allow the applicant to contact the surrounding community to see if the issues raised during the meeting could be resolved. In the intervening time, the Third District resigned and as a result the applicant has requested that the project be further continued to July 15, 2015 to allow time for another Third District Commissioner to be seated on the Planning Commission.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

CONTINUE the project until July 15, 2015.
From: Dave Jeffers [mailto:dave4djc@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 11:28 AM
To: Ross, Larry  
Cc: 'Mary Etta'; 'Karen Smith'
Subject: RE: GPA00975

Larry,
I resist extending hearings because my clients have been in this otherwise difficult process for a very long time but I don't see any way around a continuance then. It will probably be better as Mr. Washington, to my knowledge, has not appointed a new Commissioner yet. It would probably be more respectful to wait until the new Commissioner is seated.

On behalf of my clients, please consider this email as our official request for a continuance to July for GPA 975.
As always, thanks for your help.
Dave
### 2015 PLANNING COMMISSION CALENDAR

#### JANUARY
- **7**
  - DARK
- **14**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **21**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **28**
  - DARK
  - DARK

#### FEBRUARY
- **4**
  - DARK
- **11**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **18**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **25**
  - City of La Quinta
  - City Council Chambers
  - Cancelled

#### MARCH
- **4**
  - DARK
- **11**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **18**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room

#### APRIL
- **1**
  - DARK
- **8**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **15**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **22**
  - DARK
- **29**
  - DARK

#### MAY
- **6**
  - DARK
- **13**
  - Simpson Auditorium
  - Devonshire, Hemet
- **20**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **27**
  - DARK

#### JUNE
- **3**
  - DARK
- **10**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **17**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **24**
  - City of La Quinta
  - City Council Chambers

#### JULY
- **1**
  - DARK
- **8**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **15**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **22**
  - DARK
- **29**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room

#### AUGUST
- **5**
  - DARK
- **12**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **19**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **26**
  - CVWD Board Room
  - 75115 Hovley Ln E, Palm Desert

#### SEPTEMBER
- **2**
  - DARK
- **9**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **16**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **23**
  - DARK
- **30**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room

#### OCTOBER
- **7**
  - DARK
- **14**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **21**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **28**
  - City of La Quinta
  - City Council Chambers

#### NOVEMBER
- **4**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **11**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **18**
  - DARK
- **25**
  - DARK

#### DECEMBER
- **2**
  - Riverside CAC
  - 1st Floor Board Room
- **9**
  - RCTC - DARK
- **16**
  - DARK
- **23**
  - DARK
- **30**
  - DARK