



# General Plan Advisory Committee

## Riverside County 2008 General Plan Update

### MINUTES

**Meeting Date/Time:** September 09, 2009, 9:05 AM

**Location:** County Administrative Center, Room 5C

**Members Present:** Dennis Chinaeff (Chair), Joseph A. Richards (Vice Chair), Bill Blankenship, John Criste, George Hague, Michelle Randall, Patty Reyes (alt. for Steve Robbins), Matt Webb, Steve Corona, and Barry Burnell

**Members Absent:** Tom Kirk, Stan Skipworth, Mark Balys, John Snell and Ronald Sullivan

**County Present:** George Johnson, Ron Goldman, Katherine Lind, Greg Neal, Olivia Barnes, Mitra Mehta-Cooper, Jerry Jolliffe, Josh Lee, Cindy Thielman-Braun, and Phayvanh Nanthavongdouangsy

**Guests Present:** Dan Silver (Endangered Habitats League), Greg Burnett, Cindy Barket, Tricia Napolitano; Ann McKibben, Mike Naggar, Cynthia L. Ferry, Bob Wheeler, Joyce Schwartz, Pat Ratliff, Pam Nelson, Clinton Stoutenburgh, Mike Machado, Trip Herd; Nancy Swanson, Scott R. Sewell, Mike Naggar,

1. **Call to Order:** GPAC Chair, Dennis Chinaeff, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.
2. **Roll Call:** Roll call of GPAC members in attendance (as per list, above) and introduction of County staff and guests/public attendees.
3. **Approval of Minutes:** GPAC member Steve Corona abstains from vote, approval of minutes from previous meeting (July 29, 2009) postponed until quorum is achieved.
4. **Oral Communications:** Items not on the Agenda: Ann Tunner-McKibben, representative from Friends of Northern San Jacinto Valley advocates for San Jacinto Wildlife. She emphasizes on the importance of the San Jacinto Wildlife area and request that all of its units are shown on maps created for the Nuevo area. Kristi Lovelady, staff for county planning reporting back in regards to credits for recycle water usage. She states that on September 15, 2009 the Board of Supervisors will consider Ordinance 859.2 that will give recognition to developers who use recycle water in landscape; a full 1.0 ETO multiplication factor for water usage instead of 0.7 ETO may be utilized.
5. **Old Business:**
  - a. **Response to Comments:** Mitra Mehta-Cooper, Principal Planner presented letters received since the last meeting: Letters included in the information packet includes: Gregory Yarris's (resident) letter of opposition for the Northeast Agriculture Conversion Policy Area; Geotechnical issues and maps were provided by Mike McKibben (Geologist); GPAC member

George Hague sent a reminder to use the appropriate maps for the San Jacinto Wildlife Area. He is currently working with the County's Geography Information System management to determine how to integrate the maps; Adrian McGregor, a resident from South West Area Plan, requests notification on all items moving forward concerning the Southwest Area Plan; and Rick Estes (resident) comments on San Jacinto Wildlife Area and its sensitive habitats. Letters received after packet was sent includes the following: Staff has received 105 petitions for Lake Nuevo proposal opposition; the copies are available in departments viewing area; Susan Nash, Friends of the Northern San Jacinto Valley, requests the Northeast Agriculture Conversion Policy be removed from further consideration; Frank Miller, resident, supports smart growth policies in Anza; Pam Nelson, resident, submitted specific comments on the Anza Rural Village Policy language. The letter received today in opposition of the Northeast Agriculture Conversion Policy will be disseminated at a later date (Clinton Stoutenburgh-resident). The letters that were received after the packet were faxed to the Desert office.

**b. Action Items from Last Meeting:** The following items were carried over for discussion and possible action from the prior meeting.

**i. Northeast Agriculture Conversion Policy Area:** (Also previously referred to as the "Northeast Dairies Policy Area"). Mitra Mehta-Cooper, Principal Planner Riverside County, presented information on the Northeast Agriculture Conversion Policy Area located within the Lakeview Nuevo Area Plan. Per the request of the GPAC members, this item was continued from the July 29, 2009 awaiting additional information. Accordingly, a presentation was given on the policy background, the proposed policy area and the factors influencing future growth. The macro level factors include its close proximity to the Ramona Expressway expansion, existing urbanizing cities, March Inland port, and RCTC's Perris Valley commuter line extension. The micro level factors include the existing General Plan. The General Plan sets the stage for urban growth for this area through existing community development component land uses designations and a Community Development Overlay. Other micro level factors include the two adopted and three proposed specific plans and a facility needs assessment. The proposed policies address the environmental concerns. This includes the MSHCP Critical habitat cells, the San Jacinto Wildlife Preserve and recreation area, seismic hazard and 100 year flood issues. Also, job creation and residential growth will reduce commute from this area. The members of the GPAC provided the following comments: Buffer zone size and physical uses allowed between community development and the wildlife preserve and/or existing dairies; San Jacinto Wildlife Area; existing/future dairy and agriculture activities; water and MSHCP issues; and the proposed specific plans and its environmental review; 2003 General plan public discussions; recreation is an inappropriate use for buffers along reserves. The consensus from public comments was of opposition to the policy area due to the following reasons: higher standards for planning practices; absorption capacity analysis; other long term agriculture uses; consolidated development and transfer of development rights; new water lines to support agriculture; LAFCO and high density development; sustainability; MSHCP issues; right to rural lifestyle; State Dept. Fish and Game comments; impact on San Jacinto Wildlife Area; sensitive habitat; buffer area; increase drought conditions; traffic; job/housing ratio; not consistent CA Regional blueprint for sustainable growth; Subsidence; active faults; water, water runoff and aquifers issues; geotechnical studies; specific plan's environmental review; and remove policy from consideration; Mike

Naggar, applicant representative, will be submitting development application in the next few months; who plans to continue public outreach. Their proposal is pursuant to the MSHCP process HANS II agreement dedicating 185 acres next to the preserve and an additional 135 acres for a lake park as an additional buffer. The policies address compatibility uses between dairy and development. After the public comments, the GPAC members continued to discuss the policy area to formulate a recommendation. Comments included the following issues: Agriculture is a business; direction for GPAC; no action from Board for agriculture conversion for the area; and policies for the future conversion.

Action: Unanimous vote to remove the proposed policy area from consideration as a part of this General Plan update and leave the area plan as it is; with the recognition that the area will have development pressure in the future; at that time it will be more appropriate to review a need for the policy area.

**Approval of Minutes:** A quorum for the approval of minutes is now attained. Unanimous approval of minutes from previous meeting (July 29, 2009) was made; minutes were approved.

- ii. **Anza Rural Village Overlay Policy Area:** Item carried over from previous GPAC meetings (June 18<sup>th</sup> and July 29<sup>th</sup>). Jerry Jolliffe, Deputy Planning Director provided a brief presentation on the background of the Anza Valley Policy Area (AVPA), along with for different alternatives for consideration. The intent of these alternatives is to integrate the Anza Vision and Goals endorsed by the Board of Supervisors on February 2006 into the General Plan. The policies have been reorganized to separate village-only policies from those that apply to the entire policy area. The first alternative is the previous proposal (presented on July 29<sup>th</sup>) establishes the Anza Valley Policy Area covering approximately 89,000 acres with the existing Rural Village Overlay (RVO) in the middle. The second alternative eliminates the RVO and scales back some of commercial land use designation opportunities; allowing Community Development (CD) only through density transfer from other areas of the AVPA, and village development format. This proposal is not recommended because it does not provide for enough possibilities. The last scenario has two versions. Alternative 3A eliminates RVO, however, replaces it with Rural Village Limit Boundary. Limits total potential new Community Development/village areas to total of 400 acres, including 285 acres of existing CD designations. More than 400 acres of CD/village could occur through density transfers from elsewhere within the AVPA. Alternative 3B is the same as same as 3A, except that 400 acres of CD/village development would be permitted in addition to the existing 285 acres of CD designations, for a grand total of 685 acres. Also, further increases in village development could occur through density transfers from elsewhere in the AVPA. Alternative 3A is recommended by staff. Questions and Comments from GPAC includes: water availability issue, ensure that development does not impact present day water uses; size of village node; cost effectiveness of nodes for infrastructure needs etc. Comments from the public includes the following topics for consideration: feasibility of a Community Service District; village nodes; transfer density rights; scale of the village, need for water study; viable alternative would to strip malls; support for Frank Miller proposal; support village commercial for job creation; relay on existing water study; water crisis exaggerations; no moratorium on development tied to water study etc. Item was then discussed amongst GPAC members

included topics on water issues; Will-serve letters; safety of residents; clearance from Fire and Health Department; CSD within nodes;

Action – Majority vote (9 to 1) to approve staff recommendation of Alternative 3A with the suggestions for language change from GPAC member Michelle Randal for Policies 1.3b, 1.4b, c and d. GPAC member George Hague opposes.

Action –Unanimous vote to continue item 7bi- Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies to the next GPAC meeting on October 07, 2009 was made.

6. **GPAC Member Comments and Staff Announcements:** Next GPAC meeting will be from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm.
7. **Adjournment:** At 12:03 p.m., Chair Chinaeff adjourned the meeting until October 07, 2009, at 9 a.m., in Room 5C or other room (to be announced) if 5C is unavailable.