

2
3 **RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ADOPTION**
4 **OF THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY INTEGRATED**
5 **PROJECT (RCIP) GENERAL PLAN**
6

7 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et seq., public
8 hearings were held before the Riverside County Planning Commission on April 27, May 8, May 21, June
9 5, June 19, September 12, September 25, October 10, October 30, November 13, December 4, December
10 11, December 18, 2002, and January 8, 2003, in Riverside, Indio, Temecula, and Hemet, California, to
11 consider the adoption of Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 (also known as General Plan
12 Amendment No. 00618) proposing to replace the County’s existing Comprehensive General Plan with the
13 new Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan; and,
14

15 **WHEREAS**, Government Code Section 65300 requires every city and county to prepare and
16 implement a general plan; and,
17

18 **WHEREAS**, the proposed RCIP General Plan was discussed fully with testimony and
19 documentation presented by the public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

20 **BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED** by the Planning Commission
21 of the County of Riverside, in regular session assembled on January 22, 2003, that:

22 Comprehensive General Plan Amendment (CGPA) No. 618 is a proposal to adopt the RCIP
23 General Plan as the General Plan for the County of Riverside, superseding all elements and maps of the
24 Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan as adopted in 1984 and subsequently amended, with the
25 exception of the Housing Element as adopted in December, 2001, which will remain in effect. The RCIP
26 General Plan covers the entire unincorporated area of Riverside County subject to the land use jurisdiction
27 of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and features a series of Area Plans providing land use
28

1 designations throughout said jurisdiction with the exception of the undeveloped desert areas of eastern
2 Riverside County and lands subject to the jurisdiction of the March Air Reserve Base Joint Powers
3 Authority and the various sovereign Indian Tribal Councils. The RCIP General Plan includes the Land
4 Use Element, Circulation Element, Multipurpose Open Space Element, Safety Element, Noise Element,
5 the previously adopted Housing Element, Air Quality Element, and a chapter on Administration that
6 includes the General Plan Certainty System, which restricts General Plan Amendments (GPA's) between
7 various land use categories referred to in the RCIP as Foundation Components.
8

9 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented
10 on this matter, both written and oral, that the RCIP General Plan as proposed by the General Plan
11 Advisory Committee and released for public review be amended in accordance with the document entitled
12 "ATTACHMENT A: Planning Commission Recommended General Plan Text Changes", a copy of which
13 is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.
14

15 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented
16 on this matter, both written and oral, that the various Area Plan maps as proposed by the General Plan
17 Advisory Committee and released for public review be amended in accordance with the Desert Center,
18 Eastern Coachella Valley, Eastvale, Elsinore, Harvest Valley/Winchester, Highgrove, Jurupa, Lake
19 Mathews/Woodcrest, Lakeview/Nuevo, Mead Valley, Palo Verde Valley, The Pass, Reche
20 Canyon/Badlands, REMAP, San Jacinto Valley, Southwest Area, Sun City/Meniffee Valley, Temescal
21 Canyon, and Western Coachella Valley Area Plans dated January 8, 2003, copies of which are
22 electronically stored in the compact disc included herewith and incorporated herein by reference.
23

24 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission that it recommends, following or
25 concurrent with Board action to certify the associated CEQA document(s), **ADOPTION** of
26 Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 (GPA00618) to adopt the RCIP General Plan as
27 amended by the attached document and maps.
28

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission that it had the following
2 discussions on December 18, 2002, and made the following specific recommendations concerning the
3 more controversial provisions of the RCIP General Plan:

4 Land Use Element

5 **Community Centers and Other Overlays:** **The Commission agreed to recommend a policy**
6 **restricting the spatial expansion of any Community Center to a 10 percent average increase over**
7 **any five-year period.** The Planning Commission was divided as to the appropriateness of the
8 Community Center designation and overlay. District-specific observations were as follows:

9
10 * Commissioner Roth (District 1) indicated support for the concept as a departure from business as
11 usual, but considered the concept to be experimental, found the proposed number and size of such centers
12 to be overly ambitious and recommended keeping some of the Community Center designations in his
13 district and deleting others. He also proposed that Community Centers retain their original boundaries for
14 at least five years, but later clarified that his major concern was expansion and agreed to the 10 percent
15 policy specified above.

16
17 * Commissioner Snell (District 2) had previously directed that Community Center designations in
18 his district be converted to Community Center overlays so that the designation would not prohibit
19 individual property owners from using their land in the absence of a specific plan.

20
21 * Commissioner Petty (District 3) did not support County designation of land as Community Center
22 and had previously directed staff to change the designations of those properties in his district to other
23 designations. He expressed concerns that the anticipated level of densities would aggravate traffic
24 congestion and questioned the level of transit usage that could be expected. He also expressed concern
25 that the designation as Community Center could make individual properties undevelopable until such time
26 as a Specific Plan is prepared for the entire area, and did not feel that the County should take such action.

1 He indicated that he would be willing to consider landowner requests for the Community Center
2 designation through the Specific Plan or Specific Plan Amendment process.

3 * Commissioner Porras (District 4) saw a possibility that there might be need for additional
4 Community Centers in his district --- particularly within the Community Development overlay areas in
5 the Eastern Coachella Valley --- to provide for affordable housing and job creation.

6 * Commissioner Zuppardo (District 5) wanted to make sure that there would be no limit on deletions
7 from the Community Center designation.

8 All of the Commissioners agreed to the 10% five-year limit on expansion of proposed Community
9 Centers, as specified above. This policy would not limit either the establishment of new Community
10 Centers or re-designation of land proposed as Community Center to other designations.

11 **Community Separators:** One of the key goals of the RCIP General Plan is the preservation of the
12 distinctiveness of the County’s unincorporated communities and avoidance of the continuous suburban
13 development seen in Los Angeles and Orange County areas. The concept of “community separators” is
14 an important element that was utilized in the design of the Area Plan maps. Generally, these community
15 separators are areas with rural, open space, or agriculture designations as depicted on the maps. The
16 certainty system restricting changes between foundation categories is intended to ensure that the
17 community separators would be maintained as such. **The Planning Commission agreed to recommend**
18 **that a program be established to prepare a Community Separators map or overlay for review by**
19 **the GPAC Steering Committee, LAFCO, and City representatives, then the Planning Commission**
20 **and Board of Supervisors, with public lands, topographical, and geographical features constituting**
21 **the separators in most cases. Furthermore, the Planning Commission agreed that, once the**
22 **Community Separators Map is adopted, it should not be changed for at least ten years, except as**
23 **necessary to reflect the actions of other jurisdictions, and that it should be utilized as a tool for the**
24
25
26
27
28

1 **County's use in inter-governmental matters, such as commenting on proposals submitted to or by**
2 **LAFCO, cities, or Tribal authorities.**

3 * Commissioner Roth (District 1) expressed concern that the concept would not be able to be
4 implemented without the cooperation of LAFCO.

5 * Commissioner Snell (District 2) expressed concern that community separators are not delineated
6 in the General Plan despite their importance in the Vision concept. He agreed with the concept of
7 providing for a map to be used for communication purposes and not to restrict zoning.
8

9 * Commissioner Petty (District 3) expressed concern regarding the effect of the program on property
10 owners within the designated community separator area and that the analysis of the necessary width of the
11 separator would be subjective.

12 * Commissioner Porras (District 4) agreed with Commissioner Roth that the program could only
13 work with active cooperation from LAFCO and the cities. He also noted the impact of Tribal jurisdiction
14 actions on land use patterns in the Coachella Valley.
15

16 * Commissioner Zuppardo (District 5) wanted to clarify that the Planning Commission was
17 approving a concept only and that refinements would be needed.

18 **Density Transfer: The Planning Commission agreed to the density transfer concept, including**
19 **transfers between noncontiguous properties, provided that staff provides some examples of how the**
20 **process would work and provided that some official recordation or action takes place to ensure that**
21 **the sending parcel or area is preserved in perpetuity, either through fee title acquisition or**
22 **permanent conservation easement.**
23

24 * Commissioner Roth (District 1) initially proposed that transfers be limited to properties within a
25 project or properties contiguous thereto. As an alternative, he proposed that locational criteria be
26 established regarding distance between the sending and receiving sites. He also proposed that slopes be
27 considered when determining the allowable density that could be transferred from properties.
28

1 * Commissioners Snell (District 2) and Petty (District 3) stated that they would want some sort of
2 minimum lot size for the receiving site that could not be reduced through the use of density transfer.
3 Commissioner Petty also stated that he did not feel it would be appropriate to grant any density credit for
4 preservation of property that is not physically developable. Commissioner Petty also initially felt that
5 density transfer should be limited to contiguous properties.
6

7 * Agency Director Richard Lashbrook indicated that locational criteria could limit the County's
8 flexibility in its efforts to utilize the density transfer as a means of preserving habitat or community
9 separator open space.

10 * After consideration of the potential role of density transfer in an open space preservation program,
11 Commissioners Porras (District 4) and Zuppardo (District 5) did not support limiting density transfer to
12 contiguous properties, and Commissioner Snell also did not support such a limitation. Ultimately,
13 Commissioners Roth and Petty agreed to support allowing for noncontiguous transfers subject to the
14 provisions above.
15

16 **Minimum Lot Size with Density Transfer or Clustering/Community Development Areas: The**
17 **Planning Commission recommended allowing for lot sizes smaller than 7,200 square feet in**
18 **community development areas, in conjunction with clustering or density transfer, with**
19 **Commissioner Petty (District 3) dissenting.**

20 * Commissioner Roth (District 1) suggested a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet in community
21 development areas for single-family freestanding residences and a minimum of 5,000 square feet with use
22 of clustering. He stated that he could support lot sizes smaller than 7,200 square feet if, by using smaller
23 lots, some unique feature on-site could be preserved. He stated that he believed clustering was
24 appropriate for the preservation of open space, not simply habitat and not simply land that was
25 undevelopable for either practical engineering reasons or as a result of environmental concerns.
26
27
28

1 * Commissioner Snell (District 2) indicated that he would be willing to support lot sizes smaller
2 than 7,200 square feet in association with clustering or density transfer.

3 * Commissioner Petty (District 3) indicated that he would not be willing to support lot sizes below
4 7,200 square feet except in the context of a specific plan that provides substantial recreational amenities to
5 justify a smaller lot size. He would be willing to support reductions from the ½ acre designation to
6 smaller lots, but would draw the line at 7,200 square feet.

7
8 * Commissioner Porras (District 4) stated that he could also support smaller lot sizes in situations
9 where a needed amenity is being provided as part of project design. Commissioner Petty stated that he
10 believed provision for parks and preservation of unique resources could be required through the
11 development review process without the need to offer incentives.

12 * Commissioner Zuppardo (District 5) did not specifically comment on this issue.

13
14 * Agency Director Lashbrook noted that a fundamental principle of RCIP is that property owners
15 would be compensated for conservation of their lands. Clustering and/or smaller lot sizes as necessary to
16 achieve otherwise attainable dwelling unit yield is envisioned as a low-cost means of compensating
17 landowners who are willing to permanently set aside critical lands for conservation.

18 **Minimum Lot Size with Density Transfer, Clustering, or Incentives/Rural Community and Rural**

19 **Areas:**

20
21 * For rural communities and rural areas, Commissioner Roth (District 1) suggested a sliding scale of
22 densities tied to slopes. He did not support lot sizes smaller than one-half acre in these areas in order to
23 minimize conflicts between animal-keeping and large-lot suburban lifestyles.

24 * Commissioner Snell (District 2) indicated that he would be willing to consider a minimum lot size
25 of ½ acre in rural areas with clustering, where the rest of the property is dedicated as open space, and a
26 minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet for rural community areas in the vicinity of community
27
28

1 development areas. However, he thought that, with use of clustering, an incentive may not be necessary
2 since the developer would save on infrastructure costs.

3 * Commissioners Petty (District 3), Porras (District 4), and Zuppardo (District 5) indicated
4 agreement with the comments of Commissioners Roth and Snell with regard to the rural incentives
5 program and associated lot size requirements.
6

7 **Density Bonus/Incentive Program:** **The Planning Commission agreed (with Commissioner**
8 **Petty dissenting) to endorse the concept of a density bonus/incentive program, but they questioned**
9 **whether it was appropriate to provide for density bonuses based on compliance with quality**
10 **development standards or guidelines. They agreed to request and emphasized a desire to remain**
11 **active participants in the development of the incentive program.** The Commission considered a staff
12 presentation regarding the density bonus/incentive program, which would allow for density bonuses of up
13 to 25 percent (for a maximum density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre in areas designated two to four
14 dwelling units per acre). It was the Commission consensus that the current version needed further
15 modifications, especially a clarification of baseline standards.
16

17 * Commissioners Roth (District 1) and Petty (District 3) opposed giving points for compliance with
18 quality development standards or guidelines. Commissioner Roth supported the concept of density
19 bonuses and incentives, but felt that more details would be required. As to the rural and rural community
20 areas, Commissioner Roth indicated that he would not support the use of density bonuses in such a
21 manner as would allow for lot sizes smaller than ½ acre in areas where animal keeping is allowed or
22 recognized – with the exception of community development overlays such as are found in the other
23 districts. With regard to the community center incentives program, Commissioner Roth advocated for an
24 upper limit on density, or a maximum 50% density bonus, rather than the 100% density bonus
25 contemplated by the GPAC.
26
27
28

1 * Commissioner Snell (District 2) requested more details on how points would be allocated
2 regarding the provision for affordable housing or senior housing and indicated that he could support
3 10,000 square foot lots in the rural community designation (but not in the rural designation). He agreed
4 that the concept is good, but felt that more detail is needed to properly understand and evaluate the
5 proposal.
6

7 * Commissioner Petty (District 3) indicated that he could agree with the comments of
8 Commissioners Roth and Snell regarding lot sizes for the rural incentives program. However, with regard
9 to the neighborhood density bonuses, he believed that the process would be both complicated and
10 subjective, and concluded that he could not embrace this concept.

11 * Commissioners Porras (District 4) and Zuppardo (District 5) agreed with the incentive program
12 concept, but also agreed that more detail would be needed before the Commission could endorse a
13 specific neighborhood incentives program. As to the rural incentives program, they indicated a general
14 agreement with the comments of Commissioners Roth and Snell.
15

16 **Rural Village Overlay:** Commissioner Roth (District 1) suggested reducing the maximum density in
17 Rural Village Overlay areas from the proposed 10 dwelling units per acre to a more realistic level, and
18 Commissioner Snell (District 2) agreed. The other Commissioners did not comment on this issue.

19 **Medium Density Residential designation:** **The Planning Commission agreed to limit the**
20 **maximum density in the Medium Density Residential designation (before bonuses or incentives) to**
21 **four dwelling units per acre.** (The Medium High Density Residential designation would then be the
22 range of 4 – 8 dwelling units per acre.)
23

24 * Commissioners Roth (District 1), Snell (District 2), and Petty (District 3) agreed to reduce the
25 maximum density to four dwelling units per acre without bonuses or incentives. They felt that a density
26 of five dwelling units per acre would not be achievable with a minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet and
27 that the use of a 2 to 5 dwelling unit per acre range would be misleading.
28

1 * (Commissioners Porras (District 4) and Zuppardo (District 5) did not offer specific comments on
2 this issue.)

3 Administrative Chapter

4 **Certainty System: The Planning Commission indicated support for the certainty system as**
5 **a concept. The majority of the Planning Commission agreed with the five year cycle as proposed,**
6 **with the addition of a provision for a one-year period within which corrections could be made by**
7 **the County in conjunction with consistency zoning.**

9 * Commissioner Roth (District 1) indicated that it was his position that the time between
10 amendments between foundation categories, except for agriculture, should be ten years, rather than five
11 years. For agriculture, Commissioner Roth supports a five year amendment cycle, with allowance for a 1
12 % per year conversion rate during the period, allocated with priority to active agricultural operations
13 under hardship. He also supports eliminating any loopholes or ambiguous wording. However, he did
14 support a one-year time period within which corrections could be made, which Commissioner Snell
15 (District 2) specifically endorsed.

17 * The other Commissioners supported the five year provision and did not specifically comment on
18 the one-year period for corrections. Commissioners Petty (District 3) and Porras (District 4) asked for
19 information regarding the status of discussions regarding a possible special provision for agricultural
20 conversion, and Agency Director Lashbrook advised that no final resolution had been reached.