I. CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Shaw

   ➢ Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Price

   ➢ Roll Call: Commissioners Ellis, Krick, Price, Schuler, Chairman Shaw

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS - On Items Not on the Agenda

   A five-minute limitation shall apply to each member of the public who wishes to address the Chairman and Commissioners for items not on the agenda. No member of the public shall be permitted to “share” his/her five minutes with any other member of the public. (Items received under this heading may be referred to staff or future study, research, completion and/or future Commissioner Action.) PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

   Note: All items listed on the Consent Calendar may be enacted by a single motion without separate discussion. If a discussion or a separate vote on any item is desired by a Planning Commissioner, that item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately. All remaining items not removed from the Consent Calendar by a Planning Commissioner shall be voted on prior to discussion of the item(s) requested to be pulled.

   Minutes of September 6, 2017 Regular Planning Commission meeting.......

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. DISCUSS AND CONSIDER CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT 17-8004, DESIGN REVIEW 17-7003 AND A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION, FOR THE EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THE INSTALLATION OF TWO MODULAR BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS, LOCATED AT 1325 MOUNTAIN AVENUE

   Staff Report – Patty Nevins........................................Page 9
Order of Procedure:

1. Staff report presentation
2. Planning Commission questions for staff
3. Open public comments
4. Close public comments
5. Planning Commission discussion
6. Motion and Second
7. Planning Commission discussion on motion
8. Call the question (Roll call vote)

Recommendation:

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2017-17:

I. Adopting a Notice of Exemption pursuant to CEQA Section 15162 (Subsequent EIR’s and Negative Declarations).

II. Approving Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 for the expansion of an existing school, subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval contained therein; and

III. Approving Design Review No. 17-7003 for the installation of two modular buildings and associated improvements to accommodate the expansion of an existing school, subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval contained therein.

V. PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

VI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S COMMENTS:

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

The City of Banning Planning Commission is hereby adjourned to the regular Planning Commission meeting of November 1, 2017 starting at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Division (951) 922-3125. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting [28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA title II].
City of Banning

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

September 6, 2017

A regular meeting of the City of Banning Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at 6:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 99 East Ramsey Street, Banning, CA, 92220.

Commissioners Present:  Chairman Shaw  
Vice-Chairman Krick  
Commissioner Ellis  
Commissioner Price  
Commissioner Schuler

Staff Present:  Community Development Director, Patty Nevins  
Interim City Manager, Alex Diaz  
Public Works Director/City Engineer, Art Vela  
Interim Assistant City Attorney, Gregg W. Kettles  
Contract Planner, Mark de Manincor  
Recording Secretary, Sandra Calderon

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Shaw.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Linda Pippenger, resident of Banning, said Stage Coach Days will be starting Friday, September 8th and will take place through Sunday, September 10th.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS


ACTION: Motion/Second (KRICK/ELLIS) to approve the August 2, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes. (Motion Carried 5-0)

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

DISCUSS TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) 36710, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (PUD) 17-9507, DESIGN REVIEW (DR) 15-7004, AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM FOR A PROPOSAL TO SUBDIVIDE FOUR LOTS TOTALING 10.6 ACRES INTO 46 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS AND FIVE
LETTERED LOTS AND DEVELOP SAID LOTS WITH TWO-STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN THE LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LDR) ZONE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER’S 534-183-014, 534-200-004, 534-200-008 AND 534-200-047

Contract Planner De Manincor presented the staff report. He said Tentative Tract Map 37610 is located at the corner of North of East Wilson and West of North Florida Street, it is approximately 10.6 acres and is for purposes of creating 46-single-family residential lots. This tentative map project has a Planned Unit Development Permit associated with the application and a Design Review (DR).

He said there is a need for a Home Owner’s Association (H.O.A.) to be created prior to permit issuance because the streets will be private and Open Space Areas, a detention basin, street lighting, curb, gutter and the sidewalks will be maintained by the H.O.A.

The proposed project has three different floor plans that range from 1,800 to 2,100 square feet. All plans are three bedroom, two story, two master suites; one on each floor. Three different styles of homes are proposed with this project. De Manincor showed an aerial view of the proposed project showing the location of NWC of N. Florida and Wilson Street. He said there are two lots adjacent to North Hoffer Street that will contain lots 9 and 46; these lots will not have direct access to the open space area, but there will be a pathway adjacent to lot 46 and street improvements will be constructed for lots on Florida Street.

The cul-de-sacs will have 50 foot right-of-way widths, the H.O.A. will work in conjunction with the Fire Department to determine if parking will be allowed throughout the streets or on one side only.

The site has a Southern California easement that runs North and South located in the open space between the second and third cul-de-sac; it has above ground power lines that will remain as is.

A conceptual landscape plan was shown indicating the trails and dog park/detention basin. The perimeter walls will be 6 feet high, vinyl fencing will be done in between homes and split-stoned faced block will be used in the frontage along Wilson Street.

De Manincor said two conditions need to be modified, plus one needs to be added:

- Condition #25 & #29: as part of the paragraph, Florida Street should be inserted after Wilson Street.
- Developer shall create a Home Owner’s Association prior to Building Permit issuance.

De Manincor said a letter from the Banning Superintendent was received that recommends a controlled intersection at East Wilson Street and North Florida Street due to current pedestrian issues from adjacent schools to the site.
Beau Cooper, Entitlement Manager with United Engineering Group representing the Property Owner/Developer spoke. He said the conditions of approval were reviewed and they do not have objections to any of them.

Cooper said the lots are between 90 and 100 feet deep and between 50 and 55 to 60 feet wide, but it depends on the lot and its orientation. All 46 lots are over 5,000 square feet.

A decision was made to go with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) instead of a normal Low Density 7,000 square feet as originally anticipated because the shape of the land was challenging to develop, plus there was a need to comply with both Banning Zoning Codes and ALUC Zone D requirements. The applicant worked together with Southern California Edison regarding the easement that runs through the middle of the property.

Cooper said the homes in Banning are selling for an average of $200-$250,000 thousand dollars, and it is planned that these will sell around this range or a little higher.

Commissioner Price said he looked at homes for sale in this square footage range, and they sell for about $400,000-$450,000 which are high for Banning. Cooper agrees those prices are high, and he assured they are not looking at those price ranges.

Commissioner Shuler asked about the dwellings with two master bedrooms, and wanted to know if these are prospective for two families. Cooper said that is not the intention, but he pointed out that these are Spanish style homes and one of the floor plans does have an exterior entrance into the home and an exterior wall can easily be added. He said this is not a multi-family development.

A market analysis and studies were made regarding sale ability of the homes.

Cooper explained that the floor plans that were developed show the minimum lot size that the floor plans can fit on. A buyer will be able to customize their floor plan.

Cooper said that the emergency landing zone requirement from the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is 75’ x 300’. The proposed park area is 75’ aside from the 30’ Edison easement.

Commissioner Krick said he thinks that this project should remain owner occupied; he asked Cooper if he would agree to add language to the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’s) relating to rentals that would not allow having more than the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) allowable ratio; this would be part of the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Krick also asked Cooper if he would also agree to have all fences coated with a non-graffiti coating for easy graffiti removal.

There was discussion regarding the lack of security gates while keeping the streets private because they are not wide enough for public streets. Commissioner Krick asked which side of the
street is going to be red lined. Cooper said the HOA and the Fire Department will discuss that and make a decision.

Commissioner Price said he knows about two HOAs in Banning that don’t allow any street parking.

Commissioner Schuler said pick-up trucks will not properly fit in the driveways, or in the inside of the garage. She also questioned the lack of areas for recreational vehicle storage.

Commissioner Shaw said he doesn’t see where the Commission would require every subdivision to be compatible with everyone’s needs.

Director Nevins said amenities are not listed specifically for a PUD, but in other areas where they are identified they are typically open spaces, paths, recreational areas etc. that everyone can utilize.

Director Vela said the paths behind the homes might allow for people to create a nuisance, but there are ways to try and reduce that such as by adding lighting and maintaining low shrubs.

Chief of Police, Diaz said that adding adequate lighting and enough space between trees and bushes will deter crime. He said that by adding locking gates to the pathways would limit the access to outside foot traffic.

Commissioner Schuler said she didn’t find anything in the report regarding recycled water.

Director Vela said installment for a purple water pipe is not a condition for this project. The master plan for recycled water did not include any of the smaller in-fill developments because it’s not cost effective.

Commissioner Schuler said potable water is still being use for construction and irrigation in the smaller developments and individual homes. The current waste water plant is at capacity as identified by the Federal EPA at 75%. She asked how the City’s waste water treatment plant will accommodate the additional waste that will be generated in addition to other projects that have been previously approved.

Director Vela said he wasn’t sure about the EPA document Commissioner Schuler referred to. He said the waste water treatment plant has a capacity of 3.6 MGD. The average flow for the last two to three years has been about 2 MGD. State water resource control requires that once the 75% is reached, designs for expansion to the plant needs to be started. It has been estimated this small project will produce about 11 to 12 thousand gallons a day. The developer will pay development impact fees to use the facility, and any other projects that were previously approved will not be able to build homes until the capacity for the waste water treatment plant is available.

Commissioner Shuler said the proposed Tentative Tract Map is not consistent with one of the findings of fact of the primary policies of the Land Use Element of the General Plan that states “Projects adjacent to existing neighborhoods shall be carefully reviewed to assure that...
neighborhood character is protected. The surrounding properties are Low Density Residential (LDR). This proposed project would increase the density substantially. She feels this project should be more carefully considered.

Director Vela said there is a decent surplus of water in our local recharge system and that’s not counting imported water, or the amount of water stored in the Beaumont basin. He said there is an average of water usage of 20 acre feet a year for this project and feels hesitant to say the local aquifers are in overdraft.

Director Nevins said in the case of a PUD the lower minimum lot size does not afford them more density. At 10.6 acres, under the Low Density Residential (LDR) they might qualify for 53 SFD’s but they have only proposed 46 which is lower, plus Open Space.

De Manincor said all driveways will be 20 feet, same as the development standards for the Low Density Residential Zone. The minimum lot sizes will be 5,000 square feet.

Chairman Shaw opened the public hearing.

Linda Pippenger, resident of Banning said several years ago the state mandated Housing Authority required the City to reduce the density and most of them were implemented in South Banning. By direction from a former Community Development Director and Councilwoman, she found areas believed to be suitable for the state mandated housing authority. 800 plus acres were chosen to reduce density at that time. She asked if the whole City will be subject to density increase to benefit the developers.

Ellen Carr, resident of Banning said the City should not agree with developers that come with their proposed projects to reduce lot density; she thinks this project doesn’t belong in banning right now. She also questioned the current water restriction in the City.

Lester Lewis, resident of Banning said the City does need affordable housing but, has concerns about the density; he wouldn’t like to see too many homes built in a small space. He asked the Commission to listen to the people’s concerns that live near this proposed project.

Edwin Herrera, resident of Banning said his property is currently zoned Low Density Residential (LDR), but he originally bought it when it was zoned High Density Residential (HDR). His request to the Planning Commission was that if the proposed project is approved, that he would be allowed to build condos with the same development standards as the proposed PUD.

Director Nevins said this project does not meet all the standard requirements of the Low Density Residential Zone (LDR). It is consistent with the allowable density in the LDR zone. The LDR lot width is 70 feet, and they are requesting 50 feet which is allowed under the Planned Unit Development regulations. It gives the Planning Commission the authority to approve a Planned Unit Development permit that reduces some of the development standards.

Commissioner Krick said under a PUD there will be less homes even under small lots than if they were developed under the Low Density Residential development standards. He mentioned...
that the City tax payers would not have to maintain the sidewalks, street lights, curb, gutter, streets, street paving and the park.

Commissioner Shaw closed public comment.

Director Vela said they will consider having a four-way stop at the intersection and would welcome a recommendation from Planning Commission.

**ACTION (KRICK/SHAW): A motion was moved, seconded and carried that the Planning Commission take the following action:**

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2017-15 recommending the following:

I. Recommending to the City Council the adoption of the Project’s Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

II. Recommending to the City Council the approval of Planned Unit Development Permit 17-9507, Tentative Tract Map 36710 and Design Review 15-7004 subject to the conditions of approval, with the following amendments:

1. Prior to building permit issuance, the developer shall create a Home Owners Association (HOA) with Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’s) that make the HOA responsible for maintenance of all private amenities such as; streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street lights, open space areas, fences, block walls, landscaping, irrigation, and any other items not maintained by the City of Banning.

2. The Home Owners Association shall include in their Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’s) that no more than 50 percent of the homes in the subdivision may be rented.

3. All perimeter walls and fences shall be coated with a non-graffiti coating and all walls shall be landscaped in such a way to prevent graffiti.

4. All pathways behind houses shall have locking gates and all open spaces areas shall have security lighting.

5. The intersection of Florida Street and Wilson Street shall become a four way stop at a time the City Engineer determines the need exists.

*(Motion Carried 3 -2)*

AYES: Krick, Price, Shaw
Plan Commission Meeting Minutes
September 6, 2017

1. DISCUSS AND CONSIDER ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT 17-97503 TO AMEND VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE (TITLE 17 OF THE BANNING MUNICIPAL CODE) REGARDING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS.

Contract Planner De Manincor said State law has changed in an attempt to address unaffordability. The California legislature spend the last year prioritizing several proposals to create a greater supply of more affordable housing.

Assembly Bills (“AB”) 2299 and 2406, and Senate Bill (“SB”) 1069 collectively impact local authority to regulate accessory dwelling units. Commonly referred as “second units”

These bills render the term “second units” obsolete by replacing that term with “accessory dwelling units” or ADUs. The changes in the Municipal Code will be made under Sections 17.040.070 – Definitions, Table 17.080.020 Permitted, Conditional and Prohibited Residential Uses, Table 17.080.040 – Use specific Development Standards and Table 17.08.100 – Second Unit Standards.

De Manincor said Residential Second Units will now be defined as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s) they will have independent living facilities for one or two persons, and will include permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel as the single-family dwelling is situated.

Commissioner Krick said that he read that a garage could be demolished and replace it with an accessory unit, but it doesn’t say that a garage must be replaced again; he asked that language be included which states that a garage is still required.

De Manincor said a two car enclosed garage is still required for the primary unit. He asked that staff references the parking requirement code at the end of Accessory dwelling unit standards – 12-b.

Chairman Shaw opened Public comment.
None

Commissioner Shaw closed public comment.

ACTION (SCHULER/KRICK): A motion was moved, seconded and carried that the Planning Commission take the following action:

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2017-10:

I. Recommending to the City Council the adoption of Notice of Exemption for Zone Text Amendment 17-97503; and

NOES: Shuler, Ellis
II. Recommending to the City Council the adoption of Ordinance 1512 approving Zone Text Amendment 17-97503.

(Motion Carried 5 -0)

VI. PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

None

VII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S COMMENTS:

Director Nevins thanked De Manincor for his service at the City.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

__________________________
Sandra Calderon
Recording Secretary

THE ACTION MINUTES SUMMARIZE ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION. A COPY OF THE MEETING IN ITS ENTIRETY IS AVAILABLE IN DVD FORMAT AND CAN BE REQUESTED IN WRITING FROM THE CITY CLERK’S OFFICE.
The Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2017-17:

I. Adopting a Notice of Exemption pursuant to CEQA Section 15162 (Subsequent EIR’s and Negative Declarations).

II. Approving Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 for the expansion of an existing school, subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval contained therein; and

III. Approving Design Review No. 17-7003 for the installation of two modular buildings and associated improvements to accommodate the expansion of an existing school, subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval contained therein.

APPLICANT INFORMATION:

Project Location: 1325 Mountain Avenue
Banning, CA 92220

APN Information: 535-422-015
PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit Amendment to expand an existing private school, and Design Review for the installation of two modular buildings and related site and landscape improvements to accommodate the school expansion.

Planning Department files indicate that in 1976 the Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit 1976-02, permitting the establishment of a church building and the Calvary Christian School, a private school for kindergarten through 12th grade (a Design Review application was not required at that time). The approval allowed up to 200 students.

The CUP was amended by the Planning Commission in 1998 under CUP Amendment 06-8002 and Design Review 06-7017 to allow the construction of a 13,200 square foot single story school building with a multi-purpose room adjacent to the existing church and fellowship hall (again, a Design Review application was not required at that time) as well as 45,160 square feet of developed open space including lawn and playground area. That school was not constructed.

In May 2007, an amendment was approved to increase the previously approved building’s square footage from 13,200 square foot to 26,104 square foot for a two-story building to contain nine classrooms and a multi-purpose room. The footprint of the building was to be 16,760 square feet. The approval included increased school enrollment to 300 students. Building permits were obtained and the project site intended to house the new building was graded, additional parking was installed, and the turf playing field was installed, but construction on the approved building did not commence. Both the Conditional Use Permit and the Design Review approvals for the school expansion and remaining improvements have expired based on discontinuance of work.

On January 4, 2017 the applicant, Mountain Avenue Baptist Church, received Planning Commission approval of Conditional Use Permit Amendment 16-8004 for the expansion of the existing private school to accommodate up to 100 new students, and Design Review 16-7001 for the installation of five modular buildings and associated improvements to accommodate said expansion, for the existing Mountain Avenue Baptist Church. While the
improvements for CUP 16-8004 and DR 16-7001 are in progress, the applicant submitted the current application for an additional two buildings to be used as a library and science lab. The project analysis is discussed below.

Table 1 below summarizes the uses surrounding the site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Vacant Land and Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (LDR)</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (LDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (LDR)</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (LDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Open Space-Parks</td>
<td>Open Space-Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (LDR)</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (LDR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT ANALYSIS:**

In accordance with Chapter 17.08, Table 17.08.020 of the Banning Municipal Code, Private Schools require the submittal of a Conditional Use Permit application in Residential land use zones.

Conditional uses are unique and their effect on the surrounding environment cannot be determined in advance of the use being proposed for a particular location. At the time of application, a review of the location, design, configuration and potential impact of the proposed use shall be conducted by comparing the use to established development standards and design guidelines. This review shall determine whether the proposed use should be permitted by weighing the public need for the benefit to be derived from the use, against any negative or undesirable impacts which it may cause.

The project proposes the expansion of the school beyond the previous approvals to include installation of two modular buildings along with associated site and landscape improvements within the previously graded pad approved under CUP Amendment 06-8002 and Design Review 06-7017. The two additional modular units will be used as a library and science lab.
Existing Buildings and Site

The project site is located at 1325 Mountain Avenue on the west side of Mountain Avenue, north of Red Bluff Lane. The rectangular property is 6.29 acres and is relatively flat, with the northerly portions of the site, including the proposed building area being situated slightly higher (approximately two to three feet) than the surrounding areas. Immediately adjacent parcels to the north and south have been graded for construction of single family residences and are largely undeveloped. Property to the west is vacant, and single family homes are located to the east across Mountain Avenue.

The site currently contains an existing single story building that houses the church sanctuary, offices, a nursery, and fourteen classrooms serving kindergarten through twelfth grade. An athletic field/turf area is located at the west end of the property, and the site contains paved and landscaped parking with 159 spaces. Church services take place on Sundays and on Wednesday evenings. Current classes include five kindergarten classrooms, five elementary classrooms, two junior high classrooms, and two high school classrooms. Classes are scheduled Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 3:15 p.m. and the school also offers extended care from 6:30 a.m. -8:00 a.m. and 3:15 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

The school has implemented a vehicular circulation plan which directs incoming traffic into the site via the northerly driveway and through a circular flow pattern, exiting the site via the southerly driveway. The drive and parking areas are sufficiently expansive to allow cars dropping off and picking up to wait within the project site and not on Mountain Avenue.

Conditional Use Permit

The applicant’s request for expansion of an existing school – the current on-site Calvary Christian School – requires approval of a Conditional Use Permit Amendment by the Planning Commission. The existing church campus is approved for up to 300 K-12 students and the school is currently accommodating 205 students. The proposed expansion is not intended to accommodate additional students as the proposed modular units are to be used as a library and science lab.

Existing school operational parameters would remain the same and the proposed school operations remain consistent with the Zoning Code and with the goals and objectives of the General Plan. The site is located within the Low Density Residential zone and private schools are conditionally permitted within all of the City’s residential zones. With respect to the General Plan, preservation and enhancement of the City’s residential neighborhoods is a primary goal. This project provides for the maintenance of a land use that is consistent with these General Plan goals and policies by providing school services within smaller more localized facilities.
Because the expansion of the school use is proposed in facilities that will operate within multiple small buildings with exterior pedestrian circulation rather than a centralized building with interior circulation, noise is a potential concern. Staff has included Condition of Approval No.12 which restricts outdoor noise in the form of public address systems, including classroom bells. Staff is not aware of any complaints with respect to the existing school operations. A standard Condition of Approval (No.8) relates to calls for service and allows the Conditional Use Permit to be brought back to the Planning Commission for consideration if this, or any other aspect associated with the use, should pose problems to the surrounding neighborhood.

**Design Review**

*Site and Buildings*

The project proposes the installation of two modular buildings to accommodate a library and science lab on an existing graded pad. Modular buildings are built off-site as opposed to on-site, and are placed on permanent foundations. Each modular building would measure 24’ x 40’ (960 square feet) and as sited, all buildings meet required building setbacks and separation. The buildings would be located along the perimeter of a central landscaped area. Paved walkways and ramping would provide pathways and access from the existing building and parking areas to the east, west, and south, and landscaping and outdoor seating areas are provided adjacent to the classrooms as amenities to enhance the areas around the modular buildings. Exhibit 1 illustrates the proposed Site Plan and Conceptual Landscape Plan.

The pre-constructed nature of the proposed modular buildings precludes unique architectural design. However, the applicant has proposed to paint the structures in the same primary and accent colors as the existing building, and has used ledger stone to match the stone finishes of the existing church/school building in order to create cohesion between the new structures and the existing building as required by the City’s commercial and industrial architectural guidelines. Staff recommends that the ledger stone be applied as a wainscoting-type treatment similar to the finish on the existing church building and has included Condition Of Approval No.13 to this effect. Exhibit 2 illustrates Building Elevations, as proposed by the applicant.

Staff has some concern with the rooflines of the proposed buildings, which are generally flat with minimal pitch. In contrast, the City’s mobile home and manufactured housing design guidelines, which provide the closest architectural direction regarding pre-manufactured structures, require that minimum eave dimensions shall be one foot and all roofs shall have a minimum pitch of 1:4. The proposed structures do not meet the 1:4 requirement, and the applicant has indicated that this may not be possible. In order to be consistent with the Planning Commission approval for the first five modular units approved under Resolution 2017-03, Staff has removed the requirement to have a one foot eve and minimum pitch of 1:4.
Parking and Access

Site parking requirements for both the existing church and classrooms as well as the proposed classroom expansion are illustrated in Table 2 below.

Table 2
Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Zoning Code Requirement</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churches/meeting facilities</td>
<td>1 space per each 4 fixed seats or 1 space per 35 sq.ft. of non-fixed seating area in the principle sanctuary or auditorium, whichever is greater</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Existing = 3,555 sq.ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/junior high school</td>
<td>3 spaces per classroom</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 existing classrooms + 2 proposed classrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>8 spaces per classroom</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 existing classrooms + 2 proposed classrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are currently 159 parking spaces on site; thus, the existing parking on-site is sixteen spaces short of the total parking required to accommodate the combined school expansion and church parking requirements in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Table 17.28.040B–Commercial and Industrial Parking Standards. However, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 17.28.060(J) Parking and Design Standards – Shared Parking, parking facilities may be shared if multiple uses cooperative establish and operate the facilities and if these uses generate parking demands primarily during hours when the remaining uses are not in operation. The applicant has indicated that existing parking significantly outweighs actual usage, and since the church and school uses operating hours do not overlap, staff recommends acceptance of existing site parking as adequate to accommodate both uses. Should the Planning Commission disagree, existing parking to the west, along the perimeter of the playing field, can be expanded northerly to accommodate sixteen additional parking spaces and a condition of approval requiring that the additional parking be provided as required by the Zoning Code could be imposed.

Existing site circulation for the school, including drop-off and pickup, flows in a circular pattern wherein vehicles picking up students enter the northerly site driveway, either park in the parking areas to the south of the buildings or queue up in front of the
westerly building area for student pickup, and exit along the south property line and driveway entrance. The system currently works efficiently and staff has noted on site visits that the church has personnel in the parking lot monitoring the site activities. It is expected that this system will continue to operate efficiently under an expanded enrollment scenario.

**Landscaping**

A concept landscape plan, as illustrated in Exhibit 2, features a combination of turf, trees, raised planter seating areas, enhanced paving, and concrete walkways within the central area between the modular buildings. A variety of plantings, including palm, ash, and myrtle trees, shrubs and groundcover, and decomposed granite are depicted in conjunction with concrete pathways around the perimeter of the classrooms. The area just east of the structures includes an additional seating area, and seating walls will be constructed adjacent to the southerly parking lot sidewalk and around a raised planter within the westerly perimeter.

Additional trees and landscaping would also be required to be installed to comply with zoning ordinance requirements relative to any new parking lot landscaping.

**Conclusion**

The proposed use, along with proposed and conditioned site improvements, will provide a desirable service within the City in the form of an additional, localized schooling choice. The proposed use is an expansion of an existing facility within the City and furthers the goal of business retention. As proposed and conditioned, Staff recommends approval of the proposed project as outlined in Resolution No. 2017-17, subject to conditions contained in Attachment 1, Exhibit “A”,

**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:**

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The potential environmental effects of the project were addressed in the Negative Declaration adopted for CUP 06-8002 for a school building and ancillary facilities. The current proposal would be sited in the same location, but with less square footage than was originally analyzed and there have been no substantial changes in the project nor in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration; nor is there new information that shows that the project will have a significant environmental effect or an effect more severe than originally thought. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations, a subsequent environmental document is not required.
Staff has analyzed proposed Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review 17-7003 and determined that the Project meets the above criteria and no further environmental review is required. The previously adopted Negative Declaration is provided under Attachment 3.

Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

The project is found to be consistent with the MSHCP. The project is located outside of any MSHCP criteria area and mitigation is provided through payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION:

Proposed Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review No. 17-7003 were advertised in the Record Gazette newspaper on September 22, 2016 and notices were mailed to surrounding property owners within 300 feet of the project site in compliance with the City’s noticing requirements for public hearings. As of the date of this report, staff has not received any comments for or against the proposal.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution No. 2017-17 with Conditions of Approval
2. Exhibits – Site Plan/Conceptual Landscape Plan, Building Elevations
3. Previously Adopted Negative Declaration
4. Public Hearing Notice

Prepared By:  
Marie Gilliam  
Contract Planner

Reviewed and Recommended By:  
Patty Nevins  
Community Development Director
ATTACHMENT 1
Resolution 2017-17
with Conditions of Approval
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-17


WHEREAS, an application for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review 17-7003 to expand an existing private school and install modular buildings and associated improvements has been duly filed by:

Project Applicant: Mountain Avenue Baptist Church
1325 Mountain Avenue
Banning, CA 92220

Property Address: 1325 Mountain Avenue

APN: 535-422-015

Lot Area: 6.70 acres

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has the authority per Chapter 17.52 of the Banning Municipal Code to take action on a Conditional Use Permit amendment for a private school and per Chapter 17.56 of the Banning Municipal Code to take action on a Design Review for modular structures and site improvements in the Low Density Residential Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, on September 22, 2017 the City gave public notice by advertising in the Record Gazette, a newspaper of general circulation within the City of Banning, and by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project of the holding of a public hearing at which the project would be considered; and

WHEREAS, on October 4, 2017 the Planning Commission held the noticed public hearing at which interested persons had an opportunity to testify in support of, or opposition to, Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review 17-7003; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), staff determined that potential impacts associated with Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review 17-7003 were adequately analyzed under the previously adopted Negative
Declaration for CUP 06-802 and DR 06-7017 and that pursuant to CEQA Section 15162 no further environmental analysis is required; and

NOW THEREFORE, the Planning Commission of the City of Banning does hereby resolve, determine, find, and order as follows:

SECTION 1. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The potential environmental effects of the project were addressed in the Negative Declaration adopted for CUP 06-8002 and DR 06-7017 for a school building and ancillary facilities. The current proposal would be sited in the same location, but with less square footage than was originally analyzed and there have been no substantial changes in the project nor in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration; nor is there new information that shows that the project will have a significant environmental effect or an effect more severe than originally thought. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations, a subsequent environmental document is not required.

Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

The project is found to be consistent with the MSHCP. The project is located outside of any MSHCP criteria area and mitigation is provided through payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee.
REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT 17-8004:

Section 17.52.050 of the City of Banning Zoning Ordinance requires that Conditional Use Permit applications meet certain findings prior to the approval by the Planning Commission. The following findings are provided in support of the approval of Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004:

Finding A: The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan.

Findings of Fact: The project site is designated Low Density Residential (LDR), and schools are conditionally permitted within the LDR land use district. The project is consistent with the accomplishment of Residential Goal No. 1 of the General Plan Land Use Element, which calls for the preservation and enhancement of the City’s neighborhoods.

Finding B: The proposed use is conditionally permitted within the subject land use district and complies with all of the applicable provisions of this Ordinance.

Findings of Fact: Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 is consistent with Section 17.12.020 of the Zoning Ordinance in that private schools are a conditionally permitted use in the Low Density Residential zone. The project as proposed and conditioned will comply with the parking, landscaping, and refuse storage standards.

Finding C: The proposed use would not impair the integrity and character of the land use district in which it is to be located.

Findings of Fact: The subject site as well as surrounding properties is comprised of residential properties. The property meets or exceeds development standards, will operate in a substantially similar manner as the existing facility, and the exterior finishes will be the same as the existing sanctuary and school building.

Finding D: The subject site is physically suitable for the type and intensity of the land use being proposed.

Findings of Fact: The subject site is suitable for the type and intensity of land use proposed in that the site is generally flat, and at 6.3 acres is large enough to accommodate the proposed expansion. The site circulation and landscaping area is designed in a way that the project is compatible with the
character of the surrounding neighborhood and Zoning Ordinance design guidelines.

**Finding E:** There are adequate provisions for water, sanitation, and public utilities and services to ensure that the proposed use would not be detrimental to public health and safety.

**Finding of Fact:** The project will construct all necessary on and off-site infrastructure to provide utilities to the proposed project. Water, sanitation, and public utilities and services are available in Mountain Avenue, a public street.

**Finding F:** There will not be significant harmful effects upon environmental quality; natural resources; or neighborhood characteristics.

**Finding of Fact:** The proposed project was previously evaluated for environmental impacts under the provisions under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and a Negative Declaration was adopted.

**Finding G:** The proposed location size, design and operating characteristics of the proposed use will not be detrimental to the public interests, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City.

**Finding of Fact:** The proposed location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are consistent with the General Plan and zoning ordinance goals and requirements for the Low Density Residential zone. Further, the proposal involved an expansion of an existing use. The project has been designed to meet the required development standards related to setbacks, lot coverage, building height, and parking and landscaping such that it will not be detrimental to the public interests, health, safety, convenience or welfare of the City.

**REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR DESIGN REVIEW 17-7003:**

Section 17.56.050 of the City of Banning Zoning Ordinance requires that Design Review applications meet certain findings prior to the approval by the Planning Commission. The following findings are provided in support of the approval for Design Review No. 17-7003:

**Finding A:** The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan.
Findings of Fact: The project site is designated Low Density Residential (LDR), and schools are conditionally permitted within the LDR land use district. The project is consistent with the accomplishment of Residential Goal No. 1 of the General Plan Land Use Element, which calls for the preservation and enhancement of the City’s neighborhoods. It is further consistent with Goal No. 2, Policy No. 2 which prescribes that projects adjacent to existing neighborhoods shall be carefully reviewed to assure that neighborhood character is protected. This project maintains an LDR land use designation. The project, as proposed and conditioned, will be complimentary to the existing building and improvements on site and to the neighborhood as a whole.

Finding B: The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, including the development standards and guidelines for the district in which it is located.

Findings of Fact: Design Review 17-7003 is consistent with Section 17.12.020 of the Zoning Ordinance in that private schools are a conditionally permitted use in the Low Density Residential zone. The project meets the development standards for the Low Density Residential zone, and as proposed and conditioned will comply with the City’s parking, landscaping, and refuse storage standards.

Finding C: The design and layout of the proposed project will not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring existing or future development, and will not result in vehicular and/or pedestrian hazards.

Findings of Fact: The site design of the proposed project is similar to the existing usage and design of the subject site. As proposed and conditioned, it will thus not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring or existing or future development.

Finding D: The design of the proposed project is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Findings of Fact: The design of the proposed structures has been enhanced to be compatible with the existing church/school building. The building area has been enhanced with landscaping and outdoor seating, to further blend in with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
SECTION 3. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

The Planning Commission hereby takes the following action:

1. Adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 2017-17:
   a. Adopting a Notice of Exemption.
   b. Approving Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004, subject to Conditions of Approval attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A.
   c. Approving Design Review 17-7003, subject to Conditions of Approval attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 4th day of October, 2017.

________________________________
Eric Shaw, Chairman
Banning Planning Commission

APPROVED AS TO FORM
AND LEGAL CONTENT:

__________________________
Gregg W. Kettles
Interim Assistant City Attorney
Jenkins & Hogin, LLC

ATTEST:

__________________________
Sandra Calderon, Recording Secretary
City of Banning, California
CERTIFICATION:

I, Sandra Calderon, Recording Secretary of the Planning Commission of the City of Banning, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution 2017-17, was duly adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Banning, California, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 4th day of October 2017, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Sandra Calderon, Recording Secretary
City of Banning, California
EXHIBIT A

PROJECT #: Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review

SUBJECT: Conditions of Approval (Planning Commission Resolution No. 2017-17)

APPLICANT: Mountain Avenue Baptist Church

LOCATION: APN: 535-422-015

All fair share agreements, covenant agreements and agreements subject to recordation will be subject to review and approval by the City Attorney and will include appropriate enforcement provisions by the City and be properly securitized.

Community Development Department

1. This Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Design Review is approved for the expansion of a private school for the installation of two modular structures and associated site and landscape improvements.

2. The applicant shall indemnify, protect, defend, and hold harmless, the City, and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof, from any and all claims, demands, lawsuits, writs of mandamus, and other actions and proceedings (whether legal, equitable, declaratory, administrative or adjudicatory in nature), and alternative dispute resolutions procedures (including, but not limited to arbitrations, mediations, and other such procedures), (collectively “Actions”), brought against the City, and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof, that challenge, attack, or seek to modify, set aside, void, or annul, the action of, or any permit or approval issued by, the City and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof (including actions approved by the voters of the City), for or concerning the project, whether such Actions are brought under the California Environmental Quality Act, the Planning and Zoning Law, the Subdivisions Map Act, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085 or 1094.5, or any other state, federal, or local statute, law, ordinance, rule, regulation, or any decision of a competent
jurisdiction. It is expressly agreed that the City shall have the right to approve, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld, the legal counsel providing the City’s defense, and that applicant shall reimburse City for any costs and expenses directly and necessarily incurred by the City in the course of the defense. City shall promptly notify the applicant of any Action brought and City shall cooperate with applicant in the defense of the Action.

3. Approval of this entitlement shall not waive compliance with previous approvals, any sections of the Development Code, or other applicable City Ordinances in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

4. Construction and/or occupancy shall commence within two (2) years from the date of project approval, or the Conditional Use Permit Amendment approval shall become null and void. Additionally, if after commencement of construction work is discontinued for a period of one year the Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Design Review approvals shall become null and void. The Community Development Director may, upon a written application being filed 30 days prior to expiration and for good cause, grant a onetime extension not to exceed 12 months. Upon granting of an extension, the Community Development Director shall ensure that the Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Design Review comply with all current Ordinance provisions.

5. A copy of the signed resolution of approval or Community Development Director's letter of approval and all conditions of approval and any applicable mitigation measures shall be reproduced in legible form on the grading plans, building and construction plans, and landscape and irrigation plans submitted for review and approval as required by the reviewing department.

6. Prior to any use of the project site, or business activity being commenced thereon, all conditions of approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

7. If there more than three calls for service in any six-month period or any future issues that arise with the use that is the subject of this Conditional Use Permit Amendment approval (e.g., complaints from neighboring residents) the Community Development Director or other appropriate City designee has the authority to require that the Conditional Use Permit Amendment be brought back before the Planning Commission for immediate remedy which may include, but not necessarily be limited to, the imposition of additional conditions of approval.

8. The site shall be maintained free of trash and/or debris. The applicant/occupant shall properly dispose of any refuse and bulk trash located on the property.

9. Separate submittals and permits are required for all accessory structures such as but not limited to, trash enclosures, patios, block walls and storage buildings.
10. Any roof-mounted equipment or utility equipment on the side of the structure, or on the ground, shall not be visible from adjacent properties, the public rights-of-way or the parking lot. Any architectural screening that is proposed to shield the roof-mounted equipment shall be compatible in terms of colors and materials of the building. Landscape screening for ground mounted equipment shall be of sufficient size and quantity to fully screen the equipment.

11. Exterior noise, including any bells, public address system, etc, shall not exceed 65dBA at the property line.

12. The ledger stone be applied as a wainscoting-type treatment similar to the finish on the church building.

13. A complete landscape/irrigation package prepared by a landscape architect licensed by the State of California shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to issuance of building permit. The plans shall include the following elements:

   a. Water conservation concept statement.
   b. Calculation of maximum applied water allowance.
   c. Calculation of estimated total water use.
   d. Landscape design plan.
   e. Irrigation design plan.
   f. Certificate of substantial completion.

The landscape plan shall demonstrate compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements related to landscaping in parking areas, including required front yard setback landscaping and shall include trees and additional groundcover planting as required by the Zoning Code.

14. Site exterior lighting shall be shielded or recessed so that light is contained within the boundaries of the parcel on which the lighting is located. All lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way.

Engineering / Public Works Department

15. The applicant shall submit the revised Grading and Drainage Plan to the Engineering Division for review and approval before any grading activity is allowed. The revised Grading and Drainage Plan shall be drawn on 36” x 24” sheet and at a scale of 1” = 40’. The revised Grading and Drainage Plan must be prepared and signed by a civil engineer licensed to practice in the State of California.
16. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide a lot pad certification stamped and signed by a qualified civil engineer or land surveyor. Pad certification shall list the pad elevation as shown on the approved grading plan, the actual pad elevation and the difference between the two, if any. Such pad certification shall also list the relative compaction of the pad soil.

**Building Department**

The following are required at time of plan check submittal:

17. The Site shall be developed in compliance with all current model codes. All plans shall be designed in compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Codes as adopted by the City of Banning.

18. Site development and grading shall be designed to provide access to all entrances and exterior ground floor exits and access to normal paths of travel, and where necessary to provide access. Paths of travel shall incorporate (but not limited to) exterior stairs, landings, walks and sidewalks, pedestrian ramps, curb ramps, warning curbs, detectable warnings, signage, gates, lifts and walking surface material. The accessible route(s) of travel shall be the most practical direct route between accessible building entrances, site facilities, accessible parking, public sidewalks, and the accessible entrance(s) to the site. California Building Code (CBC) 11A and 11B.

   a. City of Banning enforces the State of California provisions of the California Building Code disabled access requirements. The Federal ADA standards differ in some cases from the California State requirements. It is the building owners responsibility to be aware of those differences and comply accordingly.

   b. Disabled access parking shall be located on the shortest accessible route.

19. Separate submittals and permits are required for all accessory structures such as but not limited to, trash enclosures, patios, block walls and storage buildings.

**Fire Department**

20. The required fire flow shall be available from the existing Super hydrant(s) (6” x 4” x 2 1/2” x 2 1/2”) and shall be capable of delivering a fire flow 1500 GPM per minute for two hours duration at 20 psi residual operating pressure, which must be available before any combustible material is placed on the construction site. Fire Flow test will be required to be submitted to the fire marshal office confirming the required fire flow.
21. Install a fire alarm system per CBC 907. Submit plans along with current permit fees, to the Office of the Fire Marshal for review and approval prior to installation.

22. Fire Apparatus access road shall be in compliance with the Riverside County Fire Department Standards. Access lanes will not have an up, or downgrade of more than 15%. Access roads shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance not less than 13 feet and 6 inches. Access lanes will be designed to withstand the weight of 75 thousand pounds. Access will have a turning radius capable of accommodating fire apparatus. Access lane shall be constructed with a surface so as to provide all weather driving capabilities. Access shall be provided to be with 150' of all exterior portions of the structures.

23. An approved Fire Department access key lock box (Minimum Knox Box 3200 series model) shall be installed next to the approved Fire Department access door to the main building. If the buildings are protected with an alarm system, the lock box shall be required to have tampered monitoring. Required order forms and installation standards may be obtained at the Fire Department.

24. Gate(s) shall be automatic or manual operated. Install Knox key operated switches, with dust cover, mounted per recommended standard of the Knox Company. Building plans shall include mounting location/position and operating standards for Fire Department approval.

***END***
ATTACHMENT 2
Site Plan, Elevations, Conceptual Landscaping

Site Plan
Proposed Building Elevations

Conceptual Landscape Plan

CALVARY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL
BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS
CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN

1325 MOUNTAIN AVENUE
BANNING, CA 92220

TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA: 16,770 SQ. FT.
ATTACHMENT 3
Previously Adopted Negative Declaration
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

April 12, 2007

FROM: City of Banning

TO: Responsible and Trustee Agencies/Interested Organizations and Individuals

RE: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Conditional Use Permit 06-802, Design Review 06-7017

The City of Banning (City), in its capacity as the Lead Agency for this project under CEQA, evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the project under CEQA. The City has determined through the preparation of an Initial Study that although the project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects, these impacts will not be significant in this case because the mitigation measures described in the detailed Initial Study have been added to the project. The Initial Study meets the requirements of the State of California CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Banning Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

This constitutes a Notice of Intent (NOI) to adopt the aforementioned Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Project Location/ Description:

1325 Mountain Avenue. Assessors Parcels # 535-030-037.

A Conditional Use Permit amendment to add a school to an existing church, and the review of the design of that school building.

Other permits and agreements: N/A

Toxic Sites: No listed toxic sites are present on the project site.

Public Hearing: The Planning Commission meeting has been scheduled for May 1, 2007.

Public Review: The Initial Study and related documents are available for public review daily. Members of the public may view these documents in the Department of Planning, City Hall, 99 E. Ramsey, Banning, and submit written comments at or prior to the Planning Commission or City Council hearing.
If any group challenges the action in court, issues raised may be limited to only those issues raised at the public hearing described in this notice or in written correspondence at, or prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

An opportunity will be given at said hearing for all interested persons to be heard. Questions regarding this case may be directed to Oscar Orci at 951-922-3125.

**Comment Period:** Based on the time limits defined by CEQA, your response should be sent at the earliest possible date. The public comment period on this project is from **April 12 to May 1, 2007.** All comments and any questions should be directed to:

City of Banning  
Attn: Oscar Orci  
99 E. Ramsey  
Banning, CA 92220  
Telephone: 951-922-3125  
Fax: 951-922-3128
Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: Conditional Use Permit 06-802, Design Review 06-7017

2. Lead agency name and address: City of Banning
   99 East Ramsey
   Banning, CA 92220

3. Contact person and phone number: Kevin Swartz
   951-922-3125

4. Project location: City-wide

5. Project sponsor's name and address: City of Banning
   99 East Ramsey
   Banning, CA 92220

6. General plan designation: Low Density Residential

7. Zoning: Low Density Residential

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

   Conditional Use Permit amendment to allow the construction of added school facilities on an existing church project. The existing facilities total 12,701 square feet. The additional school building, to be built on two stories, will add 26,104 square feet.

   The Design Review request is for the additional school building. Existing facilities on the site are to remain.

   Access to the site will continue to be Mountain Avenue.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

   North: Vacant
   South: Single family residential and mobile home park
   West: Vacant
   East: Single family residential, vacant

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFfected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology /Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use / Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population / Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities / Service Systems</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

**Signature**

4/10/04

**Date**
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources. A lead agency cites the (parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Aerial photograph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Master Plan document)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Master Plan document)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. a)-d) The proposed school building will rise to a height of 29 feet. The site is located on the uphill sloping Mountain Avenue, with the San Gorgonio mountains located to the north. Vacant land occurs to the north. Single family homes occur to the south and east. Due to distance and the view corridors in the area, the proposed building is not expected to significantly impact scenic vistas for these residential units.

There are no significant trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings on the project site.

The development of the school will not significantly add to light and glare in the neighborhood. School activities are generally ended by evening. The proposed athletic field is not proposed to be lighted. Although some light can be expected from car headlights when parents pick up children after sunset, this increase is not expected to be significant.

Overall impacts associated with aesthetics are not expected to be significant.
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (General Plan and EIR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Zoning Map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (General Plan Land Use Map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. a)-c) The proposed project is located in the north-central portion of the City. Vacant lands to the west have been used for cattle grazing, but are not in active agriculture. There are no Williamson Act contracts on the project site, or on lands immediately adjacent to the project site. The area has been designated for low density residential development in the General Plan for a number of years. There are no agriculturally designated lands in the vicinity. There will be no impact to agricultural resources as a result of the proposed project.
### III. AIR QUALITY: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (SCAQMD CEQA Handbook)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (SCAQMD CEQA Handbook)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (SCAQMD CEQA Handbook)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Project Description, Aerial Photo, site inspection)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Project Description)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. a)-e)

Construction of the new school building will result in air emissions associated with construction and long term operation of the facility. Each of these impacts is discussed separately below.

**Construction Emissions**

The proposed project includes the construction of a structure with a 17,000 square foot footprint, landscaping and parking areas. It is estimated that an area of about 3 acres will need to be disturbed to complete the improvements. As a result, and assuming mass grading of this area, the proposed project would result in up to 79.2 pounds of fugitive dust per day during the grading process. This is well below the SCAQMD threshold of 150 pounds per day.

In addition to fugitive dust, grading will generate emissions associated with the equipment utilized to complete grading. Table 1, below, quantifies the emissions which can be expected from these vehicles. As shown in the Table, the emissions will not exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance.
Table 1
Grading Equipment Emissions
(pounds per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th># Pieces</th>
<th>hrs/day</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>ROC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>SOx*</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawler Tractors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor/Loader/Backhoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber Tired Dozer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Highway Trucks (Water Trucks)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAQMD Threshold

|        | 550 | 75  | 100 | 150 | 150 |

Operational Emissions
Once construction is complete, daily operations will result in air emissions from vehicles coming to and from the school. The traffic impact analysis for the project estimated that 620 average daily trips will be generated at the site\(^1\). These trips have the potential to generate the following emissions.

Table 2
Moving Exhaust Emission Projections at Project Buildout
(pounds per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. Vehicle Trips/Day</th>
<th>Ave. Trip Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total miles/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>= 6,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>SOX</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAQMD Thresholds

|        | 550.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 150.0 | 150.0 |

URBEBMIS Version
2.2

Scenario Year 2007 -- Model Years 1965 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant - Vehicle</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>SOX</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.012820</td>
<td>0.001361</td>
<td>0.001383</td>
<td>0.00009</td>
<td>0.000115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the Table, emissions are not expected to exceed thresholds of significance for any criteria pollutant. Impacts are therefore expected to be less than significant.

The proposed project will consist of a school and is not expected to generate any odors. Overall impacts associated with air quality are expected to be less than significant.

---

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (General Plan Biological Resources Element)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the proposed project will occur on lands which are currently covered in non-native grasses and ornamental vegetation. The area to be built upon is turfed, is used as athletic field and playfield area, and does not contain native habitats. The site is likely used by common species for foraging habitat. However, no species of concern are expected to occur on the project site. The project site is not located in a conservation area or a corridor area of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan. The site is surrounded by development on two sides, and is not appropriate as a migratory corridor. No impacts associated with biological resources are expected as a result of the proposed project.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. a)-d) The proposed project site is not located in an area of potential significance for cultural resources. There are no historic structures on the site. As a previously developed site, the area is not likely to contain either archaeological or paleontological resources. There are no known burial grounds on the project site. California law requires that if the contractor were to unearth human remains, law enforcement officials are to be immediately contacted for proper investigation and removal of the remains. This provision of law assures that there will be no impact to human remains.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. a)-e) The proposed project is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The project site is, however, located less than one mile from the Banning Branch of the San Andreas fault, and will experience strong ground shaking during a seismic event. The City, however, implements the building standards for a Zone 5 classification of the Uniform Building Code, and will require that the proposed building be designed to meet or exceed these standards. The standards are designed to lower the potential impacts associated with seismic ground shaking to less than significant levels.

The site will be subject to soil erosion during the grading process. Wind erosion will be reduced by the City’s requirements for PM10 Management Plans, which will be required
of the proposed project. These requirements will reduce wind erosion hazards to less than significant levels. The project will also be required to conform to the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which requires the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), including best management practices for the control of stormwater during and after construction. These requirements will assure that impacts associated with water erosion are reduced to less than significant levels.

The site is located in an area of the City which does not have a high groundwater table. It is estimated that water levels are located at a depth of more than 100 feet. As a result, liquefaction potential at the site is negligible. The site is gently sloping, and does not occur adjacent to hillsides, so that there is no potential for landslides. The soils in the City are generally sandy loams, and are not expansive. The proposed project will be required to connect to the City’s sewer system, and will not use septic tanks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Application materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Application materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Application materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Riverside County Hazardous Materials Listing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (General Plan land use map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (General Plan land use map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (General Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (General Plan, Fire Setback standards)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. a)-h) The proposed school building will not transport, store or use hazardous materials. The school will store small quantities of cleaning materials and products, which will be managed by staff to assure safe use. There are no hazardous materials storage or use facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project site which could pose a threat to the proposed school. No impacts are expected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Urban Water Management Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (FEMA Maps)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. a)-g) Domestic water is supplied to the project site by the City of Banning. The eventual development of the site will result in the need for domestic water service for the school. Expected water demand from this development will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere with groundwater recharge. The project site occurs in the Banning Hydrologic Subunit and is between the Banning Bench Storage Unit and the East Banning Storage Unit. The City’s Urban Water Management Plan clearly states that the City has sufficient water supplies, or access to additional water supplies, to serve the proposed project.

The project will be required to implement the City’s water efficient landscaping and construction provisions, which will ensure that the least amount of water is utilized within the homes.

The proposed project will result in additional impervious surfaces which will create additional runoff. The City will require, prior to the issuance of grading permits, the preparation of a hydrology study, to determine the level of storm flows to be expected at the site. The City will require that the 100 year storm flow be retained on site. This is likely to be accomplished through the construction of a retention basin on site. Given the location of an athletic field to the west of the proposed project, sufficient lands occur for this facility on the project site. The project will also be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP, including best management practices to clean storm water and assure that silt and pollutants are not allowed to leave the site during and after construction. These City requirements will assure that impacts associated with hydrology will be less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community? (Aerial photo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (General Plan Land Use Element)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Banning Municipal Code)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. a)-c) The proposed project consists of a church school to be located adjacent to the existing church. The school requires the approval of an amendment to the existing CUP. However, the church has operated for a number of years at this location, and is located in a quiet neighborhood. Schools, parks and churches are compatible with residential development, insofar as they provide services to the residents around them. Although the school will generate a higher level of noise than currently occurs at the site, due to play activities during school recess, the activities are not incompatible with the surrounding development.

The project will be required to pay the fees associated with the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, in compliance with that plan.

No impacts associated with land use are expected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. a) & b) The project site is partially developed, and is located in a residential neighborhood. The site is not appropriate for mineral extraction. No impact is expected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. NOISE Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of noise levels in excess of standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established in the local general plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or noise ordinance, or applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards of other agencies? (General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan EIR, p. III-163 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of excessive groundborne vibration or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groundborne noise levels? (General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR, p. III-163 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambient noise levels in the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicinity above levels existing without</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the project? (General Plan EIR, p. III-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase in ambient noise levels in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project vicinity above levels existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without the project? (General Plan EIR,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. III-163 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land use plan or, where such a plan has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not been adopted, within two miles of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public airport or public use airport,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would the project expose people residing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or working in the project area to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excessive noise levels? (General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land use map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a private airstrip, would the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expose people residing or working in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(General Plan land use map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project is located in a relatively quiet area of the City. Mountain Avenue will carry more traffic as development occurs to the west and north, but traffic levels are not expected to significantly increase. The school will be located behind the existing church, which will act as a buffer to road noise. Therefore, the school is not expected to be significantly impacted by surrounding traffic noise.

The school will generate noise levels in excess of the noise levels currently experienced in the area. These noise levels will be associated with children at play. These activities
will occur during the daytime hours, and will be temporary and periodic. Such noise levels are not expected to be significant. The athletic field to the west of the school is not proposed to be lighting, and therefore would not be used during the quieter evening hours.

The site will generate noise during the construction of the school. Noise levels associated with construction equipment can range to 100 dBA CNEP for short periods. However, construction at the site will be limited to the hours prescribed by the Municipal. Also, the adjacent residential development to the south, if constructed at the time the school is under construction, will include block walls along the back yards, which will reduce the noise levels to less than significant levels.

The proposed project site is not located in proximity to the Banning Airport.

Overall impacts are expected to be less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (General Plan, application materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (General Plan, application materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (General Plan, application materials)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XII. a)-c) The proposed school will accept students of residents of the community, rather than inducing growth in the community. The site is currently occupied by a church, and will not displace any people or housing units. No impacts are expected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire protection? (General Plan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police protection? (General Plan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools? (General Plan EIR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks? (General Plan; Recreation and Parks Master Plan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other public facilities? (General Plan)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. a) The proposed project will marginally increase the need for fire and police services, insofar as the school will likely occasionally require these services. The need, however, is expected to be very small when compared to other land uses in the community. The proposed project will add to the inventory of available school facilities in the area. The site includes an athletic field, and the project is not expected to have any impact on parks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIV. RECREATION --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Application materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Application materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIV. a) & b) As previously stated, the proposed project includes an athletic field, and will not impact the City’s parks and recreation facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections (General Plan EIR p. III-20 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (General Plan EIR p. III-20 ff.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (No air traffic involved in project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Application materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Application materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Application materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Project description)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XV. a)-g) A traffic impact analysis was prepared for the proposed project. The analysis found that the proposed project will generate approximately 620 trips per day, 198 of which will occur in the morning peak hour, and 43 of which will occur during the evening peak hour. The study included the analysis of impacts of the proposed project on surrounding streets and intersections. The study found that the surrounding intersections are all

---

operating at level of service B or better. With the addition of the proposed project, as well as ambient growth in the area, area intersections will continue to operate at level of service B or better in the evening peak hour, and level of service C or better during the morning peak hour. The City’s General Plan requires that level of service C be maintained on City streets. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the area’s roadways.

The proposed project will have a loop access through the site. Circulation will occur through one driveway, which will be reviewed by the City Engineer to assure safe access to Mountain Avenue. The project will be required to conform to the Zoning Ordinance standards for parking. The Fire Department will review the plans for the site to assure adequate emergency access.

Overall impacts are expected to be less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Water Management Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Water Management Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (General Plan, Dept. of Public Works)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. a)-g) Utilities are available at the project site. Electric, telephone and other utilities and services have facilities which will collect connection and usage fees to balance the cost of
providing services. The City’s solid waste franchisee will continue to implement the requirements of AB 939, requiring the reduction of the solid waste stream. The construction of the proposed project is expected to have no impacts on utility providers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVII. a) The project site is turfed and developed, and will not impact biological resources. Similarly previous development of the site, and the area’s lack of significance for cultural resources reduce the potential impacts associated with the project.

XVII. b) The proposed addition of a school in the community adds to the services of a full-service City, as anticipated in the General Plan. The project will not impact long or short term goals of the General Plan.

XVII. c) The proposed project will have no cumulative impacts.

XVII. d) The proposed project will not have significant impacts on human beings. Noise and air quality impacts are identified as being less than significant.
XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

General Plan EIR.

b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

Not applicable.

c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Not applicable.
ATTACHMENT 4
Public Hearing Notice
Record Gazette
218 N. Murray St.

Proof of Publication
(2015.5 C.C.P.)

147897 PHN MTN. AVE. CHURCH

State of California )
County of Riverside ) ss.

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer and publisher of Record Gazette, a newspaper published in the English language in the City of Banning, County of Riverside, and adjudicated a newspaper of general circulation as defined by the laws of the state of California by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, under the date October 14, 1986, Case No. 54737. That the notice, of which the annexed is a copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

September 22, 2017

Executed on: 09/22/2017
At Banning, CA

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT 17-8004 AND DESIGN REVIEW 17-7003 TO CONSIDER A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT TO EXPAND AN EXISTING SCHOOL AND DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF TWO MODULAR BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS TO ACCOMMODATE ADDITIONAL EXPANSION FOR THE EXISTING MOUNTAIN AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH PROPERTY (APN 555-425-015) LOCATED AT 1325 MOUNTAIN AVENUE WITHIN THE LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of a public hearing before the City of Banning Planning Commission to be held on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 99 East Ramsey Street, Banning, California, to consider a Notice of Exemption, Conditional Use Permit Amendment 17-8004 and Design Review 17-7003 application for the installation of modular buildings to accommodate a school expansion for the existing Mountain Avenue Baptist Church property located at 1325 Mountain Avenue (APN 555-425-015) within the Low Density Residential (LDR) zoning district pursuant to Chapter 17.52 (Conditional Use Permit) and Chapter 17.56 (Design Review) of the City of Banning Municipal Code.
All parties interested in speaking either in support of or in opposition of this item are invited to attend said hearing, or to send their written comments to the Community Development Department, City of Banning at P.O. Box 898, Banning, California, 92220. If you challenge any decision regarding the above proposal in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised in written correspondence delivered to the City Clerk at, or prior to, the time the Planning Commission makes its decision on the proposal; or, that you or someone else raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the hearing body at, or prior to, the hearing (California Government Code, Section 65509).
BY ORDER OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR OF THE CITY OF BANNING, CALIFORNIA
Patty Nevison
Community Development Director
Dated: September 19, 2017
Published: September 22, 2017
Published in
The Record Gazette
No. 147897
09222017