

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



FROM: Transportation and Land
Management Agency

SUBMITTAL DATE: March 6, 2003

SUBJECT: **COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 618 - EIR NO. 441** –
Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan - All Supervisorial
Districts and Zoning Districts/Areas, PROPOSAL: Adoption of a new General
Plan for all of the unincorporated areas of Riverside County; also, **AMENDMENT
TO ORDINANCE NO. 348** to adopt a map defining new boundaries for zoning
districts.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

The Planning Commission recommends:

TENTATIVE APPROVAL of COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 618 to adopt
the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan as amended in accordance with
the document entitled "ATTACHMENT A: Planning Commission Recommended General Plan
Text Changes" and in accordance with the Desert Center, Eastern Coachella Valley, Eastvale,
Elsinore, Harvest Valley/Winchester, Highgrove, Jurupa, Lake Mathews/Woodcrest,
Lakeview/Nuevo, Mead Valley, Palo Verde Valley, The Pass, Reche Canyon/Badlands,
REMAP, San Jacinto Valley, Southwest Area, Sun City/Menifee Valley, Temescal Canyon, and
Western Coachella Valley Area Plans dated January 8, 2003, copies of which are electronically
stored in the compact disc included herewith; and,

TENTATIVE APPROVAL of an AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. 348 to adopt a map defining
new boundaries for zoning districts.

The Planning Commission did not make a recommendation regarding EIR No. 441.

Attachments

(Continued on Page 2)

Richard Lashbrook, Agency Director

CEO. RECOMMENDATION:

County Executive Office Signature

Department Recommendation: 9 Policy
9 Consent
Per Executive Office:

Prev. Agn. Ref.

Dist. All

AGENDA NO.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

RE: Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 – EIR No. 441 and Amendment to Ordinance No. 348

Page 2 of 4

RECOMMENDED MOTION (Continued):

The Director of the Transportation and Land Management Agency recommends:

CERTIFICATION of ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 441. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, your Board cannot take action on the proposed General Plan without first or concurrently making an environmental determination. The Planning Department has determined that the proposed project will have significant impacts on the environment which will be only partially avoided or lessened by the mitigation measures specified in EIR No. 441.

The Director of the Transportation and Land Management Agency further recommends that your Board consider, in its deliberations, the additional and/or substitute policies included in the attached Staff Report and Recommendations and the Area Plan maps dated March 10, 2003.

BACKGROUND:

The Riverside County Board of Supervisors authorized the preparation of a new general plan for Riverside County in May 1999. California law requires each city and county jurisdiction in the state to prepare and periodically update a general plan to serve as a guide for public and private land development activities within its jurisdiction. The County last adopted a countywide general plan in 1984, and updated it numerous times since then by incorporating various community plans, site-specific amendments, and other policies and programs. Upon adoption, the new general plan would completely replace all documents currently constituting the general plan for Riverside County (Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan). The preparation of the new general plan was authorized as being one of the three major components of the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP). The other two components of the RCIP are a Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan for western Riverside County, and a transportation corridor plan (known as "CETAP" - Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process). All three components of the RCIP are being developed together in a coordinated manner. The proposed new general plan is the first of the three RCIP components to have reached the stage of being ready for public hearings before the Board of Supervisors; however, the other components are progressing closely along with the new general plan and are expected to be presented to the Board of Supervisors later this year.

Organization of this Report:

This report package consists of this Form 11, the attached Staff Report and Recommendations, the proposed new general plan, which consists of four volumes, Final Environmental Impact Report No. 441, and letters and copies of emails received from the public in regard to the proposed new general plan.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

RE: Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 – EIR No. 441 and Amendment to Ordinance No. 348

Page 3 of 4

This report package is organized as follows:

- 1) The proposed **general plan consists of four volumes**, all dated April 5, 2002:
 - a) **General Plan Public Hearing Draft**, which contains the Introduction, the **Vision Statement, and the Land Use, Circulation, Multipurpose Open Space, Safety, Noise, Housing, Air Quality, and Administration Elements**;
 - b) **General Plan Area Plans**, Volume No. 1, including the **Eastvale, Jurupa, Temescal Canyon, Elsinore, Southwest, Sun City/Menifee Valley, Lake Mathews/Woodcrest, Mead Valley, Highgrove, and Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plans**;
 - c) **General Plan Area Plans**, Volume No. 2, including the **Reche Canyon/Badlands, Lakeview/Nuevo, San Jacinto Valley, The Pass, REMAP, Western Coachella Valley, Palo Verde Valley, Eastern Coachella Valley, and Desert Center Area Plans**; and,
 - d) **General Plan Technical Appendices**, including the Glossary, General Planning Principles, Public Opinion Survey, Summary of Community Workshops, Assumptions and Methodologies, Population and Employment Forecasts, Fiscal Analysis, Geotechnical Report, Noise Element Technical Data, Community Center guidelines, and Implementation Program.
- 2) The General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) - EIR No. 441 - consisting of three volumes:
 - a) **General Plan Draft Program EIR**, dated August 2002;
 - b) **Existing Settings Report**, dated March 2000, and contained on a compact disc (CD) located in the inside of the front jacket of the General Plan Draft Program EIR; and
 - c) **General Plan Final Program EIR**, dated March 2003.
- 3) Binder No. 1 contains large-scale area plan land use designation maps, the Planning Commission Resolution with Attachment A, and Circulation Element information. This binder contains a set of full-size, parcel-specific area plan maps for:
 - a) recommendations to the Board of Supervisors adopted by the Riverside County Planning Commission on January 22, 2003, and
 - b) additional recommendations proposed by staff, prepared after the action taken by the Planning Commission. Each binder of the report package provided to the five members of the Board of Supervisors, has been tailored for each supervisorial

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

RE: Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 – EIR No. 441 and Amendment to Ordinance No. 348

Page 4 of 4

district, to contain full-size, hard copy maps only for areas contained within each district, as well as a CD that contains all of the area plans in the county. This binder also contains endorsements and information regarding the proposed General Plan concept for the development of Community Centers.

- 4) Binders No. 2 through 19 contain copies of all correspondence received by the County in regard to the proposed new general plan. The correspondence in each binder is arranged by area plan, and as to whether it was received by the County on or prior to December 11, 2002, and thus becoming available for review by the Planning Commission prior to its closure of the public hearings regarding the area plan maps, or after December 11, 2002.

STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 618 – EIR NO. 441 Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan

General Plan Process:

The process of preparing the new General Plan actually had its genesis a couple of years prior to the formal initiation of the general plan program by the Board of Supervisors. Several divergent stakeholder groups met frequently on a cooperative, voluntary basis to craft “Tier 1” Principles intended to provide a common understanding about the desired objectives for the County’s general plan program. When the program was authorized by the Board in 1999, the Board directed that the Tier 1 Principles be used as a starting point in the development of the program.

To manage the overall production of the general plan and the other components of the RCIP, the County contracted with the consultant firm of Jacobs Civil Inc. (formally Sverdrup Civil Inc.). The Planning Center consultant firm was selected as part of the team managed by Jacobs Civil, to prepare the new general plan. LSA Associates was selected to prepare the EIR. A number of other firms were included in the consultant team to assist with the production of demographic forecasts, geographic information system products, and other necessary components of the program.

To provide stakeholder guidance to the development of the General Plan, the Board appointed a **General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)** in 1999. The GPAC held numerous public meetings between 1999 and early 2002 to discuss the issues facing the County and provide guidance to the County and its consultant team in preparing the general plan. The GPAC, as appointed by the Board, included representatives from a broad range of organizations and special interest groups. The GPAC also included two additional citizen appointees from each supervisorial district. The 29 members of the GPAC provided broad stakeholder input into the process, and very notably was able to reach consensus on a number of bold, fundamental principles that provide the underpinnings for the new general plan. As the general plan and overall RCIP process evolved, the GPAC committee plus the MSHCP and CETAP advisory committees agreed to form a Steering Committee to assist in providing direction to ensure that the three RCIP products (general plan, MSHCP, and CETAP plan) proceeded in an integrated manner. The Steering Committee also assumed a role of providing coordinated policy recommendations from time to time directly to the Board of Supervisors, to ensure that the overall RCIP and general plan processes remained on track.

The first major task of the RCIP process, and the general plan, was to prepare a Vision Statement to guide the effort. The Vision Statement was prepared directly from input received from the public during the summer and fall of 1999. Two series of public meetings were held in various locations throughout Riverside County to tap public perceptions about the existing quality of life in the County, and the future

that they desired for their communities and the County as a whole. The Vision Statement was endorsed in December 2000 by the Board of Supervisors and the Riverside County Transportation Commission. The Vision Statement is included in the general plan volume entitled “The General Plan Public Hearing Draft.”

GPAC established a specific set of principles to identify the primary policy objectives for the general plan effort in order to guide its deliberations, and to provide guidance to the County and The Planning Center in preparing the general plan documents. The General Planning Principles are an important feature of the new general plan; indeed, more than any other aspect, as they provide the foundation upon which the important community development, environmental protection, transportation, community design, agricultural, rural development, economic development, and general plan certainty system concepts are based. The General Planning Principles are contained in Appendix B of the General Plan Technical Appendices.

The GPAC met from mid-1999 to early 2002 to deliberate in crafting its recommendations regarding the General Planning Principles, the general plan elements, the area plan maps, and to address issues of coordination between the general plan and the CETAP transportation corridors plan and the Multiple species Habitat Conservation Plan. In addition, staff participated in numerous meetings with neighborhood and community organizations throughout the county during this period, in order to explain the proposed plan to the public, and to get input to assist in crafting it.

Planning Commission Hearings

The Riverside County Planning Commission held public hearings regarding the RCIP General Plan on April 27, May 8, May 21, June 5, June 19, September 12, September 25, October 10, October 30, November 13, December 4, December 11, and December 18, 2002, and January 8, 2003. Most of the hearings were held in Riverside, but hearings were held in Indio on May 8 and September 12, in Temecula on May 21, and in Hemet on October 10, in order to provide opportunity for comment from residents and landowners in southern and eastern Riverside County.

Policy Recommendations

In addition to considering testimony regarding the designations of individual properties and character of Riverside County’s unincorporated communities, the Planning Commission considered and extensively discussed a number of the tenets and underlying principles that distinguish the RCIP General Plan from the existing Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan.

After consideration of extensive public testimony over the course of the first eight hearings, the Planning Commission decided that the names assigned to the residential categories were misleading, in that conventional suburban tract development should be considered “medium density”, rather than “low

density”. In addition, staff at this time was introducing the concept of an additional foundation component, “rural community”, which would consist of areas proposed for densities greater than one dwelling unit per five acres, but not exceeding two dwelling units per acre. The Planning Commission and staff agreed to change the labels of the residential designations, such that the new one dwelling unit per acre designation would be “Very Low Density Residential”, the two dwelling unit per acre designation would be “Low Density Residential”, and the “2 to 5” dwelling unit per acre designation would be “Medium Density Residential”. The names of each higher intensity category would be adjusted, and the “20 or more” unit per acre designation would become “Highest Density Residential”.

The Planning Commission endorsed the certainty system as a concept, with the majority agreeing with the GPAC proposal to restrict amendments between foundation component categories to five-year cycles. First District Commissioner John Roth indicated support for an even stronger level of certainty - a ten-year cycle. However, the Planning Commission indicated support for the addition of a provision for a one-year period after Plan adoption within which corrections could be made by the County (through the general plan amendment process) in conjunction with consistency zoning.

One of the most controversial provisions of the RCIP General Plan is the introduction of the Community Center concept. The Planning Commission was divided as to the appropriateness of this designation. Commissioners expressed concern that the anticipated levels of density would aggravate traffic congestion and questioned the level of transit usage that could be expected. They also expressed concern that the designation as Community Center, coupled with the requirement that Community Centers be developed pursuant to a unified Specific Plan, could render individual properties undevelopable until such time as a specific plan is prepared. These concerns were to some extent reinforced by substantial public opposition to the proposed Community Center designations in some areas of western Riverside County. The reaction was more positive in the desert communities, and Fourth District Commissioner Jim Porras felt that there might be a need for more Community Centers in the Eastern Coachella Valley in order to provide for affordable housing and job creation.

The only conceptual change made by the Planning Commission was to recommend a policy restricting the spatial expansion of any Community Center to a 10 percent average increase over any five-year period. This recommendation was apparently based on concerns regarding potential effects of Community Center development and a feeling that the concept was experimental and that the program to establish up to 20 such centers was overly ambitious. The Commissioners addressed this concern in different ways. First District Commissioner John Roth maintained the Community Center proposed designations at some sites, but eliminated this designation at others, including the Horsethief Canyon site, which was subject to heavy public opposition, and the Woodcrest site, which had been questioned by the City of Riverside. Second District Commissioner John Snell directed that Community Center designations in his district be converted to Community Center overlays in order to allow for development of these centers, but not prohibit individual property owners from using their land in the absence of a specific plan. Third District Commissioner John Petty felt that it was unwise for the County to apply this designation without specific commitment from the owners of the underlying land,

and directed that all of the Community Center designations be eliminated within his district. For the areas

that were already proposed for mixed use or town center designations within adopted specific plans, a new designation of Mixed Use Policy Area was established.

The Planning Commission also extensively discussed the issue of minimum lot size. Commissioners were concerned that the RCIP General Plan would affect the general standard lot size for tract maps in the community development foundation component, and that density bonuses or incentives would result in even smaller lot sizes. There was a general consensus that the 7,200 square foot minimum lot size of the R-1 zone should remain as a baseline standard. The majority of the Planning Commission recommended allowing for lot sizes smaller than 7,200 square feet in community development areas in conjunction with clustering or density transfer, or to provide for preservation of open space or a needed recreational amenity. Commissioner Petty dissented; he was unwilling to support lot sizes below 7,200 square feet except in the context of a specific plan that provides substantial recreational amenities.

Based on the concept of maintaining a 7,200 square foot lot size as the baseline level of intensity for medium density subdivisions, the Planning Commission decided that a density of five dwelling units per acre would not be achievable with this minimum lot size, and that the use of a 2 to 5 dwelling unit per acre range for such areas would be misleading. The Commission, therefore, changed this range to “2 to 4” dwelling units per acre. (The range in the next higher intensity category would then change from “5 to 8” to “4 to 8” dwelling units per acre.)

Another major issue was the proposed incentive program. While not a part of the General Plan text itself, this program is considered a key RCIP implementation measure as a means of encouraging a more efficient pattern of development. The Planning Commission agreed (with Commissioner Petty dissenting) to endorse the concept of a density bonus/incentive program, but they questioned whether it was appropriate to provide developers with density bonuses based on compliance with quality development standards or guidelines. The Commissioners generally felt that it was within the power of the County to mandate higher standards without offering incentives. The Planning Commission specifically requested that this Board report emphasize the Commission’s desire to remain active participants in the development of the incentive program. It was the Commission consensus that the most recent version that they considered (as presented on December 18, 2002) needed further modifications, especially a clarification of baseline standards.

The Planning Commission also discussed the issue of density transfers. The Commissioners felt that density transfers between noncontiguous properties should only be approved provided that some recordation or action takes place to ensure that the “sending” parcel or area (the one that cedes its development rights) is preserved in perpetuity, either through fee title acquisition or permanent conservation easement.

One of the key goals of the RCIP General Plan is the preservation of the distinctiveness of the County’s unincorporated communities and avoidance of the continuous suburban development seen in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The concept of “community separators” was utilized in the design of the

Area Plan maps. The Planning Commission agreed to recommend that a program be established to prepare a Community Separators map or overlay for review by the GPAC Steering Committee, LAFCO, and City representatives, then the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, with public lands, topographical, and geographical features constituting the separators in most cases. Furthermore, the Planning Commission agreed that, once the Community Separators map is adopted, it should not be changed for at least ten years, except as necessary to reflect the actions of other jurisdictions, and that it should be utilized as a tool for the County's use in inter-governmental matters, such as commenting on proposals submitted to or by LAFCO, cities, or tribal authorities.

Area Plan Public Testimony and Controversies

The issues of concern to the people of Riverside County who testified at the public hearings varied from one area to the next.

Desert Center - There was little or no testimony from residents of Desert Center, Eagle Mountain, or Lake Tamarisk. The main concern here was the need for the County to provide infrastructure, particularly flood control.

Eastern Coachella Valley - There was considerable public testimony from the residents of this area. One of the major concerns was the impact of the certainty system on farmers. A number of farm owners testified that a prohibition on amendments from the Agriculture designation to more intense designations for a five-year period would result in lower land values and thereby make obtaining loans for conducting business more difficult, increasing the likelihood that they would be forced out of farming. In response, staff agreed to work with the agricultural community to provide for a modification specifically related to the Agriculture designation.

At the May 8 public hearing, the Planning Commission also heard from a number of people whose properties had been designated Agriculture since at least 1985 (the date of the approval of the existing Community Plan), but who have wanted to divide their properties into one acre lots. Many of these requests were accommodated in changes to the maps, especially in the vicinity of the existing communities of Thermal and Mecca. However, a number of these properties were determined to be within the boundary of the Torres-Martinez Indian Reservation. These properties are shown as Areas Subject to Indian Jurisdiction, as the sovereign tribes maintain land use control within their boundaries.

The Planning Commission and staff upgraded the proposed designations of large portions of the community of Oasis, in accordance with the "vision map" proposal submitted by the Oasis Community Council. The Council also advocated provision for "country club" type development along the foothills westerly of the valley, in areas that are now agricultural in character. However, plans for the development of this area are in a conceptual stage at best. Rather than applying specific designations, the Planning Commission and staff are recommending written policies that would allow for the filing of master planned developments in these areas without being subject to the five-year restriction, providing

that certain requirements are met. Similar policies are proposed to address potential development at Chiriaco Summit and Shavers Valley easterly of the developed portions of the Coachella Valley.

For the “Vista Santa Rosa” area, special provisions apply, including a 5 acre (rather than 10 acre) minimum for the Agriculture designation. Additionally, the Planning Commission and staff recommend that a large portion of this area be subject to a Community Development overlay, which would exempt general plan amendments from the 5 year restriction. The Community Development overlay has also been applied liberally in the Thermal and Mecca areas in an attempt to address the areas’ housing situation and economic development needs.

Eastvale - Most of this area, which has historically been devoted to dairy farming, was already slated for residential community development on the preferred alternative map, so there were only minor changes here. The Planning Commission added Community Center overlays at a couple of locations here, while converting proposed Community Center designations to overlays.

Elsinore - The Elsinore Area Plan includes areas that were formerly covered by portions of the Southwest Area Community Plan and the Temescal/El Cerrito Community Plan, and includes several distinct communities. In Wildomar, there was considerable testimony from residents and landowners requesting changes in designations on their individual properties. The Area Plan as developed by The Planning Center and the GPAC had proposed rolling back densities relative to densities that had been permitted by the Southwest Area Plan in a number of locations. The Planning Commission carefully considered these requests on their merits in directing specific changes.

Considerable correspondence was generated by the residents of Horsethief Canyon Estates and by the owners of lands surrounding this development. The Area Plan proposal had called for a Community Center northerly of existing Horsethief Canyon Estates and rural residential and rural mountainous designations east and west of the existing development. However, residents opposed the Community Center proposal, and the owners of lands to the east and west persistently requested to be able to develop at a density of 2 to 3 dwelling units per acre. The Planning Commission ultimately eliminated the Community Center proposal, reverting the portions within the existing Specific Plan to the land uses already authorized by that Plan, and the uncommitted areas to densities in the 2 to 4 dwelling unit per acre range.

The Area Plan proposal had called for a combination of Rural Mountainous and Conservation - Habitat designations within the community of El Cariso along the Ortega Highway. However, residents pointed out at the hearings that their private properties were shown as Conservation - Habitat. The Planning Commission and staff recommended that the Conservation - Habitat designation be removed from properties within the community and further placed the community in a Rural Village Overlay Study Area so as to allow more detailed topographical analysis and review of existing lot sizes and land use at the consistency zoning stage.

Initially, landowners in Meadowbrook similarly requested changes in the designations of individual properties to allow for commercial and industrial land uses; however, after a number of community meetings, the community came together to request the application of a Rural Village Overlay. The Planning Commission and staff agreed to recommend a Rural Village Overlay Study Area centered along State Highway Route 74.

Harvest Valley/Winchester - On a general basis, residents and landowners in the community of Winchester would like to see their community developed for urban uses, while residents in the existing community of Green Acres want to maintain their rural lifestyle. Consequently, the Planning Commission has recommended community development land uses for the community of Winchester; however, the Commission also deleted the proposed Community Center designation for the downtown area. The Planning Commission also recommended rural community designations for Romoland, Homeland, and Green Acres.

Highgrove - Highgrove is the site of a recently adopted community plan, and that plan, as modified by the adoption of the Spring Mountain Ranch Specific Plan, forms the basis of the proposed Area Plan. Due to the introduction of community development land uses to east Highgrove through the specific plan, the Planning Commission and staff recommended that some additional lands be proposed for medium density, rather than low density, residential development.

Jurupa - The main concern that surfaced in the General Plan hearings that was not site-specific was the need to maintain rural lifestyles in some areas of the community. The Planning Commission recommended rural community status for many of these areas.

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest - Considerable testimony was received from this area.

Many landowners in the El Sobrante area, generally located easterly of La Sierra Avenue, northerly of El Sobrante Road, and westerly of Mockingbird Canyon Road, who have traditionally maintained orange groves requested community development designations, as the rising cost of water and increased competition from foreign markets have made citrus production economically unfeasible. At the same time, the City of Riverside was asking the County to hold the line on development in this area in order to be consistent with the intent of the City's greenbelt protection measures. A joint City-County committee was set up to address land use and circulation issues, and the recommendations of that committee are generally reflected in the Planning Commission's recommendations, which provide for a combination of designations in the area easterly of McAllister Street.

In Woodcrest, the basic concern of residents was maintaining the one acre average lot size requirement. This is implemented through the Planning Commission's recommendation of the Very Low Density Residential - 1 Acre designation for most of the community not included within the adopted Alta Cresta Specific Plan. The Planning Commission also deleted the Community Center designation in this area, where densities would be incompatible with community character.

The Lake Mathews area includes considerable territory that has been designated for 2 acre and 2½ acre lot sizes since the adoption of the Lake Mathews Community Plan in 1987. In order to address the preponderance of this development pattern in this and other communities, the Planning Commission and staff developed the Estate Density Residential designation for application generally to areas preponderantly characterized by this development pattern.

Lakeview/Nuevo - During preliminary consideration of alternatives in the year 2000, the community had indicated its support for maintaining a plan that was as close as possible to the 1990 Community Plan for this area. There were a number of landowner requests for upgraded intensities in this area, but the Planning Commission and staff made few changes here. The Planning Commission did recommend that the two proposed Community Centers in existing specific plans be changed to mixed use policy areas.

Mead Valley - The major concern of Mead Valley residents was to maintain the rural community status of the area and animal-keeping rights. The Planning Commission and staff are recommending that the majority of this area be designated in the rural community foundation component. The Community Center near the Cajalco/I-215 interchange was retained, with the understanding that this would be a Job Center.

Palo Verde Valley - Most of the changes in the Palo Verde Valley are site-specific and affect only small acreages. The Planning Commission and staff are recommending policies that would allow the filing of general plan amendments for master planned communities along the Colorado River northerly and southerly of Blythe that would not be subject to the 5 year restriction.

The Pass - The Planning Commission and staff recommended that the majority of Cherry Valley and all of Banning Bench be designated Rural Community - Very Low Density Residential in accordance with the recommendations of community organizations. Most of the changes made by the Commission and staff are site-specific and include some changes from the Agriculture and Rural Mountainous designations, as appropriate. Recommended designations in Cabazon generally reflect the adopted Community Plan.

Reche Canyon/Badlands - The residents of Reche Canyon northerly of the City of Moreno Valley generally want to preserve their rural lifestyle. This is reflected in the Planning Commission's proposed designations Rural Residential and Rural Mountainous, with some Estate Density Residential. The Estate Density Residential designation within the rural community foundation component also fits the needs of Pigeon Pass residents. A number of landowners in the Badlands area easterly of Gilman Springs Road advocated for higher densities, but most of this area was retained in rural and open space foundation component designations, with Estate Density Residential for some existing smaller lots. The Planning Commission did recommend a community development designation for a portion of the Quail Ranch property adjacent to the existing golf course. The City of Moreno Valley had expressed support for a community development designation at this location.

REMAP - There are a number of communities in this area with differing concerns. In Idyllwild, the main concern was preservation of scenic beauty and wildlife. In Aguanga and Radec Junction, a number of property owners requested to be included in a Rural Village Overlay. The Planning Commission and staff recommended Rural Village Overlay Study Areas for Aguanga, Radec Junction, and Twin Creek.

San Jacinto Valley - This area has not been subject to a community plan since the adoption of the Comprehensive General Plan in 1984, and the General Plan hearing process sparked a heated debate among residents and landowners in the Valle Vista area easterly of Hemet and southerly of Florida Avenue. A number of residents in the subdivisions adjacent to the agricultural areas would like to see those agricultural areas confined to agricultural uses, while many of the owners of those agricultural lands would like to see their lands slated for development. The Planning Commission ultimately recommended that most of the area of controversy be designated Agriculture, except for the northwesterly portion of the area, which was recommended for the rural community category. In the Cactus Valley area, the Planning Commission recommended increased densities at some locations and decreased densities in others. However, most of this area would be within either the rural community or rural foundation components.

Southwest Area - The Planning Commission recommendation map for this area looks considerably different from the initial proposal, but a large portion of this difference is attributable to the adoption of specific plans and specific plan amendments in the French Valley area. The Planning Commission recommended plan includes these changes. The Planning Commission also changed the proposed designation of a Community Center within Specific Plan No. 213 (Silverhawk) to a Mixed Use Policy Area. In the area east of the City of Temecula, the Planning Commission and staff applied the Estate Density Residential designation to most of the areas that had been designated 2½ Acre Minimum on the 1989 Southwest Area Plan. However, areas east of De Portola Road were generally retained in the Rural Residential designation, and it was determined that the Valle de los Caballos area would be subject to a special policy requiring a 10 acre minimum. The Planning Commission and staff also recommended that the Santa Rosa Plateau policies allowing for the possibility of lots as small as 5 acres within the Rural Mountainous designation be retained.

Sun City/Meniffee Valley - The Planning Commission recommendation map for the north half of this Area Plan (including the Sun City core community) generally resembles the initial proposal. However, there are some major differences in the southerly half of the Plan area. The Planning Center had identified southern Meniffee Valley as a prime location for a Community Center and proposed the largest such center in the County along both sides of Interstate 215 extending northerly from Scott Road. In order to support the Community Center's job producing land uses, they had also provided for areas of housing at densities of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre extending west from the Community Center. However, considerable testimony was received in opposition to the Community Center designation from both rural residents concerned about the potential for high densities and from landowners on the west side of I-215 who did not want to wait for adoption of a specific plan to

develop their properties. The Planning Commission deleted the Community Center and rolled back the proposed densities in most of the surrounding area to rural community foundation component designations.

Temescal Canyon - Most of the changes recommended by the Planning Commission in this area were site-specific. However, the Planning Commission map represents a slightly different vision for the area. The Planning Commission would like to see residential development located along the west side of Interstate 15, industrial development easterly of Interstate 15 and westerly of Temescal Wash, and rural and open space uses farther to the east. Accordingly, the Planning Commission recommended that the designations in one area that had been Mountainous on the

1991 Temescal/El Cerrito Plan but was shown for residential densities of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre on the initial proposal be changed to Open Space - Rural.

Western Coachella Valley - There are a number of changes to designations on this map relative to the initial proposal, but most of them are site-specific and reflect project approvals or existing land uses. Additionally, most of the recommendations of the Bermuda Dunes Community Council were recommended for approval by the Planning Commission and staff. Designations in Thousand Palms and in the area southerly of Desert Hot Springs generally reflect the initial proposal.

Staff Recommendations - Area Plan Maps

Staff is recommending the following additional changes to the Area Plan maps as recommended by the Planning Commission. These changes are reflected on the maps labeled “Staff Recommended Land Use Plan” dated March 10, 2003.

No changes to Desert Center, Eastvale, Mead Valley, and Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plans

Eastern Coachella Valley: In the Vista Santa Rosa area, a strip of Light Industrial and Commercial Retail designations has been added along the westerly side of Harrison Street, southerly of Airport Boulevard, and the depth of an area that had previously been depicted for Commercial Retail was reduced to correspond to the depth of the strip. Designations of several other properties are recommended for change in order to reflect general plan amendments approved by the Board of Supervisors, and a Community Development Overlay was added to a property that had been depicted as Rural Residential, but that was surrounded by lands recommended for Agriculture with a Community Development Overlay.

Elsinore: Staff is recommending that the Walker Canyon Policy Area (see below) be added to the Area Plan map to provide for a potential additional Community Center. Designations of several other properties are recommended for change in order to reflect general plan amendments approved by the Board of Supervisors (in one case, adding a few parcels to “round out” the designation of a neighborhood), appropriate designations are recommended for two tracts that had received Board approval for extensions of time, and an approved paintball park site is recommended for an Open Space - Recreation designation.

Harvest Valley/Winchester: Staff is recommending that Community Center designations as originally proposed be reinstated for sites proposed for mixed use on the Domenigoni-Barton and Menifee North Specific Plans and that a Community Center Overlay be reinstated for a 280-acre area centering on Highway 79 in Winchester. Additionally, the communities of Romoland and Homeland, and undeveloped areas of Green Acres, are proposed to be within the community development foundation category. The map also recognizes the Board’s recent approval of a medium density residential

subdivision south of Green Acres. Within the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) Diamond Valley Reservoir properties, various changes between Public

Facilities, Open Space - Recreation, Commercial Tourist, and Open Space - Recreation designations are proposed in accordance with MWD's request.

Highgrove: A number of areas within the community development foundation category are recommended to be changed from Very Low Density Residential - 1 acre to Low Density Residential - ½ acre to better reflect the designations from the adopted Highgrove Community Plan. One neighborhood would be changed to Medium Density Residential to better reflect existing lot sizes.

Jurupa: Staff recommends that the Flabob Airport be designated Public Facility in accordance with the owner's request and based on its status as a recognized facility. One property on Limonite Avenue would be changed from Open Space - Recreation to Commercial Office, reflecting Board approval of a change of zone. Four sites fronting on Mission Boulevard within the community development foundation component would be changed to Commercial Office, Highest Density Residential, and Public Facility. Finally, upon recommendation from the Director of the Economic Development Agency (EDA), staff is recommending a change from Commercial Retail to Medium High Density Residential for a row of lots on a street northerly of Mission Boulevard in Rubidoux (where EDA feels commercial development would not be feasible) and from Business Park to Medium Density Residential for an area northerly of Bellegrave Avenue and westerly of Etiwanda Avenue (where EDA felt the amount of Business Park designation depicted was unrealistic).

Lake Mathews/Woodcrest: The staff recommendation map depicts a redefined boundary of the El Sobrante Policy Area in accordance with the recommendations of the City-County joint committee (see above) with adjusted boundaries between ½ acre, 1 acre, 2 acre, and 5 acre areas to more accurately reflect the final committee proposal. Additionally, the map provides for a Commercial Retail designation at the correct location of Louie's Nursery in Woodcrest (switching Commercial Retail and Rural Community Very Low Density Residential designations on two parcels) and reinstates Open Space - Conservation designations for areas generally zoned W-1 along Mockingbird Canyon.

Lakeview/Nuevo: Staff is recommending that Community Center designations be reinstated as originally proposed in Specific Plans along Ramona Expressway and Nuevo Road, westerly of the San Jacinto River. Additionally, pursuant to EDA recommendations, two areas in Lakeview north of the aqueduct that had been depicted as rural community areas are proposed to be moved to the community development foundation component, and Community Development Overlays are proposed to be added over Agriculture areas both northerly and southerly of Ramona Expressway in the Lakeview area.

Palo Verde Valley: In order to recognize existing zoning, in consultation with Planning Department Indio office staff, the staff recommendation map proposes a change from Agriculture to Rural Residential for an area of less than 80 acres southerly of Ripley and a Commercial Tourist designation for several C-T zoned lots on the west side of Mesa Drive. Additionally, the Mesa Verde community name is proposed to be recognized, and the map also reflects an annexation by the City of Blythe.

The Pass: Staff is recommending that an area of an approved tract that has R-A-2 zoning be designated Estate Density Residential, rather than Rural Residential.

REMAP: Staff is recommending that Idyllwild Pines Camp and Conference Center (approved Conditional Use Permit No. 3334) be recognized with a Public Facility designation, and that the existing Boy Scout Camp be designated Open Space - Recreation. In Anza, an area southerly of Highway 371 that had been depicted for Commercial Retail, but that is neither zoned commercial nor used for commercial purposes is recommended for the Rural Community - Very Low Density Residential - 1 acre designation. In Pinyon Pines, privately owned parcels in the section of land easterly of the landfill are recommended to be removed from the Conservation - Habitat designation and changed to Rural Mountainous and Estate Density Residential (depending on slopes), with Commercial Retail for existing commercial uses.

San Jacinto Valley: Staff is recommending the addition of a Community Center Overlay for an area of Valle Vista both northerly and southerly of Florida Avenue, easterly of Fairview Avenue. EDA supports providing for the possibility of higher density housing within the redevelopment area. Staff is also recommending the delineation of a policy area (Agriculture/Potential Development Study Area) for a large area southerly of Florida Avenue and easterly of Soboba Street (see below). In Cactus Valley, staff is recommending that areas east of State Street and north of Newport Road be changed from Community Development - Low Density Residential (½ acre) to Rural Community - Estate Density Residential (2 acre). Staff is also recommending a High Density Residential (8 to 14 DU/AC) designation for an R-3 zoned property located on the west side of Girard Street, northerly of Whittier Avenue, and the addition of an area of Commercial Retail northwesterly of the intersection of Highway 79 (Lambs Canyon) and Gilman Springs Road.

Southwest Area: Staff is recommending reinstatement of Community Center designations for mixed use/town center areas in the Domenigoni-Barton and Silverhawk Specific Plans and recommends that a portion of Lake Skinner be designated Open Space - Recreation, rather than Commercial Tourist.

Sun City/Meniffee Valley: Staff is recommending reinstatement of the originally proposed Community Center designation easterly of Interstate 215, and that a Community Center Overlay be provided westerly of Interstate 215. Additionally, staff is recommending that two areas westerly of the overlay be changed from Rural Community - Very Low Density Residential (1 acre) to Medium Density Residential. Easterly of Interstate 215, staff is recommending a Medium Density Residential designation on the site of a tract map in process on the north side of Garbani Road; however, this tract would be within the Garbani Lindenberger Policy Area (see below). In order to provide for a community separator, the area generally easterly of Briggs Road is recommended for a change from Rural Community - Estate Density Residential to Rural Residential.

Temescal Canyon: Staff is recommending reinstatement of Medium Density Residential and Open Space - Conservation designations for the site of a large specific plan easterly of Temescal Wash that

would provide for conservation of important habitat. Additionally, a Light Industrial designation is recommended for the site of an approved conditional use permit in Temescal Wash.

Western Coachella Valley: Staff is recommending that areas depicted for Very High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential designations in Sky Valley, but that are undeveloped and not part of a previously approved project, be designated Rural Residential in accordance with the character of the Sky Valley community. Additional change recommendations in the Dillon Road corridor include a Light Industrial designation for a golf cart manufacturing facility, a Public Facilities designation for a sewer treatment plant, and a Commercial Retail designation for the site of a convenience store approved by the Board of Supervisors in October. Staff also recommends application or reinstatement of Open Space - Water designations for W-1 zoned areas southeasterly of Sun City-Palm Desert and in Cahuilla Hills. Staff also recommends an Open Space - Mineral Resources designation for the site of Surface Mining Permit No. 176, approved in May, 2002. Other changes include corrections to recognize several approved general plan amendments in Bermuda Dunes and the addition of a mapped Wind Energy Policy Area.

Important Policy Considerations:

Proposed in the new general plan are many new, often bold, concepts, that are intended to help the County respond to the continued rapid pace of development expected over the next 20 years, and beyond. Some of the most important concepts are the general plan certainty system, community centers, community separators, and the incentives program.

The general plan certainty system originated primarily from a stakeholder concern that the rapid pace of development in the county had resulted in a large scale, haphazard consumption of land for traditional land development, that eroded important habitat and open space, rural lifestyle, and agricultural areas without adequate provisions for the orderly, long - term protection of these areas. The GPAC decided to recommend to the County that all categories of land use - there are 26 different categories describing urban, rural, open space, etc. uses - be grouped into four primary categories, or Foundation Components, called Community Development, Rural, Agriculture, and Open Space, and that amendments between these categories be permitted only once every five years. Amendments within each Foundation Component, for example, between residential, commercial, or industrial categories within the Community Development Foundation Component, could continue to occur on a quarterly basis, just as they are under the County's existing general plan. It is hoped that this new process will slow the conversion of lands between Foundation Components, and provide for a more orderly manner of development in the County. As a result of public testimony from persons residing and owning land in rural communities that additional certainty was needed in the general plan to protect their lifestyles, the Planning Commission is recommending that a fifth Foundation Component be included in the general plan to accommodate rural residential and animal-keeping lifestyles in rural communities with one-half, one, and two acre minimum lot sizes.

In order to promote the development of community cores that provide a focus and identity for the

County's growing communities, mixed-use Community Centers have been proposed by GPAC in 22 areas in the County, generally at or near major transportation corridors, and at or near the major activity areas of existing or planned communities. In community centers, a dynamic mix of commercial, residential, industrial, and public uses are planned around major roadway and mass transit opportunities. Stacked uses - i.e., residential on top of commercial, for example, would be permitted, as well as other design features that would encourage walkability and an intimate feel, and ultimately, to the appeal and success of these community center areas. As one of the major concepts in the general plan, community centers would assist in promoting the efficient use of land, and broader use of transportation options. These areas would also provide the opportunity to plan what could be the cores of future cities. Depending on their location and significance to the surrounding areas, community centers would be classified as, and have different mixtures of uses as, town centers, village centers, job centers, or entertainment centers. The Planning Commission has expressed several concerns about the viability of the community centers concept, including whether the centers would be compatible with other, adjacent land uses, whether they would be effective in encouraging more use of mass transit, and whether transit facilities would even become available to serve them. Staff would note that these and other issues will need to be addressed in the site planning for each community center. The Planning Commission is recommending to the Board that several of the proposed Community Centers not be adopted with the new general plan. Staff is recommending that most community centers be retained to provide us with the ability to plan for the cores of all of the larger planned communities. Information about the proposed Community Centers concept is included in Binder No.2, and in Technical Appendix J to the General Plan.

One of the concepts that was considered while the area plan maps were being developed was the need to respond to a desire expressed by the public during the visioning process that separators be planned between communities, wherever possible, so that the County's communities do not ultimately grow together in a manner similar to how communities have grown together in Orange and Los Angeles Counties, eliminating individual community identities and important open space and rural areas. Community separators are not mapped as a separate category; however, generally mountains, hills, and flood plains are used where appropriate as community separators. Also, rural and open space areas can be regarded as community separators where there is a clear need to protect existing rural lifestyles and open space resources. The Planning Commission is recommending that the Board direct that a map be prepared that delineates community separators, in order to provide a means of communication to cities, the LAFCo, and other public agencies about the County's intent to in the general plan to provide the separators. Staff recommends that a map showing community separators be prepared that defines separators using "bubble" diagrams, not hard lines.

The general plan incentives program is not actually part of the general plan, but is proposed as a general plan implementation program. Accordingly, it is still under development, and has not been included with this package. The incentives program would provide an incentive, primarily in terms of increased residential densities (up to 25% in most Community Development areas, and up to 50% in Community Centers), in community development areas, for developers to produce neighborhoods of superior

design quality. The superior designs would be on top of enhanced design guidelines, which are currently in the process of being developed. In addition, a developer proposing to make use of the incentives program would agree to voluntarily pay a fee to be used toward the acquisition of open space and recreational areas. Landowners in rural areas would also be able to use the incentives program. The program would provide incentives for both rural and agriculture - designated properties to either cluster their rural development, or sell or transfer it off-site to properties designated to accommodate higher densities. The intended effect of the program is to make more efficient use of land, provide open space and recreational amenities near developing areas, and to assist in providing funding and in acquiring land needed for implementation of the proposed Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. The Planning Commission had numerous concerns with the Incentives Program as proposed. Some of the major concerns were that the smaller lots associated with the proposed 25% density increase would represent an inappropriate increase in density, and that superior design standards could be required of developers without granting density increases. Staff is recommending that the Incentives Program be implemented, but with density incentives granted for superior design standards on top of enhanced baseline countywide design standards for all development. The Incentives Program is intended to be an implementation program; therefore, is it not included as part of the proposed general plan at this time. However, much work has occurred on a draft of the Incentives Program, and staff intends to make a presentation to the Board describing the proposed program at the end of the hearing on Thursday.

Adoption of the new general plan will provide many benefits to the County - a greatly updated plan to accommodate future growth, assist with economic development, provide improved protection for natural resources and rural communities, just to name a few. It will also, however, require that the County undertake a number of actions and programs to implement the new general plan. By law, we will need to undertake a "consistency zoning program," with public hearings, to ensure that all zoning in the County is consistent with the newly adopted general plan. We will also need to overhaul Ordinance No. 348, the Land Use Ordinance, and revise other ordinances affecting development activities. We have already begun to revise our development review process to address habitat and transportation corridor issue, along with land use planning, in a more coordinated fashion, and additional refinements to that process will be necessary. To ensure quality and timely implementation of general plan programs, we will need to undertake a host of other activities, as well. To accomplish this, additional staffing and budget adjustments will be necessary. Staff will bring forth proposals to address these matters as the general plan progresses toward adoption.

Staff Recommendations Regarding Several Significant Issues Addressed in the Planning Commission's Resolution to the Board:

Several of the recommendations made by the Planning Commission in its Resolution to the Board recommending the adoption of the new General Plan present issues in the way certain fundamental aspects of the General Plan are structured, or would be implemented. The recommendations, in some cases, would significantly change the effectiveness of the new General Plan, in staff's opinion.

Therefore, staff is presenting additional recommendations to the Board regarding ways, in staff's opinion, in which the issues should be addressed. In addition, the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) and the RCIP Steering Committee also met and decided to present their recommendations to the Board on these matters. A matrix illustrating, in summary, the Planning Commission's recommendations regarding each issue, and staff's recommended revisions and the **RCIP Steering Committee and GPAC recommendations** regarding the issues is included in Binder No. 1. The staff recommendations are explained in more detail below:

Certainty System: The Agricultural community has expressed concerns that the General Plan's proposed Certainty System, with the proposed 5 - year restriction on general plan amendments involving Foundation Component changes, would present a special hardship to farmers, who continually need to acquire financing for both capital and operating purposes, based on the value of their farmland holdings. As a result, the County and Farm Bureau have been working together for several months to craft revisions to the Certainty System language addressing agriculture, in order to address this issue. The County/Farm Bureau process had not been completed as of the time of the adoption of the Planning Commission's resolution to the Board regarding the general plan. During the Planning Commission hearing process, however, the Planning Commission expressed concern that the Certainty System is one of the most important components of the new General Plan, and its integrity should be maintained in whatever solution was crafted to address the agriculture industry's concern. Draft language has since been developed, and staff is recommending that be incorporated into the general plan Certainty System as described in this report. The effect of the proposal would be to permit up to 5% of the areas designated as Agriculture in each of the County's three major agricultural regions - western county, Coachella Valley, and Palo Verde Valley - to convert to other Foundation Component designations during each 5 year period. Also, Board - appointed committees would be established for each area to evaluate and make recommendations to the Board regarding each application to amend the Agriculture designation, and to evaluate the various factors affecting agriculture, and whether this proposed policy is effectively resolving the agriculture industry's concerns with the Certainty System. The committee would also be able to recommend to the Board whether an increase in the five percent per five year agricultural conversion amount would be necessary.

The Planning Commission also recommends that, in order to ensure that all corrections of potential map errors are made to the new general plan maps before the Certainty System's 5 year restriction on Foundation Component amendments takes effect, that a period of one - year be observed to make such corrections that would otherwise be affected the Certainty System. Staff concurs with this proposal, and further recommends that any potential mapping errors be identified and corrected during the process of consistency zoning.

Incentives Program: The Planning Commission has agreed, with Commissioner Petty dissenting, to support the concept of using an incentives program to assist in implementing the new general plan, but has questioned whether it is appropriate to provide for density bonuses based on compliance with higher quality development standards, opining that the County has it in its power to require the higher

standards, without providing the density bonuses. Staff would note that the County is in the process of upgrading the existing design guidelines, so that there would be both improved baseline design guidelines for all development, plus the opportunity under the incentives program to achieve even higher standards in conjunction with increased density.

Community Centers : The Planning Commission has endorsed the concept of community centers overall, but has recommended that many of the originally proposed community centers not be included in the adopted general plan. The community centers that were eliminated in the Planning Commission's recommendation are those in the Third Supervisorial District, and a few of those in the First Supervisorial District. The Planning Commission has also recommended to the Board that for those community centers that are adopted in the new general plan, a 10% limit be placed on potential expansions of the area that they cover during any 5 - year period. Staff recommends that most of the community centers, as shown on the staff recommendation maps, be retained, and that the 10% expansion limit not be adopted, in order to provide sufficient flexibility for the implementation of the community centers concept. The Board would still retain in its power the ability to establish specific density ranges in conjunction with individual community center applications, and to deny general plan amendment proposals to expand their sizes, if that is deemed inappropriate.

Minimum Lot Size : The Planning Commission recommends (with Commissioner Petty dissenting) that in Community Development areas, where development clustering or density transfers are used, lots smaller than 7,200 square feet be permitted. In Rural Community and Rural areas, the Planning Commission recommends that minimum lot sizes be based on a sliding scale depending on the severity of slopes, with the minimum lot size being one-half acre. In Rural areas with clustering, where the rest of the property is dedicated to open space, the Planning Commission recommends a one-half acre minimum lot size. In Rural Community areas in the vicinity of Community Development areas, the Planning Commission is recommending a 10,000 square foot minimum lot size. Staff would recommend some modifications, in order to facilitate the implementation of the incentives program. First, for single family, detached units, staff recommends that a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet be permitted, but only where appropriate design standards are applied. Staff recommends that lots smaller than 5,000 square feet be permitted in order to accommodate attached units, such as row houses, town houses, etc., but there should be building coverage ratios and other standards to avoid overcrowding of units.

Specific Plans : In order to ensure that there is a periodic review of specific plans that have been previously been adopted, some many years ago, the Planning Commission recommends that all specific plans currently over twenty years old be reviewed, and revised or abandoned as appropriate. The Planning Commission also recommends that a fee-bearing ordinance be adopted for the review of new specific plans that haven't achieved 50% buildout within 10 years, and abandon any without 90% buildout within 15 years, or 100% buildout within 18 years. Staff supports some form of review of older specific plans that have experienced little or no development since their adoption. Staff would suggest that a regular program of review of specific plans be accomplished during each 5 - year Certainty System general plan review/amendments, starting, for each specific plan, when the plan is at

least 10 years old. The review should also take into account the degree to which a particular specific plan has been developed, and whether bonding and other financing mechanisms have been put in place for the plan.

Community Separators: The Planning Commission recognizes the importance of the Community Separators concept in the new general plan, and recommends that the Board direct that a map be prepared in order to illustrate to cities, LAFCo, and other public agencies the County's intent in incorporating the concept into the general plan. Staff concurs with the Planning Commission's recommendation in concept, but recommends that the map be of the "bubble" variety, and not show hard line boundaries, to avoid misinterpretations of the map as being a land use designation map, like the area plan maps. Staff would also recommend incorporating into the General Plan text describing the bubble map and its communicative intent.

Density Transfer: The Planning Commission recommends that density transfers be allowed in the new general plan, including transfers between non-contiguous properties. The Planning Commission also recommends that staff develop examples of how the process would work, and also recommends that some official recordation or action takes place to ensure that the "sending" parcel is preserved in perpetuity, either through fee title acquisition or permanent conservation easement. Staff supports the density transfer concept applied on a case-by-case basis, based on issues affecting sending and receiving sites.

Designation of Low and Medium Densities: Due to concerns that the implementation of the incentive program would result in lots that are too small (for example, using the incentive program maximum of a 25% density bonus in the proposed Medium Density Residential Designation, with a planned density range of 2-5 dwelling units per acre, the maximum density allowed would be 6.25 units per acre, and lots of 5,000 square feet or smaller), the Planning Commission recommends that the Medium Density Residential designation density range be reduced to 2-4 dwelling units per acre, thereby limiting potential densities to only 5 dwelling units per acre under the incentives program. Staff recommends that the original proposed density range for Medium Density Residential of 2-5 dwelling units per acre be retained, in order to ensure that the incentives program retains the flexibility it needs in order to be effective.

Rural Village Overlay: The Planning Commission recommends that the proposed potential maximum residential densities in rural village areas be reduced from 10 dwelling units per acre to a lesser, more reasonable level. Staff concurs that the existing proposed rural village policies could result in higher densities and more development in these areas than what is generally envisioned, and therefore, recommends that densities in rural villages greater than two units per acre be limited to small, core areas of the villages where the same level of services can be provided as are provided in Community Development areas, and where public facilities can be located to broadly serve surrounding rural areas.

Certainty System Policy Revision to Support Land Exchanges and Land Consolidation Associated with Resource Conservation: A concern has been raised that the proposed general plan Certainty System, with its 5 - year Foundation Component general plan amendment restriction, would hamper efforts by the Bureau of Land Management and other agencies managing public land to undertake land exchanges with owners of privately-held lands in order to consolidate public lands for conservation purposes. To ensure that public agencies continue to

have the ability to work with private land owners on land exchange programs, staff recommends that the following policy be incorporated into the Certainty System section of the general plan:

“In order to promote the objectives of resource conservation, the County may grant exceptions to the five year general plan amendment cycle affecting public lands. Such exceptions would be considered in support of proposed land exchanges to consolidate public ownerships and thereby enhance management effectiveness of public lands. Any such proposed amendments will be evaluated in the context of surrounding land use designation patterns. This exception would permit a property owner to apply for an amendment to the Foundation Component designation through the general plan concurrent with, or upon completion of, a land exchange or other transfer of property.”

Wind Energy:

To maintain the unique wind energy sector within Riverside County and encourage its continued vitality, the following changes are recommended to Attachment “A” of the Resolution Recommending Adoption of the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) General Plan adopted by the Planning Commission on January 22, 2003.

- 1. Delete the Wind Energy Resources section of the Land Use Element on Page LU-32 through LU-34 and replace it as follows:**

Wind Energy Resources:

Energy resources provide the power necessary to operate and maintain the quality of life enjoyed by most Riverside County residents. Wind energy resources are among the beneficial energy resources located in Riverside County; development of wind resources provides economic and revenue advantages to the County. Many types of wind energy power generating facilities are present or will be built within the life span of this General Plan; however, the potential aesthetic, land use, noise, and ecology issues associated with the development of wind turbines necessitates adequate policy direction in order to ensure the continuation of the quality of life in the County. Wind turbines, also referred to as Wind Energy Conversion Systems (WECS), should generally be located away from natural hazards, critical habitat and community development type land uses. Nonetheless, wind turbines have an essential role as electric power generators, and, consistent with these policies may be constructed and maintained in areas proven to have a wind resource.

Policies:

- LU 15.1 Prohibit commercial wind turbines within Community Development Foundation Component Areas, and within the Rural Residential land use designation. (AI 3).

- LU 15.2 Require wind turbines to address through project design the alignments of multipurpose trails as designated on Figure C-5 of the Circulation Element.-

- LU 15.3 Require wind turbines to address through project design County Regional Parks and sensitive environmental areas. Setbacks will be determined on a project by project basis. (AI 3).

- LU 15.4 No wind turbines shall be sited on lands in excess of 25% of slope.

- LU 15.5 Restrict lands in excess of 25% of slope from uses associated with wind turbine development, such as access roads, except in specific instances where site-specific investigation indicates that no adverse impacts or increased hazard would result, and that visual impacts can be mitigated. (AI 3).

- LU 15.6 Prohibit wind turbines located on top of earthquake faults or lineaments. (AI 3).

- LU 15.7 Geotechnical considerations, such as potential landslides and mudflows, shall be reviewed with all commercial wind energy developments. Geotechnical reports submitted for review shall adequately address avoidance of hazards and, if avoidance is not feasible, propose mitigation according to good engineering practices. (AI 3).

- LU 15.8 Wildlife and natural vegetation impacts of proposed commercial wind turbine development shall be considered, including endangered species avoidance and mitigation, bird migration flyways, and may include appropriate consultation with state and federal wildlife agencies. (AI 3).

- LU 15.9 Restrict placement of commercial wind turbines within 3,000 feet of residential development unless the applicant supplies documentation that the machines are designed according to proven engineering practices and will not violate applicable County noise standards including excessive low frequency or pure tone noise. (AI 3).

- LU 15.10 Require wind turbines to operate at less than 65db(A) and not less than 60db(A) when installed adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses. (AI 3).

- LU 15.11 Ensure that site designs and operation provide for adequate security and safety to less the possibilities and impacts of accidents, vandalism, and environmental hazards. (AI 3).

- LU 15.12 Require the design and location of commercial wind energy developments to mitigate visual impacts. Issues which may be included in the review may be, but are not necessarily limited to, the following list, depending on turbine types, densities, and siting: (AI 3).

- a. Color of turbines;
- b. Location and design of associated facilities such as roads, fencing, non Public Utilities Commission regulated utility lines, substations and maintenance buildings to minimize intrusion or disruption of the landscape;
- c. Rerouting or placing of utility lines underground where feasible near roads, viewpoints and visual features;
- d. Aligning of new transmission lines closely with existing transmission corridors;
- e. Minimizing of disturbed ground and roadway, and restoring of the surface to natural vegetation;
- f. Prohibition of brand names or advertising associated with wind turbines visible from any scenic highways or key viewpoints;
- g. Need for interpretation and/or visitors center located at the end of the view shed of turbines.

LU 15.13 Require design measures for commercial wind energy development on sites within 2/3 of a mile of an official or eligible State or County Scenic Highways designated (Figure C-7, Circulation Element) by Riverside County, and sites within those areas identified as “critical” and “very critical” by Environment Impact Report No. 158. Issues which may be included in the review may be, but are not necessarily limited to, the following list, depending on turbine types, densities, and siting: (AI 3).

- a. No wind turbine will be sited on slopes in excess of 25% to prevent disturbance and degradation of landforms, and visual scarring by cut and fill, side casting, retaining walls, trenching, and vegetation removal; avoid skyline and ridgeline location.
- b. Wind turbines should be set back from scenic highways and viewpoints; set back individual turbines far enough from scenic highways and key viewpoints so they do not obscure or overwhelm distinctive skylines; set back large turbines from small important landmarks so that they do not overwhelm the landform.
- c. Coordinate color schemes for all developments; avoid mixing colors within a particular array unless to subordinate a particular turbine type or to provide safety markings; limit use of color patterns as accent for key clusters or individual turbines; consider aviation safety coloration and lighting as may be required by the FAA.

2. **Revise the “Notes” column for the Rural Desert Area Plan Land Use Designation in Table LU-3 on Page LU-36 of the Land Use Element as follows:**

Rural	Rural Desert (RD)	≤0.1 du/ac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Single-family residential uses, limited animal keeping and agricultural uses are allowed, with a minimum lot size of 10 acres required for residential uses. · Allows limited recreational uses, wind energy uses, compatible resource development (which may include the extraction of mineral resources with approval of a surface mining permit) development), governmental and <i>utility</i> uses.
-------	-------------------	------------	--

3. **Add Policy C 20.2 to the Scenic Corridors section of the Circulation Element on Page C-43 as follows:**

C 20.2 Wind turbine generators have proven to be a unique tourist attraction.

4. **Revise the third paragraph in the Renewable Resource section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element on Page OS-3 and the corresponding Man-made Environment Vision Statement on Page V-6 as follows:**

“We acknowledge and respect the long heritage of economic endeavors that have shaped portions of our environment through mining, agriculture, renewable energy development and similar enterprises and continue to take their value into consideration in shaping our environmental management.”

5. **Delete the Wind Energy section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element on Page OS-20 and replace it as follows:**

Wind Energy

Wind energy generation installation, known also as Wind Energy Conversion Systems (WECS), are a well established industry in the San Gorgonio Pass and Coachella Valley areas of the County. General regulatory issues to be considered in relation to wind energy are aesthetics, safety, noise, air navigation interferences, land use, wildlife and general ecology, slopes and erosion, PM10 and dust control, wind access and equity.

Policies:

- OS 10.1 Provide for orderly and efficient wind energy development in a manner that maximizes beneficial uses of the wind resource and minimizes detrimental effects to the residents and the environment of the County.
- OS 10.2 Continue the County's Wind Implementation Monitoring Program (WIMP) in order to study the evolution of wind energy technology, identify means to solve environmental and community impacts, and provide for an ability to respond with changes in the County's regulatory structure.

6. Delete the Solar Energy section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element on Page OS-25 and replace it as follows:

Solar Energy

Solar radiation in the form of sunlight can be utilized for energy production in two ways. Active solar systems involve the use of mechanical devices to convert solar energy to heat or electricity. Passive solar systems utilize natural heating and cooling from the sun through building orientation and building design techniques.

Policies:

- OS 11.1 Enforce the state Solar Shade Control Act, which promotes all feasible means of energy conservations and all feasible uses of alternative energy supply sources. (AI 62, 65,66, 70)
- OS 11.2 Support and encourage voluntary efforts to provide active and passive solar access opportunities in new developments. (AI 63, 64).
- OS 11.3 Permit and encourage the use of passive solar devices and other state-of-the-art energy resources. (AI 62, 63, 64).

7. Add Policy OS 15.2 to the Petroleum Resources Section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element on Page OS-31 as follows:

OS 15.2 Development of renewable resources should be encouraged.

8. Delete Noise Policy N 5.2 on Page N-12 and replace it with the following:

N 5.2 Encourage the replacement of outdated technology with more efficient technology with less noise impacts. (AI 105)

9. Delete Air Quality Policy AQ 4.5 on Page AQ-17 and replace it as follows:

AQ 4.5 Require stationary pollution sources to mitigate the release of toxic pollutants through:

- Design features;
- Operating procedures;
- Preventative maintenance;
- Operator training; and
- Emergency response planning.

10. Delete the description of San Gorgonio Pass on Page 9 of the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan and replace it as follows:

San Gorgonio Pass

The San Gorgonio Pass area extends west of Indian Avenue to the foothills north and west, south to the City of Palm Springs, and west through the Interstate 10 corridor between the San Jacinto and San Gorgonio Mountains. The portion of this geographic feature within the boundaries of the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan is generally characterized by a large expanse of open desert and mountainous terrain, along with isolated pockets of development. A number of utility corridors are concentrated in this area, including high voltage electrical transmission lines and the Devers Substation. Due to the constant prevailing westerly winds, the highest concentration of commercial wind energy development in the County occurs in this area.

11. Delete the San Gorgonio Wind Energy Policy Area on Page 23 and 24 of the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan and replace it as follows:

San Gorgonio Pass Wind Energy Policy Area

The San Gorgonio Pass Wind Energy Area (see Figure 4) is considered to be one of the best areas in the nation for the development of wind energy. This is due primarily to the air pressure differences that exist between western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley. As air moves from the high pressure to low pressure area, it is, in effect, “funneled” through the Pass, creating ideal wind energy conditions.

However, the siting of wind energy facilities can result in impacts to the environment and the general community, including scenic view sheds, nearby residents, and increasingly, nearby existing wind energy facilities. The sheer size of the wind turbine structures may block scenic views, noise generated by wind turbines could impact nearby residents; and spinning wind turbine blades could create wake effects which could adversely affect existing downwind wind turbines.

Wind energy development in the San Gorgonio Pass area was studied through the San Gorgonio Wind Resource Study EIR (1982), a joint environmental document prepared for the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and Riverside County. The document assessed three scenarios for wind energy development in the area. The document also includes criteria for the development of wind energy on both a countywide basis and specifically for the San Gorgonio Pass area. Since the adoption of the San Gorgonio Wind Implement Monitoring Program (WIMP) reports have been prepared, and substantial wind energy development has occurred. Reflecting the evolution of wind energy over the years, the specific policies for wind energy development in the San Gorgonio Pass as listed below:

Policies:

- WCVAP 2.1 Require that wind turbines address through appropriate design the Pacific Crest Trail alignment.

- WCVAP 2.2 Continue to require wind energy development to contribute a fair-share to the Wind Implementation Monitoring Program (WIMP) prior to construction of wind turbines.

- WCVAP 2.3 Prohibit the placement of wind turbines east of Indian Avenue, north of Pierson Boulevard, and south of Highway 111.

- WCVAP 2.4 Require proposed wind energy development to address significant impacts caused by wind turbine wake effects upon existing and approved downwind wind turbines.

- WCVAP 2.5 Prohibit the location of wind turbines within the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument.

Revision to Public Facilities Designation

Staff recommends that the definition of the land use designation of Public Facilities be revised in order to ensure that private facilities with public use characteristics, such as privately owned airports and electric generating facilities, can be designated as Public Facilities where it is determined appropriate to do so. A specific example of where the Public Facilities designation would be applied to a privately held facility is Flabob Airport in the Rubidoux area. The first sentence of the definition of public

facilities, appearing in the Land Use Element, Page LU-53, would be reworded in two sentences, as follows:

“The Public Facilities area plan land use designation provides for the development of various public, quasi-public, and private uses with similar characteristics, such as governmental facilities, utility facilities including electric generating stations and corridors, landfills, airports, educational facilities, and maintenance yards. Privately held uses with public facility characteristics are not required to be designated as Public Facilities, but are eligible to be so designated based on site-specific reviews of the characteristics of the use in question.”

Specific Plans Administration:

Two concerns have been raised regarding the manner in which the Certainty System would affect the adoption and future revision of specific plans. First is a concern that future adjustments between development areas within specific plans; for example, to switch the locations of a planned residential area and a planned park site, would be prohibited outside the 5-year Certainty System general plan amendment policy, since the designations for these two different land use types are included in different Foundation Components. In staff’s opinion, specific plans are designed to be implemented in a dynamic environment, where changes occur over time in the development marketplace, in regard to the needs of public agencies that provide services to the areas covered by specific plans, etc. Therefore, specific plans need to be open to refinements and adjustments as their implementation proceeds. Therefore, staff proposes that at the time of the adoption of the new general plan, and whenever new specific plans are adopted, all specific plans be identified as to whether they are intended to be Community Development plans (the vast majority of specific plans), Rural Community plans (there are a few of these), or whatever other foundation component would most appropriately describe them. Then, future amendments would be permitted to the specific plans involving any land use designation within its foundation category, or to any designation in a less intense Foundation Component. For Community Development specific plans, any land use designation in the general plan could potentially be applied. For Rural Community specific plans, any land use designation in the Rural Community Foundation Component, or lesser intensity Foundation Component could be applied. However, no land use designation in the Community Development Foundation Category could be applied within a Rural Community specific plan, except as a 5 - year general plan amendment.

A second issue that has been raised is whether the general plan would need to be amended simply to reflect the switching of locations of various specific plan development areas and other minor specific plan modifications through specific plan amendment or substantial conformance applications. This has been posed as an issue because of the format of the area plans, whereon the actual development pattern of each specific plan is shown, in order to present a complete picture, on one map, of the County’s land use plan for an entire community area. Staff recommends that only those specific plan changes that would result in increases in total residential units, acreage of commercial or industrial uses,

etc. within a specific plan, would require general plan amendments. Lesser changes would need to be reflected on the area plan maps, but should be done so automatically each time the area plan maps are updated.

Elsinore Area Plan

Amend the Policy Areas section beginning on Page 19 by inserting an additional Policy Area on Page 20, following the “Airport Influenced Policy Areas” section, to read as follows:

Farm Worker Housing in Eastern Coachella Valley:

In order to clarify that farm worker housing of all densities may be permitted in the Agriculture - designated areas in the Eastern Coachella Valley, policy ECVAP 5.1 in the area plan is proposed to be reworded by adding a second sentence reading:

“Provided that adequate provisions for public services and compatibility with adjacent uses is achieved, farm worker housing projects of both 1-12 dwelling units and greater than 12 units are permitted in the Agriculture designation in the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan.”

Walker Canyon Policy Area

The Walker Canyon Policy Area consists of 1,250 acres of land located northerly of Interstate 15 in the vicinity of Walker Canyon Road. The site is designated Open Space - Rural on the Elsinore Area Plan. However, a preferable alternative to extremely large lot rural land sales would be the master planning of this area to provide for a limited amount of development, coupled with preservation of the majority of the site as open space and wildlife habitat.

Policies:

- ELAP 4.1 Notwithstanding the Open Space - Rural designation of this property, any proposal to establish a master planned community within this area through the general plan amendment and specific plan process shall be exempt from the 5-year limit placed on Foundation Component amendments as described in the Administration Element, provided that:
- f) A specific plan is submitted for a Community Center or mixed use village center development designed as a hillside village. Potential uses may include residential uses at a variety of densities (including community development foundation component densities), commercial retail and service uses, offices, and a hotel, as well as public facilities and recreational areas. In addition to the required components, the specific plan must address the unique requirements of hillside development, special hillside design guidelines, and the special nuances of integrating hillside development into the natural environment.

- g) Approximately 900 acres, or at least two-thirds of the site area, is set aside as Open Space - Conservation Habitat for inclusion in the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan reserve system.
- h) The specific plan shall include special attention to the following concerns: (1) pedestrian circulation in a hillside context, including provision for ramps and paths as well as stairs in order to ensure full accessibility for all users; (2) provision for retail commercial uses so as to minimize the need for residents to travel outside the village for routine daily needs, such as groceries, banking, etc.; and (3) the buffering and protection of conserved open space, especially relating to the interface between riparian areas and development.
- i) Due to the unique character of this development, the area is hereby determined to be eligible for reductions in on-site street widths and an exemption from the prohibition on development on slopes over 25%. Such exemptions would be subject to official determination by the Board of Supervisors or its successor-in-interest at the time of its action on the specific plan.
- j) The environmental impact report or other CEQA document prepared for any specific plan at this site shall address the site's access, soils, geology, hydrology, biology, and wildfire susceptibility in addition to issues of slope and topography.

Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan

Amend the discussion of Specific Plans on Page 20 by adding the following Policy, in addition to those specified in Attachment "A".

Policies:

- ECVAP 2.6 Notwithstanding the Agriculture designation of properties in this area, any proposal to establish, through a general plan amendment and specific plan, a planned community of not less than 400 acres located in all or portions of Sections 17, 19, 20, and 21, Township 7 South, Range 8 East, SBB&M, located generally between Avenue 66 and Avenue 68, and between Old Highway 86 and the Santa Rosa Mountains, shall be exempt from the 5-year limit placed on Foundation Component General Plan amendments as described in the Administrative Element, provided that at a minimum:
- k) The project will provide for a range of housing that will assist in meeting the variety of housing needs in the Eastern Coachella Valley area, including active

participation in, and provision for, programs to assist very low income and/or low income families to purchase homes..

- l) The project is designed in a manner to minimize potential negative impacts on adjacent agricultural lands.
- m) At least one-third of the net area of the project is allocated to recreational amenities, parks, and open space.
- n) The project provides off-site roadway improvements at a level sufficient to mitigate its impacts on traffic and contributes its fair share to funds for paving of roads to control PM10 particulate levels in the surrounding area.
- o) The project provides for the extension of water and sewer infrastructure to the site in the event that lots smaller than one-half acre are included therein.
- p) The project demonstrates that residents will be protected from flooding hazards in accordance with County requirements.
- q) The project is designed to be compatible with the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
- r) The project design does not conflict with plans for a system of riding and hiking trails along the base of the Santa Rosa Mountains connecting with the planned system of trails in this area of the Coachella Valley.

San Jacinto Valley Area Plan

Amend the Policy Areas section beginning on Page 19 by inserting an additional Policy Area on Page 21, following the “Airport Influenced Policy Area”, to read as follows:

Agriculture/Potential Development Study Area

During the course of public hearings regarding the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, it became apparent that the visions of local residents and landowners for the future of the historically agricultural area of the eastern San Jacinto Valley, especially areas southerly of Florida Avenue and easterly of Soboba Street, are not easily reconciled. Many of the residents in this area would like the surrounding agricultural lands to remain in agricultural use for the foreseeable future, while many of the owners of agricultural land are concerned that agricultural uses will be economically marginal within the next few years, requiring provision for alternative development opportunities.

Policies:

SJVAP 5.1 Following adoption of the RCIP General Plan, the County of Riverside shall initiate a focused study of agricultural and undeveloped areas within the Agriculture/Potential Development Study Area. A committee shall be established including, as available, representatives of the Office of the Agricultural Commissioner, the Cooperative Extension Service, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Office of the Third District Supervisor, the Riverside County Planning Department, the Lake Hemet Municipal Water District, the City of Hemet, owners of farmland, and residents within and in the vicinity of the study area to assess the viability of continued agricultural use of the area, enhance the long-term preservation of agriculture in the area, and address problems resulting from the interface of agricultural uses with community development and rural community uses.

SWAP Ridgeline Policy

It has recently come to staff's attention that the policy contained in the existing Southwest Area Plan that is intended to require special review and regulation of developments along the easterly edge of the Santa Rosa Plateau, to preserve the views of that scenic resource, was inadvertently not included in the new proposed Southwest Area Plan. The policy provides needed protection for the ridgeline; therefore, staff recommends that it be included in the new Southwest Area Plan of the new General Plan, to read as follows:

“Building sites shall not be permitted on the Western Ridgeline as identified on the Area Plan Land Use map. Projects proposed within the area of the Western Ridgeline shall be evaluated on a case by case basis to ensure that building pad sites are located so that buildings and roof tops do not project above the Ridgeline as viewed from the Temecula Basin. All projects within one-half mile of the Western Ridgeline shall also be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if the building site will have an adverse impact to the ridgeline as viewed from the basin.”

Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan

Amend the Policy Areas section beginning on Page 21 by inserting an additional Policy Area on Page 23, following the “Rural Residential Area East of Interstate 215,” to read as follows:

Garbani Lindenberger Policy Area

The Garbani Lindenberger Policy Area consists of an area of land northerly of Garbani Road at its intersection with Lindenberger Road that is the site of a proposed community development intensity

residential subdivision. However, the land use pattern on the opposite (southerly) side of Garbani Road is clearly that of a rural community characterized by 2½ and 5 acre estate lots and an equestrian lifestyle. If this area is to be developed with community development intensity residential housing, such development must occur in such a manner as to provide for compatibility with the character of the surrounding rural community.

Policies:

SCMVAP 5.1 The Garbani Lindenberger Policy Area is separate from, although surrounded by, the Rural Residential Area East of Interstate 215 Policy Area.

SCMVAP 5.2 In the event that this area is developed at a level of residential intensity exceeding one dwelling unit per two acres, project design shall provide for either a row of lots along the southerly (Garbani Road) boundary of the project not less than one acre in size to serve as a transition between this development and the estate residential area to the south or a setback area of 40 to 80 feet in width is needed in order to provide for an area of landscaping of sufficient width to provide buffering for the rural areas to the south and an equestrian trail.

SCMVAP 5.3 In the event that this area is developed at a level of residential intensity exceeding one dwelling unit per two acres, the project developer shall work with the Eastern Municipal Water District in the location and sizing of infrastructure in a manner that will allow for the future extension of piped water service to the community southerly of Garbani Road.

El Sobrante Policy Area:

Over a number of months, the El Sobrante Planning Round Table Committee has worked to develop policies regarding circulation, area development, and maintenance of a rural lifestyle within the El Sobrante Policy Area. The below policies reflect the work of the Committee and is also recommended by staff as follows:

Delete the El Sobrante Policy Area policies on Page 19 of the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan of the proposed General Plan and replace it with the following:

El Sobrante Policy Area

Policies:

LMWAP 1.1 Require the provision of adequate and available infrastructure to support development. To sustain the rural lifestyle found within the area, while still providing an acceptable level of service on local roadways, the total number of dwelling units within the Policy Area shall not exceed an additional 1500 dwelling units. The circulation system, which would support the development of these additional dwelling units and which would, in part, be funded by their development, includes the following roadway improvements: the McAllister

Street/Dufferin Avenue Loop and the construction of a new connection (“A” Street) between McAllister Street/Dufferin Avenue Loop and Van Buren Boulevard, south of Dufferin Avenue. In addition to these improvements, other circulation connections between the Policy Area and the adjacent City of Riverside would be closed. These closures would direct high traffic volumes away from rural residential and green belt streets and toward more appropriate thoroughfares. Limiting the number of dwelling units within the Policy Area will help to maintain acceptable levels of service on local roadways both within the County and adjacent green belt areas of the City of Riverside. Limiting the number of dwelling units will also contribute to the continuation of the rural lifestyle enjoyed by area residents.

- LMWAP 1.2 Within the area depicted as Medium Density Residential, overall density shall not exceed three (3) dwelling units per acre.
- LMWAP 1.3 Coordinate with local agencies to ensure adequate service provision for all development within the Policy Area.
- LMWAP 1.4 Coordinate development strategies with the City of Riverside.
- LMWAP 1.5 Encourage the use of Specific Plans to implement the land use designations identified within the Policy Area.
- LMWAP 1.6 Encourage clustering of dwelling units when it would avoid the development of areas constrained by physical features or sensitive resources. Encourage clustering in areas designated for Low Density Residential uses (One-half acre minimum lot size) rather than areas designated for Very Low Density Residential uses (1 acre minimum lot size) or Estate Density Residential uses (2 acre minimum lot size).
- Where clustering is allowed, minimum pad size shall not be less than 8,000 square feet.
- LMWAP 1.7 Development shall be sensitive to and retain the unique topographical features within and adjacent to the planning area.
- LMWAP 1.8 Require that development on hillsides blend with the natural surroundings through architecture, the use of appropriate construction materials and colors, and the retention of natural vegetation.

LMWAP 1,8 Restrict hillside development and grading in accordance with policies found in the Open Space, Habitat & Natural Resources section and Hillside Development and Slope section of the Land Use Element and the Scenic Resources section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.

LMWAP 1.9 Encourage open space and recreational amenities.

Agriculture:

The following changes address issues raised by the agricultural community as well as properly define the relationship between the Riverside County General Plan and the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

Revise the fifth paragraph on Page I-4 of the Introduction to as follows:

The MSHCP for Western Riverside County if adopted, will be implemented through integration into the Multipurpose Open Space element, and at the Area Plan Level. The MSHCP Advisory Committee, a third stakeholder group, also played a key role in shaping the development of the MSHCP for Western Riverside County, together with County staff and consultants. The proposed Coachella Valley MSHCP is referred to in the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element, as well as the Area Plans for REMAP, The Pass, Western Coachella Valley and Eastern Coachella Valley.

Delete the second bullet item in the text box on Page I-7 of the Introduction which reads:

Incorporates the major conclusions from the CETAP and MSHCP studies;

Delete the Integrating Habitat Consideration section on Page I-9 of the Introduction.

Revise the second and fourth sentence of the opening paragraph of the Conservation and Open Space Resource System on Page V-17 of the Vision Statement as follows:

The multi-purpose open space system provides for the preservation of multiple species.Land areas will be preserved, set-aside for this purpose, and will be linked by corridors of various designs to allow movement between habitat areas.

Delete the last sentence of the fourth paragraph of the section on Concepts of the General Plan on Page LU-11 of the Land Use Element. This sentence begins, “In addition, the multi-purpose open space system provides....”

Delete the first sentence of the second paragraph on Page LU-19 of the Efficient Use of Land section of the Land Use Element. This sentence begins, “The achievement of these desires involves...”

Revise the second sentence of the third paragraph of the Open Space, Habitat & Natural Resources Section of the Land Use Element on Page LU-27 as follows:

The Multipurpose Open Space Element addresses this issue in great detail.

Revise the OS-Conservation Habitat Land Use Designation in the Notes column of Table LU-3 on Page LU36 to read:

Applies to land conserved and managed in accordance with adopted Habitat Conservation Plans.

Revise agricultural policy LU 16.10 on Page LU-39 of the Land Use Element by adding the following sentence directly after the first sentence of the policy as follows:

It is not the County’s intent pursuant to this policy to subject agricultural related uses to any discretionary permit requirements other than those in existence at the time of adoption of the General Plan.

Add a new agricultural policy, LU 16.11, on Page LU-40 of the Land Use Element to read as follows:

The County shall pursue the creation of new incentive programs, such as tax credits, that encourage the continued viability of agricultural activities.

Revise the second sentence of the first paragraph on Page LU-44 of the Land Use Element to read:

There are a number of methods proposed to achieve this balance, including implementation of adopted MSHCP’s, the creation...

Revise the first sentence of the Open Space-Conservation Habitat designation on Page LU-44 of the Land Use Element to read:

The Open Space-Conservation Habitat land use designation applies to public and private lands conserved and managed in accordance with adopted MSHCP’s.

Delete the Side Note Text Box on page C-15 of the Circulation Element.

Revise the Floodplain and Riparian Area Management policy OS-5.3 d. on Page OS 12 of the Multipurpose Open Space Element to read:

- d. wildlife movement corridor or linkage; and

Delete the Floodplain and Riparian Area Management policy OS-5.5 on Page OS 12 of the Multipurpose Open Space Element and replace it with the following:

OS 5.5 Require new private or public development to preserve and enhance existing native riparian habitat and prevent obstruction of natural watercourses as mandated by local state and federal laws and regulations. Encourage new private development to voluntarily preserve and enhance these resources through the use of incentives as may be determined to be appropriate in the County's sole discretion.

Revise the Forest Resources policy OS 8.1 on Page OS 19 of the Multipurpose Open Space Element to read:

...and protecting natural resources and habitat lands included within the MSHCPs. (AI 3)

Delete the last sentence of Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement Policy S 4.8.

Revise the first sentence of Environmental Protection Principle D. 2 on Page 4 of Appendix B to read:

Moreover, the types of uses to be accommodated within components of the multi-purpose open space system should be clearly spelled out in the General Plan, based on sound community planning principles.

Delete Environmental Protection Principle E. Program Credits on Page 4 of Appendix B.

Revise the end of the first sentence of the first paragraph of on Page 1 of Appendix K: Implementation Program to read:

....a major transportation corridor analysis (CETAP), and the multiple species habitat conservation plans (MSHCP) for Western Riverside County.

Delete the last sentence of the first paragraph of on Page 1 of Appendix K: Implementation Program.

Revise the last sentence of the entry in the Administration Activities/Programs Column of AI 4 on Page 8 of Appendix K to read:

....any unresolved issues arising out of the completion of any adopted MSHCP(s) and CETAP.

Revise the entry in the Administration Activities/Programs Column of AI 40 on Page 40 of Appendix K to read:

Consult the Public Access map and any adopted MSHCP for restrictions on trail use when any trail segment is being considered for development, construction, or proposed trail segment.

Revise the Element Activities/Programs Column of AI 123 on Page 28 of Appendix K to read:

Identify and promote voluntary alternative farming practices that farmers will find acceptable, yet will reduce the impacts of particulate matter in the air.

Revise Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement policy S4.4 on Page S-37 of the Safety Element as follows:

Revise the first sentence of S4.4 to read:

Prohibit alternation of floodways and cannalization and unless alternative methods of flood control are not economically and practically feasible.

Revise letter “a.” of S4.4 to read:

...the proposed development will not result in any significant increas in flood levels during the occurance of a 100-year flood discharge.

Revise letter “b.” of S4.4 to read:

...the proposed development will not result in any significant increase in flood levels during the occurenc4e of a 100-year flood discharge.

Delete the last sentence of Revise Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement policy S4.7 on Page S-38 of the Safety Element.

Revise the first paragraph of Flood Plain and Riparian Area Management policy OS 5.3 on Page OS-12 of the Multipurpose Open Space Element to read:

Encourage setback of inconsistent development uses, excluding non-motorized trails and agriculture, from the floodway boundary when a site-specific study determines it is necessary to setback development due to...

Revise the first sentence of Flood Plain and Riparian Area Management policy OS 5.6 on Page OS-12 of the Multipurpose Open Space Element to read:

Encourage voluntary conservation of remaining upland habitat...

Land Use Element

Amend Policy LU 16.1 to read as follows:

Encourage retaining agriculturally designated lands where agricultural activity can be sustained at an operational scale, where it accommodates lifestyle choice, and in locations where impacts to and from potentially incompatible uses, such as residential uses, are minimized, through incentives such as tax credits.

Revise Rural, Rural Community, Open Space, and Community Development Foundation discussions throughout the General Plan to expressly permit commercial agricultural activities and compatible uses as set forth in Riverside County Ordinance No. 509 in all Foundation Component areas and land use designations.

Amend Policy LU 16.10 to read as follows:

Allow agriculturally-related retail uses such as feed stores and permanent produce stands in all areas and land use designations. Where a discretionary permit or other discretionary approval is required under the County zoning ordinances in effect as of December 2, 2002, then allow such retail uses with the approval of such a discretionary permit or other approval. The following criteria shall be considered in approving any discretionary permit or other discretionary approval required for these uses:

- s) Whether the use provides a needed service to the surrounding agricultural area that cannot be provided more efficiently within urban areas or requires location in a non-urban area because of unusual site requirements or operational characteristics;
- t) Whether the use is sited on productive agricultural lands and less productive land is available in the vicinity;
- u) Whether the operational or physical characteristics of the use will have a detrimental impact on water resources or the use or management of surrounding properties within at least 1/4 mile radius;
- v) Whether a probable workforce is located nearby or is readily available.

Allow for proposed agriculturally-related processing uses whether or not in conjunction with a farming operation, such as commercial canning, packing, drying, and freezing operations, in all areas and land use designations. Where a discretionary permit or other discretionary approval is required under the County zoning ordinances in effect as of December 2, 2002, then allow such processing uses with the approval of such a discretionary permit or other approval. The following criteria shall be considered in approving any discretionary permit required for these uses:

- a. Whether the uses are clustered in centers instead of single uses;
- b. Whether the centers are located a sufficient distance from existing or approved agricultural or rural residential commercial centers or designated commercial areas of any city or unincorporated community;
- c. Whether sites are located on a major road serving the surrounding area;
- d. Whether the road frontage proposed for the uses and the number of separate uses proposed are appropriate;
- e. For proposed value-added uses such as canneries and wineries with on-premises retail uses, the evaluation under the criteria above shall consider the service requirements of the uses and the capability and capacity of cities and unincorporated communities to provide the required services.

Administration Element - General Plan Certainty System

Revise General Plan Certainty System to provide for:

1. An Agriculture Foundation General Plan Amendment policy to allow up to 5% of all land designated as Agriculture to change to other Foundation and land use designations during each 5 year General Plan Amendment Cycle and convert to another land use consistent with the amended Foundation and land use designation. The 5% conversion can occur within one year or any multiple-year period within the 5 year General Plan Amendment Cycle and is to be calculated separately for each of the following three areas:
 - a. The area covered by the Palo Verde and Desert Center Area Plans and the Eastern Desert Land Use Plan;
 - b. The area covered by the Eastern Coachella Valley and Western Coachella Valley Area Plans; and,
 - c. The area covered by all other Area Plans.

The finding required to approve this type of amendment would be:

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.

2. An Agricultural Task Force in each of the three areas comprised of representatives of the farming community from each area that derive their primary income from farming, and representatives of the agricultural lending community, appointed by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors upon the recommendation of the Riverside County Farm Bureau Board, the Milk Producers Council, the Desert Grape Growers League of California, the Date Commission of California, American Ag Credit, and other agricultural trade organizations to be identified. The Agricultural Task Force would: (1) annually review the adequacy of the 5% conversion amount and recommend changes to the Board of Supervisors should the 5% conversion amount be insufficient; and (2) make recommendations on a case-by-case basis on agricultural landowners' requests made in connection with an Agriculture Foundation General Plan Amendment Cycle in excess of the 5% conversion amount, as discussed below.
3. An Agriculture Foundation General Plan Amendment Procedure to change the designation of land in the Agriculture Foundation to another Foundation and land use designation in excess of the 5% conversion amount. Should the 5% agricultural conversion amount be met within a period shorter than a 5-year General Plan Amendment Cycle, any additional requests to file a Foundation Amendment would occur on a case-by-case basis. The request to file a Foundation Amendment would first be submitted to the Agricultural Task Force. After the Agricultural Task Force recommendation, the request to file a Foundation Amendment would proceed to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. The Agricultural Task Force and the Board would consider the following criteria in considering requests to file a Foundation Amendment under the Agriculture Foundation Amendment Procedure:
 - a. Whether conditions or circumstances justify modifying the Agriculture Foundation of the General Plan, such as labor, water availability, water cost, commodity prices, market conditions and marketability, trade issues, estate issues, lender and financing flexibility for farm planning, exotic pests, quarantines, diseases (e.g., Pierce's Disease), foreign competition, government regulation (e.g., EPA limiting use of certain necessary pesticides and/or growth hormones), input costs (e.g., worker's compensation rates and minimum wage), union issues, death/illness/retirement of farmer, and other business considerations or undue hardships;
 - b. The availability of adequate infrastructure to serve the proposed land use designation.

If the Board of Supervisors approves the request to file a Foundation Amendment, then a general plan amendment and associated land use applications may be filed consistent with the

approval for filing. The finding required to approve this type of general plan amendment would be:

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.

If the Board of Supervisors denies the request to file a Foundation Amendment, then no land use application requiring a Foundation Amendment may be filed for that property until the next five-year General Plan Review cycle.

Note: Revisions are necessary throughout the General Plan’s discussions of the Certainty System to reflect the proposed Agriculture Foundation annual review cycle instead of the 5-year cycle. (Table A-1 on page A-13; paragraph No. 1 on pages A-13 through A-14; paragraph no. 3 on page A-14; Section D in Appendix B, pages 15 through 16; Section E in Appendix B, pages 17 through 18; page 1-7; page 1-8; and LU 16.6.) Likewise, modifications are needed in Section V entitled, “Agricultural Principles” in Appendix B, paragraph 2.a., as follows:

“Agricultural lands should be designated as Agriculture (A) on the General Plan. This denotes that agriculture is the current development form for these lands. The characteristics of this use include, but are not limited to, ...”

Multipurpose Open Space Element

Amend Policy OS5.7 to read as follows:

OS 5.7 Where landowners voluntarily agree to retain land as buffer zones, make incentives available to compensate the owner of such land, including density transfer and other mechanisms as may be adopted. These incentives will be provided for the purpose of encouraging the preservation of natural watercourses without creating undue hardship on property owners.

Amend Policy OS 6.2 to read as follows:

OS 6.2 Encourage preservation of buffer zones around wetlands where feasible.

Amend Policies OS 17.1, OS 17.2, and OS 17.3 to read as follows:

OS17.1 Comply with the provisions of applicable MSHCPs, if adopted, when conducting review of development applications. “Applicable MSHCPs” is hereby defined as either the CVAG MSHCP or the Western Riverside County MSHCP, and/or other adopted

sub-regional MSHCPs (such as AD 161 MSHCP) which has or have been adopted by the County and has or have not otherwise been rescinded or terminated. (AI10)

OS17.2 Comply with the provisions of applicable MSHCPs, if adopted, when developing transportation or other infrastructure projects that have been designated as covered activities in the applicable MSHCP. (AI10)

OS17.3 Comply with the provisions of applicable MSHCPs, if adopted, when conducting review of possible general plan amendments and/or zoning changes. (AI10)

Additional General Plan Changes

Amend Policies/Programs AI 25 and AI 61 as follows:

AI 25 Prepare and implement a watercourse management system that identified the functional roles of each water course (e.g., flood control, water recharge, habitat, etc.) And stipulates a system to encourage setbacks adjacent to and within designated watercourses and floodways, including incentives to landowners.

AI61 Develop guidelines for establishing wetland buffer zones in conjunction with floodway setbacks addressing both their form and delineation and methods for their implementation , including incentives to landowners.

Consistency with Airport Land Use Commission Comprehensive Land Use Plans:

The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is currently reviewing the proposed General Plan for consistency with adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) for airports under its jurisdictions. The affected airports include: Banning, Chino, Bermuda, Blythe, Chiriaco, Corona, Desert Center, Desert Resorts, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, March, Perris, Valley, Riverside, and Skylark.

At its January 23, 2003 hearing, the ALUC's consultant, Kenneth Brody with Shutt Moen Associates, presented a review of the General Plan elements, technical appendixes, and the draft EIR and submitted a memorandum to the Commission outlining potential compatibility concerns. The hearing was continued to February 20, 2003. At this hearing, the consultant reviewed the area plans and submitted a second memorandum to the Commission outlining potential compatibility concerns. At that time, the Commission continued any action on the compatibility of the General Plan to its next meeting on March 20, 2003.

Although the ALUC has not taken action, the memoranda indicate that the proposed General Plan is not compatible with the Airport Land Use Plans. To address this issue and bring the General Plan into

conformance with the adopted CLUPs, staff recommends that the CLUPs be incorporated into the General Plan by reference. It is also recommended that a policy be added to the General Plan that requires land uses to be consistent with CLUPs as they now exist and may from time to time be amended. These actions would be expected to make the proposed General Plan consistent with the CLUPs.