

## **MONTEREY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

*William Peters, Chairman*

*Marc del Piero*

*Michal Moore*

*Dusan Petrovic*

*Barbara Shipnuck*

## **MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

*David Hendick, Chairman*

*S. Gary Varga, 1st Vice Chairman*

*Calvin Reaves, 2nd Vice Chairman*

*Peter Cailotto*

*Louis Calcagno*

*Tom Glau*

*Manuel Jimenez*

*Thomas Mill*

*Lynn Riddle*

## **TORO AREA PLAN CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

*Joseph Sullivan, Chairman*

*Karen Watkins, Vice Chairwoman*

*Larry Daniels*

*Harriet Gordon*

*Charlotte Martin*

*Richard Rhodes*

*Bruce Winge*

## **MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

*Robert Slimmon, Jr., Director of Planning*

*Raymond W. Lamb, Assistant Director of Planning*

### **PROJECT STAFF:**

*Lynne Kastel Hsia, Project Planner*

*David Warner, Planner*

*Bruce Bowman, Planner*

*Jeff Main, Editing Planner (1992)  
(1992)*

*Steve Early, Graphics Supervisor*

*Steven Sigala, Project Graphics*

*Carmelia Moon, Manuscript*

*Katherine Bullis, Manuscript*

*Carol Allen, Editing Manuscript*

*Approved by the Planning Commission on September 28, 1983.*

*Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 13, 1983.*

*Amended by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors May 22, 1990.*

# **UPDATE INDEX**

## **TORO AREA PLAN - AMENDMENTS AS ADOPTED BY THE MONTEREY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE FOLLOWING DATE(S):**

1. **July 31, 1984** - ADD POLICY 40.2.4 (T) - County Scenic Routes - Open Space Zoning.
2. **July 31, 1984** - ADD POLICY 40.2.5 (T) - Newly created parcels must be located outside viewshed.
3. **July 31, 1984** - ADD POLICY 40.2.6 (T) - Density transfers to be allowed from viewshed.
4. **July 31, 1984** - ADD POLICY 40.2.7 (T) - Type of Development Permits in the Critical Viewshed.
5. **July 31, 1984** - DEVELOP MAPS - Show Critical Viewshed beyond 100' roadway setback. (See Figure 10a, 10a.1-10a.7)
6. **October 7, 1986** - MAP CHANGE - APN 161-021-22 Change Land use designation from Residential to Commercial. (See Figure 10b)
7. **May 19, 1987** - MAP CHANGE - APN 161-011-04; 05 Change Land use designation from low density Residential to Commercial. (See Figure 10c)
8. **August 30, 1988** - MAP CHANGE - APN 416-451-36; 37 Change land use designation from Public/Quasi Public to Resource Conservation. (See Figure 10d)
9. **May 22, 1990** - AMEND POLICY 40.2.4 (T) - Amend policy regarding 100 foot setback from scenic routes and visually sensitive areas.
10. **December 3, 1991** - ADD POLICY 30.1.1.1 (T) ADD TEXT - Land Use Designation add "Special Treatment" - MAP CHANGES - APN 139-021-03; 04 - Property subject to "Special Treatment" in stream sand extraction operation.
11. **August 24, 1993** - MAP CHANGE - (APN 416-321-11; 13; 14; 15; 16) from "Public/Quasi-Public" to Rural Density Residential, 5 Acre+/Unit, Board Resolution 93-341.
12. **December 14, 1993** - AMEND LAND USE PLAN MAP AND TEXT - (PC 92-170 APNs 161-011-09, 19, 30, 39, 57, 58, 59, 78, 09, 37, 61, and 64 thru 71) - Amend the land use plan map and text of the Toro Area Plan to delete references to the Toro Vista Specific Plan.
13. **January 9, 1996** - ADD POLICY 26.1.4.3 - Regarding sewer and water requirements for proposed subdivisions.
14. **January 6, 1998** - MAP CHANGE - (APN 139-091-013-000) - Change land use designation on a 270 Acre parcel from "Farmlands, 40 Acre Minimum" to "Low Density Residential, 5 Acre/Unit."

# **TORO AREA PLAN PHILOSOPHY**

*This Toro Area Plan was prepared under the guidance of the Toro Area Plan Citizens Advisory Committee appointed by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors on July 6, 1982. The philosophy of the Toro Area Plan is derived from the values and desires of the people living within its boundaries and their concern for the areas surrounding them and the County as a whole.*

*A quote from Steve Crouch in his book, Steinbeck County, is appropriate:*

*"If you hold out your hand, cup it lightly, and then tilt it so it slants toward you, it will resemble nothing so much as the great wrinkled earthen bowl that the Spaniards called the 'Corral de Tierra' and John Steinbeck called the 'pastures of heaven'."\**

*People live in the Toro area for reasons of climate, rural atmosphere, good schools, and open space scenic qualities. Growth tends to diminish the qualities which attracted people to the area originally. With growth comes traffic congestion, noise, less "elbow room," and more restrictions.*

*This Toro Area Plan seeks to reconcile the demand for growth with the need to preserve the essentially rural quality of life.*

*Where there is an established trend toward higher densities, the plan addresses the needs of people living in closer concentrations. Where relatively large undeveloped areas still predominate, the plan does not encourage higher density growth.*

*Important visual elements which give the Toro area its identity should be preserved as a first planning priority. Native trees, ridgelines, frontal slopes, and scenic road corridors are especially critical. Additionally, road improvements should enhance scenic corridors and promote pedestrian circulation and safety.*

---

*\*Used by permission of Mrs. Ethlyn Crouch*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**TORO AREA PLAN PHILOSOPHY ..... i**

**INTRODUCTION.....4**

## **PART I: INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS**

**CHAPTER I: NATURAL RESOURCES.....6**

*Geography and Climate.....7*

*Soils and Slope.....9*

*Farmlands.....9*

*Water Resources.....9*

*Vegetation and Wildlife.....12*

*Environmentally Sensitive Areas.....12*

**CHAPTER II: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS.....14**

*Seismic and Other Geologic Hazards.....15*

*Flood Hazards.....18*

*Fire Hazards.....18*

*Miscellaneous Hazards.....18*

*Emergency Preparedness.....21*

*Air Quality.....21*

*Water Quality.....21*

*Noise Hazards.....22*

*Lighting Intrusions.....22*

**CHAPTER III: HUMAN RESOURCES.....24**

*Demographic Analysis.....25*

*Socioeconomic Data.....28*

**CHAPTER IV: AREA DEVELOPMENT.....30**

*Existing Land Use.....31*

*Transportation.....33*

*Public Services and Facilities.....36*

*Housing.....38*





# ***INTRODUCTION***

With the explosive growth that has taken place in Toro over the past two decades and with continuing development pressures, a detailed, up-to-date area plan for Toro is an essential tool for guiding land use decisions. The Toro Inventory and Analysis is a comprehensive study of Toro's natural resources, environmental constraints, demography and social setting, development patterns, and land suitability. The area plan was developed utilizing this detailed information; it establishes a framework for development and conservation for the next twenty years.

Monterey County's General Plan\* represents long-range goals, objectives, and policies for the County. The Toro Area Plan, as one of eight area plans of Monterey County, will be more definitive than the General Plan because of its size and geographic focus. Development opportunities and constraints and the natural resources of the Toro Planning Area\*\* are unlike those in other parts of the County, so the policies for Toro are more precisely adapted to the characteristics of this area than are the more general policies of the General Plan. The area plans, once they are adopted, will amend the General Plan but must be consistent with it and must address all subjects required by state law.

Additionally, the Toro Area Plan and the other seven area plans will supersede all previous general plans. Specifically, the Toro Area Plan will replace the Toro Area Master Plan which was originally adopted in 1960 and was last reprinted in 1980. The total area encompassed by the new Toro Area Plan is somewhat larger than the area addressed by the old Toro Area Master Plan.

When adopted, the Toro Area Plan must be implemented so that it will apply in an explicit manner to each parcel of property and so that it will address every development proposal made in the County. Regulations and programs will be used to properly implement each plan once it is adopted. These include zoning regulations, subdivision regulations, capital improvements programming, and project review under the California Environmental Quality Act. Each of these has its own focus and purpose and all of these must be in accord with the goals, objectives, and policies adopted in the General Plan.

---

\*"Monterey County General Plan" or "General Plan" refers to any part of the body of information which includes county wide policies, the land use plan, and/or the eight area plans.

\*\*Throughout this report, the geographical area defined as the "Toro Planning Area" (Figure 1) shall be referred to as "Toro" or "the Planning Area."

***PART I: INVENTORY & ANALYSIS***

## ***CHAPTER I: NATURAL RESOURCES***

In preparing an area plan for Toro, it is essential to have an understanding of the opportunities and limitations of the area's physical features and natural resources. Natural characteristics shape the setting in which man's physical development takes place. Toro's unique combination of natural resources provides considerable opportunities for a variety of land uses.

The natural resources discussed in this plan can be characterized either as those which are unaffected by man or as those which may be depleted or destroyed through improper management. Geography, climate, and geology, for example, are essentially unchanged by man's activities. The remaining categories of this section--soils, water, vegetation, wildlife, environmentally sensitive areas, and archaeological resources--may be significantly altered or even destroyed through misuse.

# ***NATURAL RESOURCES***

## ***GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE***

As illustrated by Figure 1, Toro is located in the north-central area of Monterey County. It lies directly south of the City of Salinas and east of the Monterey Peninsula. Fort Ord property abuts Toro on the northwest; a minor ridgeline defines the south boundary; and the Salinas River forms the northeast boundary. About 74 square miles is included in Toro, most of which is dominated by the mountains and rolling hills of the Sierra de Salinas Range. Mt. Toro, with an elevation of 3,560 feet, is the highest peak in this minor range and is located on the southern boundary of Toro.

It is primarily along the Salinas River and El Toro Creek that the relatively flat areas are found. The terrain of Toro varies greatly and is composed primarily of rolling hills and valleys. Site elevations range from 40 feet above sea level to 3,560 feet. Topography in the area includes steep ravines with slopes exceeding 75%, a large amount of hillsides with slopes exceeding 30%, canyon floors and ridgelines with moderate slopes, and the flat floodplains along the Salinas River.

The climate of Toro is characterized by mild winter rainy seasons and cool dry summers. Due in part to its inland location, lower elevations of Toro experience daytime temperatures which are generally six to ten degrees warmer than those in Monterey. Prevailing winds from the northwest and the buffer created by the land mass of Fort Ord keep Toro relatively free of coastal fog.

## ***SOILS AND SLOPE***

A wide variety of soils are present in Toro. The characteristics of the soils and the slope of the land are significant determinants of the appropriate land uses for a specific area. Some of the soils, due to their composition, drainage, and gentle slope, are suitable for either agricultural use or urban use. Such soils are found along River Road, Highway 68, and in some of the Corral de Tierra/San Benancio area. Other soils pose severe limitations to the agricultural or urban use of the land. Rugged areas along Laureles Grade Road, in the south and central portions of the planning area, and on the east slopes of the Sierras de Salinas have limiting types of soils.

*Figure 1*  
*TORO PLANNING AREA*  
*LOCATION MAP*

Slope is a major factor in determining soil suitability. The degree of slope influences soil stability, erosion, and runoff. Generally, areas with severe slopes are poorly suited for development or cultivation. Figure 2 illustrates the patterns of slope in Toro. All areas with slopes greater than 30 percent tend to have high soil constraints due to high erosion and runoff potential. In most cases, slopes greater than 30 percent are appropriate only for open space, recreation, watershed, or grazing purposes. However, soils have a variety of properties and site conditions besides slope (such as water capacity, depth to and hardness of bedrock, geologic origin and age, soil structure, and susceptibility to flooding). Therefore, specific sites under 30 percent may prove to be inappropriate for development or, conversely, sites on slopes over 30 percent may be feasible with special planning and design.

## ***FARMLANDS***

The USDA Soil Conservation Service has developed and adopted a system for categorizing important farmlands for California and the rest of the nation. The system distinguishes four categories of farmlands, each with specific criteria. The categories are "prime farmlands," "farmlands of statewide importance," "unique farmlands," and "farmlands of local importance." Figure 3 shows where in Toro the important farmlands are located.

As shown in Figure 3, all farmlands in Toro qualifying as prime farmlands and farmlands of statewide importance are located along River Road and the Salinas River. These lands are among the County's most productive. Toro also contains farmlands of local importance but has no farmland in the "unique" category.

## ***WATER RESOURCES***

Water resources of Toro are divided between two watersheds. One is within the El Toro Basin and encompasses 32 square miles of the 74 square miles of the planning area. The other is within a portion of the large Salinas River Basin.

Surface water is a very limited resource in Toro. The Salinas River is the only river or stream in Toro that flows year-round. El Toro Creek flows only seasonally. There are no sizable reservoirs in Toro. The flow of the Salinas River is controlled, however, by the monitored release of water from the San Antonio and Nacimiento Reservoirs to the south. A large portion of the planning area lies within Zones 2 and 2a which utilize water from the reservoirs.

Groundwater resources within Toro vary greatly from one area to another. There are differences in water quality, storage capacity of the aquifers, and hydraulic properties. These differences arise primarily from the variations in underlying geologic formations. Local testing will be required to determine the quality and quantity of groundwater at specific sites.

*Figure 2*  
*SLOPE*

*Figure 3*  
*IMPORTANT FARMLANDS*

Overall, water supply in the El Toro Basin is quite adequate for anticipated levels of growth according to a report completed in 1981 by Anderson-Nichols & Co., Inc. for the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. There is also an abundant supply in the Salinas River Basin. In many areas, however, water quality or supply may be problematic. Localized water quality and supply problems are a possibility and proper engineering will be necessary in most areas.

## ***VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE***

There are four general vegetation communities present in Toro: grasslands, chaparral, woodlands, and riparian. Grasslands and woodlands predominate. Dry soils such as those on steep or south-facing slopes, on ridgetops, or in dry hot valleys support grassland vegetation, as do soils in areas which have been heavily grazed.

Scattered among the slopes of Toro are chaparral plant communities of hard woody evergreen shrubs. The grasslands and chaparral both present a high fire risk, particularly on the steeper slopes and during the dry season. The woodlands of Toro are dominated by evergreen oak communities, are generally found on the north and east facing slopes, and in the valleys. Riparian vegetation is limited in Toro and is found adjacent to the Salinas River and El Toro Creek.

The vegetation in Toro is highly valued for its scenic qualities, recreational opportunities, and its role in watershed and soil management. Just as important, however, is its role of providing habitat for wildlife. A diversity of birds and animals find food, shelter, and cover in Toro's various vegetation communities.

## ***ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS***

The following plant species have been identified as environmentally sensitive habitats. The rare and endangered Hutchinson's delphinium (*Delphinium hutchinsonae*), Carmel Valley bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus palmeri*, *involucratus*) and Monterey manzanita (*Arctostaphylos montereyensis*) have been identified in Toro. The rare but not endangered plant, the Monterey Ceanothus (*Ceanothus rigidus*), is also located in Toro. There are no known rare or endangered wildlife in Toro.

The California Natural Areas Coordinating Council has designated Toro Regional Park as an area of unique research, education, and recreation value because of its oak woodlands, chaparral communities, and relatively undisturbed site.

Archaeological resources are also sensitive to man's activities but information is scarce on where these resources are located. Using available information and applying the various topographic characteristics most often associated with such sites, the County has delineated archaeological sensitivity zones. Three zones were established: low, moderate, and high which indicate the

probability of an archaeologically sensitive site being present. Within Toro, there is one section of high archaeological sensitivity located southeast of Highway 68 in the Corral de Tierra area. The area located north of River Road is in the low sensitivity zone and the remainder of Toro has been designated as having a moderate chance of containing areas of archaeological importance.

## ***CHAPTER II: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS***

The environmental constraints analysis identifies conditions and hazards that threaten people and property. The analysis identifies hazard prone or sensitive areas that may or may not be occupied by people. The term "constraints" implies that because of possible negative effects of development in specific hazardous areas, land uses must be critically analyzed and, where necessary, restricted. Environmental constraints include seismic, geologic, fire, flood, noise, and miscellaneous hazards as well as air and water quality.

# ***ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS***

## ***SEISMIC AND OTHER GEOLOGIC HAZARDS***

Although there are no active faults within Toro, seismic activity along any of the region's active faults would be felt in Toro as well as in other portions of the County. Active faults in this region include the San Andreas Fault, those in the Monterey Bay Fault Zone, and those in the Palo Colorado-San Gregorio Fault Zone. The San Andreas located fifteen miles to the east has shown the most recent activity; the major hazards in Toro would be from ground shaking and the secondary effects of liquefaction or landsliding.

There are fifteen potentially active faults in the County as identified in the Monterey County General Plan. As indicated by Figure 4, five are in or near Toro: King City, Harper, and Chupines Faults and the Berwick Canyon and Navy Faults just outside of the planning area.

The locations of these faults are approximate and have been mapped according to available geologic and seismic information and technical interpretation of this information. The basic data are quite general and, therefore, subject to differing interpretations. These faults are still considered potentially active by the California Division of Mines and Geology, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the County General Plan. The greatest seismic hazards, therefore, would be the same as from the active faults--ground shaking, liquefaction, and slope failure--rather than ground rupture on specific sites.

Figure 5 indicates six zones of relative susceptibility to landslide and erosion hazards. The fault zones are again shown on this map. The boundaries for the landslide zones are very general, based upon a previous history of landsliding, underlying geology, steepness of slopes, and locations of faulted or weakened rock materials. Because the mapping is generalized, each zone includes both areas of more or less stable ground than the classification indicates.

Figure 5 shows that susceptibility to landslide and erosion is very high in Corral de Tierra, in the hills southeast of Highway 68, and adjacent to River Road. Flatter areas along Highway 68 and near the Salinas River have a very low susceptibility to landslide and erosion.

Some of the factors which have precipitated landslides in the Corral de Tierra area are the nature of the bedrocks (particularly shales), the degree of slope, concentrated periods of rainfall, and soil characteristics. Development may increase the potential for landslides if improperly engineered or poorly located. Generally, structures should not be located on previous slide areas since these areas remain unstable.

FIGURE 4  
SEISMIC HAZARDS

FIGURE 5  
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

## ***FLOOD HAZARDS***

The major cause of flooding in Monterey County is surface runoff caused when storms of high intensity and/or long duration exceed the soil's ability to absorb water. The very geologic formations which make Toro an attractive place to live also add to the flood dangers. Ridges and steep slopes compound the runoff problems. The floodplain of the Salinas River is broad and includes large acreages on Toro's northeast side. In addition, portions of the lowland area along the El Toro Creek and the tributaries of the Salinas River are in the 100-year floodplain as indicated by Figure 6.

## ***FIRE HAZARDS***

Wildland fires are a major hazard in many areas of California. The Salinas Rural Fire District, which serves Toro, responds to almost twice as many wildland fires than either structural or vehicular fires. As the population of Toro grows and more structures are built, the risk of fire escalates. The Salinas Rural Fire District has identified several access roads in Toro which are considered inadequate for fire fighting equipment. Each of these routes serves as the only access to homes nestled in wooded valleys and just below ridge bluffs.

Based on vegetation, climatic conditions, water availability, and topography, the California Department of Forestry has assigned levels of fire hazard ratings to the entire County. In Toro, nearly all areas have been rated as having moderate to very high fire hazard (Figure 7). Much of the more remote, rugged areas are considered as having a very high fire hazard. A few slopes east of the peak of Mt. Toro have an very high fire hazard. The area along River Road has a moderate fire hazard. Lands adjacent to Highway 68 have a moderate to high fire hazard, except in Toro Regional Park which has a very high fire hazard. Much of Corral de Tierra and San Benancio as well as numerous areas in the lower elevations or in relatively flat areas also have a high fire hazard rating.

## ***MISCELLANEOUS HAZARDS***

Miscellaneous hazards include pesticides, fertilizers, petroleum, natural gas, and radioactive, flammable, or explosive materials, most of which are not a problem in Toro. Agricultural chemicals are the largest chemical hazard in Monterey County. Pesticides are used by farmers to combat weeds, insects, rodents, and fungi. Air and water borne pesticides can present a health hazard to developments near agricultural areas, such as the area along River Road. There are no producers or storage areas of hazardous chemicals in Toro.

Figure 6  
FLOOD PRONE AREAS

Figure 7  
FIRE HAZARDS

## ***EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS***

Safety planning is concerned with the prevention of hazards and the ability to deal with emergencies should they arise. While prevention is the most cost-effective and least stressful way to save lives and protect property, the County must also be prepared if disaster should strike. The County must anticipate possible needs and be able to respond to all emergencies to the fullest extent of its resources.

The General Plan, on pages 46 and 47, explains the types of affirmative actions needed to respond to widespread emergencies. Further information on these actions can be obtained from the Monterey County Emergency Plan. Through Policy 19.1.4 the General Plan provides for some amendments to the Emergency Plan which would allow greater detail and therefore greater preparedness in responding to emergencies. The mandates in that policy include identification of evacuation routes, provisions for emergency shelter, transportation, clothing, food, and medical aid and identifying the roles and relationships of all governmental, quasi-governmental, and private service agencies within the community. Figure 8 of the General Plan indicates emergency evacuation routes in Monterey County.

## ***AIR QUALITY***

Sources of pollution in Toro are few. Auto exhaust and the use of chemicals in the agricultural parts of Toro present the greatest threats to air quality. Sea breezes act to flush the air basins throughout most of the year. This combination of air flow and the generally rural character of Toro with few sources of pollution has maintained relatively good air quality in Toro.

## ***WATER QUALITY***

As stated in the section describing Toro's water resources, the planning area includes all of the El Toro Basin and a portion of the Salinas Valley Basin. Surface water quality is an issue only for the Salinas River in this area.

During dry months of summer and fall, the flow of the Salinas River is minimal. With a reduced flow, pollutants remain concentrated and water quality deteriorates. Pollutants from agricultural lands and from sewage treatment facilities have severely degraded the Salinas River, particularly in the segment from Highway 68 northward. This portion of the Salinas River has been listed by the state as one of the five dirtiest in California.

Groundwater quality in the El Toro Basin, which includes only a part of the Toro area, has been generally rated fair to poor. Naturally occurring totally dissolved solids, sulfates, chlorides, metals, and other substances affect the quality of water drawn from most of the area's wells. If not properly

treated, these substances may pose a health threat. Groundwater quality in the Toro portion of the Salinas Valley Basin is generally good.

A recent report by the County Environmental Health Division estimated the maximum buildout that could occur in the El Toro Basin without exceeding the State Department of Health standard for nitrates. The standard used was a nitrate loading (NO<sub>3</sub>-N) of 6.0 mg/l (six milligrams per liter). The maximum development based on this water quality constraint is 3,104 residential units. Table 1 indicates that, with 1,044 existing units, 2,060 new units could be accommodated if only this constraint was considered. The report was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 22, 1983.

## ***NOISE HAZARDS***

Within Toro the major source of noise is from traffic on the streets and highways. Construction activity periodically results in levels of noise loud enough to cause concern. Portions of Toro experience discomfort from fly-over aircraft from the Monterey Peninsula Airport and military flights from Fritzsche Field. Agricultural and military equipment using River Road may also create noise.

The western portion of Toro experiences noise intrusion from sport racing at the Laguna Seca County Recreation Area. During the summer season which extends from April through October, Laguna Seca is booked almost every weekend with professional and club auto racing, motor cross, motorcycle, and music activities. There are five national auto races yearly.

## ***LIGHTING INTRUSIONS***

In a rural area such as Toro, an important quality of life is the quality of darkness. In other words the absence of street lighting preserves the night sky. The increasing number of subdivisions and other projects with overhead lighting is a major intrusion upon darkness quality. Therefore, when subdivision conditions are reviewed, strict controls over street lighting and other types of outdoor lighting must be imposed.

TABLE 1

POTENTIAL NEW UNITS ALLOWED BY WATER  
QUALITY CONSTRAINT

## ***CHAPTER III: HUMAN RESOURCES***

The human resources component encompasses the demographic and socioeconomic analyses of Toro. The size, characteristics, distribution, and structure of Toro's population, growth trends, and population projections are explored in the demographic section. The social and economic characteristics of the population--level of education, personal income, number of low income households, employment--as well as Toro's economic base are analyzed in the socioeconomic section. The size and composition of the current and projected population and its economic resources form the foundation for major planning decisions and are essential in forecasting demand for housing, jobs, land, water, recreation facilities, and transportation systems.

# *HUMAN RESOURCES*

## *DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS*

The population of Toro has increased dramatically since 1960 when the population was only 2,001. By 1970 the population had grown to 3,858, an increase of 92.8% in ten years. In 1980 the number of Toro residents was 6,423, a ten-year increase of 66.5% (Table 2). During these same decades, the population growth of the County as a whole was much slower.

---

**TABLE 2**

***Population Change, 1960 - 1980***

<i>Location</i>	<i>1960 Population</i>	<i>1970 Population</i>	<i>% Change 1960-1970</i>	<i>1980 Population</i>	<i>% Change 1970-1980</i>
Toro Planning Area	2,001	3,858	92.8%	6,423	66.5%
Monterey County	198,351	247,450	24.8%	290,444	17.4%

Sources: 1960, 1970, and 1980 U.S. Census of Population

---

### ***Population Density***

Population density represents the average number of persons per square mile in a given area. Table 3 indicates that in Toro the population density has increased significantly, reflecting a large increase in population. In 1960, the population density in Toro was 27 persons per square mile, less than half the density for Monterey County that year. By 1980, the density in Toro had risen to 87 person per square mile, equal to the County's density. The population density within Toro is not uniform. Most of the present population is concentrated in subdivisions along the major roads, particularly along Highway 68. The more mountainous and remote areas of Toro are very sparsely populated. New residents are anticipated to reside in new subdivisions in areas similar to those already developed.

---

**TABLE 3**

***Population Density***

<i>Location</i>	<i>1960 Density</i>	<i>1970 Density</i>	<i>1980 Density</i>
Toro Planning Area	27/square mile	52/square mile	87/square mile
Monterey County	60/square mile	74/square mile	87/square mile

Sources: 1960, 1970, and 1980 U.S. Census of Population

---

***Population Characteristics***

Table 4 shows that Toro's racial composition is unlike that of most of the rest of Monterey County. Only 12% of Toro residents were classified as non-white in the 1980 U. S. Census versus 40.3% countywide.

Of the small percentage of Toro residents who were listed in racial categories other than "White," 131 (2.0%) were "Asian and Pacific Islander," 40 (0.6%) were "Black," 31 (0.5%) were "American Indian," and 434 (6.8%) were "Spanish Origin." The numbers claiming "Other" were 2.1%. The percentages for all of these minority categories are much lower for Toro than for Monterey County.

---

INSERT TABLE 4



The age distribution in Toro is also a typical of the County as a whole in a number of ways. First of all, the median age of Toro residents is 33.3 years versus 27.6 years for County residents, according to the 1980 U. S. Census. The median age has risen in Toro since 1976 (31 years at that time) but declined slightly for the County. The major difference in the age structure is that there are proportionately fewer young adults and more established families in Toro than there are countywide. The Census indicates that 19% of the Toro population is in the 20-34 age bracket, contrasted with 30% countywide; the proportions are exactly reversed for the 35-54 age group. Percentages of Toro residents under 19 and over 55 closely parallel the County averages.

### ***Population Forecast***

Population projections developed in 1960 forecasted that 10,000 people would live in Toro by the year 1980. Recent forecasts (1980) for the area estimate that a population of 10,000 residents is not likely to be reached until the year 2000. The population forecast made by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) estimates a year 2000 population of 10,200. This figure indicates that a much lower average annual growth rate is anticipated for the twenty-year period from 1980 to 2000 than was experienced between 1960 and 1980. In the twenty years preceding 1980 the average annual growth rate for Toro was 6.01%. If a population of 10,200 is attained by the year 2000, as projected by AMBAG, the average annual growth rate will have been only 2.34% between 1980 and 2000.

### ***SOCIOECONOMIC DATA***

The 1980 U. S. Census indicates that the educational level in the County and in Toro is increasing. The percentage of high school graduates was 81% in 1970 and 89% in 1980, in Toro. In Monterey County the percentage of high school graduates was 63% in 1970 and 71% in 1980. As of college graduates, Toro had 33% and 21% in 1980 and 1970, respectively; the County had 16% and 15% in the same period.

The median household income, as reported by the 1980 Census, was \$32,194 in Toro versus \$17,661 countywide. Median household income is, therefore, 182% higher than the County as a whole. Median income is \$34,202 for families and \$10,452 for unrelated individuals. Out of 2,049 households in Toro, 269 or 13% were in the category considered low income; this is defined as 0-80% of the County median household income.

Most income is earned outside Toro in the major employment centers of Salinas and the Monterey Peninsula. Few employment opportunities exist within Toro. Of the local jobs which presently exist, most are located adjacent to Highway 68 at the Toro Park Commercial Center, a number of highway-related businesses, fire and police facilities, and a few professional offices. In the agricultural areas along River Road, several workers are employed in farm-related positions. Additional employment is generated by local golf and tennis clubs, Toro Regional Park, schools, and residential support services. Most essential services are fulfilled outside of the planning area in Salinas or on the Monterey Peninsula.



## ***CHAPTER IV: AREA DEVELOPMENT***

The area development component of the Toro Area General Plan includes the subjects of land use, zoning, holding capacity, housing, transportation, and public services and facilities. These represent the major considerations in the spatial distribution of human activities and the facilities necessary to support them. Area development encompasses the environment built by man.

The existing land use analysis examines the pattern of existing development; that is, it examines the extent and location of land developed with various uses. Zoning is the mechanism that designates permitted uses and densities of all land in Toro. Current holding capacity analysis examines the availability of vacant land for various development uses and provides an estimation of total development potential under the existing General Plan. The housing analysis describes characteristics and trends in housing supply and conditions. The transportation section describes Toro's transportation network for the movement of people and goods. The adequacy of services and infrastructure is analyzed in public services and facilities.

# ***AREA DEVELOPMENT***

## ***EXISTING LAND USE***

Land use patterns are changing in Toro, primarily as grazing land is converted to residential development. Figure 8 represents existing land use patterns. The vast majority of Toro is currently undeveloped. Much of this land has been used for grazing cattle. Irrigated crops are grown along River Road and adjacent to the Salinas River.

Public and quasi-public land uses which include such uses as schools, churches, police and fire stations, and parks total almost 13% or 6,108 of Toro's 47,175 acres. Of this acreage, Toro Regional Park, located along State Highway 68, contains 4,970 acres and the Bureau of Land Management owns 1,094 additional acres in the southeast part of Toro.

Streets and highways cover a small part of Toro. State Highway 68, the major Monterey-Salinas route, and River Road are the two principal vehicular routes. Several other County roads and collector streets provide access through the major subdivisions and canyons, as discussed later in this report.

The amount of residential development has been increasing over the last few years. Approximately 2% of Toro has been subdivided for residential development. Though single family homes are scattered throughout the canyon areas, most large subdivisions are located along the northwest side of Highway 68 and along the southwest side of River Road. Most of the residential development consists of single family homes; however, several multiple-family residential units are located in developments adjacent to Highway 68 and Corral de Tierra Road.

Only 27 acres (0.06%) of the land in Toro is currently used for industrial purposes. These uses are primarily sewage treatment, utilities, and communication facilities.

Three small shopping areas and several isolated commercial uses along Highway 68, one commercial area on the north side of River Road, and a commercial use on Corral de Tierra comprise a total of 21 acres in Toro.

FIGURE 8  
EXISTING LAND USE

## ***TRANSPORTATION***

### ***State Highways***

Highway 68 is the only state highway located in Toro, and it generally follows Toro's northwestern boundary. Except for a short four-lane section from where the highway enters Toro to just south of the River Road intersection, Highway 68 is a two-lane highway. Proposed highway alignments for future freeway construction have been adopted for the entire route between Monterey (at Highway 1) and River Road. However, the State Transportation Improvement Plan only contains that portion from River Road to Torero Drive (including an interchange at Toro Park).

In 1981, annual average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on Highway 68 increased with closer proximity to Salinas. At Laureles Grade Road, the ADT was 14,400; at San Benancio Road it was 16,700; and at River Road it was 20,000. Peak hour volume varied from 1,600 at Laureles Grade Road to 1,900 at San Benancio, and 2,300 at River Road. According to Caltrans traffic counts, higher traffic volumes near Salinas indicate significant commuting by Toro residents to the Salinas area on Highway 68.

### ***County Roads***

Table 5 compares 1981 and 1980 ADTs for major roads in Toro.

---

INSERT TABLE 5

The major County roads in Toro are River Road, Laureles Grade, San Benancio, and Corral de Tierra. The first three roads have few impediments to traffic flow. Corral de Tierra, on the other hand, is substandard by today's road standards from Robley (Four Corners) to Corral del Cielo Road. The deficiencies are lack of sight distance, lack of accommodation for pedestrians, dangerous curves, and lack of lateral clearance (no shoulders). Designated level of service "E", the road is very heavily traveled and designed for slow speed.

### ***Scenic Highways***

The visual diversity of Toro and the surrounding area as seen from its scenic corridors has been widely recognized as a valuable resource of Monterey County. The rural character, rugged terrain, pastoral meadows and hillsides, and the intermixture of vegetation and landform beg for attention. Toro is laced with especially scenic areas. However, most critical in terms of general planning are the aesthetically valuable and visually sensitive areas which are viewed by the thousands of motorists who travel these scenic corridors daily. Because these vistas have already been degraded by ridgetop development, road cuts, and electric transmission lines, it is crucial that future protection be ensured.

Toro has two roads within the state scenic highways system. State Highway 68 is designated as a State Scenic Highway. Laureles Grade Road, a major corridor between Highway 68 and Carmel Valley Road, is an officially designated County Scenic Route. The Board of Supervisors has also designated Corral de Tierra, San Benancio, Corral del Cielo, and Underwood Roads as county scenic routes.

Monterey County pioneered the scenic highway concept in the State of California. Such designations recognize the need to blend roadways into the landscape and preserve the critical viewshed. The County has established development standards for land use on scenic routes, particularly in the critical viewshed. Controls are implemented through the use of zoning and design requirements. Such requirements include setbacks, use permits, scenic conservation permits, and plot plan and architectural review.

Figure 9 displays some of the most visually sensitive areas which will require responsible management if their character is to be retained. The map shows ridgelines, mountain faces, hillsides, open meadows, natural landmarks, and unusual vegetation which are visually prominent from various roadways. Marked areas in Figure 9 may be visible from long distances, for long durations of time, or from many viewing points. They may include particularly distinctive or prominent landforms or vegetation; or they may represent sensitive juxtapositions of line, color, shape, and texture in their composition.

FIGURE 9  
VISUAL SENSITIVITY AND SCENIC HIGHWAYS

Among the most visually sensitive features of the planning area are:

- o Toro Peak and surrounding ridgelines which can be seen throughout the Salinas Valley;
- o the "entrances" to Toro--the rising foothills above the River Road/Highway 68 intersection and the panoramic summit on Laureles Grade;
- o the wide scenic corridor of Highway 68 characterized by rolling hills dotted with oak trees, sycamores, and meadows of wildflowers;
- o The River Road corridor with serene cropland on the one side and the Sierra de Salinas foothills on the other;
- o The San Benancio/Corral de Tierra corridor, separated by ridgelines between the two sides of the "loop" and which reach a canyon ringed with hills, meadows, and pasture land;
- o the historic sand castle formation which also resembles Grecian columns; and finally,
- o the native oak groves on both sides of Corral de Tierra near Four Corners.

### ***Public Transit Services***

Toro is served by Monterey-Salinas Transit, a publicly-owned and operated transit system. Regularly scheduled bus service, which began in Toro in 1979, is provided between Salinas and Monterey along Highway 68. Bus stops are located along Highway 68 and Portola Drive. Other roads in Toro such as San Benancio, Corral de Tierra, and River Road receive no public transit service. Bus service is hourly, Monday through Saturday; on Sunday, buses run from Salinas to Toro Park only. Average weekday ridership, surveyed from May through September, 1982 is 227 eastbound and 297 westbound; average Saturday figures were half of weekday ridership.

## ***PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES***

### ***Fire Protection Service***

Fire protection services are provided by the Salinas Rural Fire Protection District for most of Toro. Areas south of Calera Canyon and Underwood Roads and the southeastern corner of the Planning Area are not in the District. The California Department of Forestry provides fire protection to these areas.

The Salinas Rural Fire Protection District operates one fire station in the Toro area. Additionally, a volunteer station is located on Laureles Grade.

### ***Police Protection Agencies***

The Sheriff's Office of Monterey County is the primary provider of police services to the unincorporated areas of the County, including Toro. The Toro area is entirely within Sheriff's patrol Beat 4 and is serviced from the Department's Salinas station. Beat 4 is patrolled by a one-man unit during daytime hours and a double unit during hours of darkness.

The California Highway Patrol has jurisdiction and law enforcement powers on all County roads, freeways, and state highways. Toro is served by the Salinas office of the Highway Patrol located on Portola Drive. The CHP assigns one vehicle to patrol Highway 68 three times daily. The patrol is on-call for the back road areas when an emergency arises.

The Monterey County Parks Department rangers are authorized to enforce park ordinances, protect park property, and maintain the peace within the park. They have jurisdiction in Toro Regional Park and have a cooperative agreement with the Sheriff's Office for penal code violations and arrests with the park.

### ***Education Facilities***

The eastern half of Toro is located in the Spreckels Union Elementary School District. The western half is in the Washington Union Elementary School District. Enrollment in grades kindergarten through 8th grade has shown a small decline over the last three years (1978, 1979 and 1980) for both districts. All of Toro is located in the Salinas Union High School District.

According to the 1980 U. S. Census, 259 Toro residents were enrolled in private schools; this is 11% of Toro residents enrolled in school.

### ***Park and Recreation Facilities***

The County Parks Department owns and operates the 4,789 acre Toro Regional Park located along Highway 68 in Toro. Toro Park provides for 17 miles of nature and equestrian trails, has an organized youth group camping area that will accommodate approximately 100 people, maintains an environmental nature center, provides for several large group day use picnic areas, and has nearly 350 picnic tables for day use. There is also an equestrian staging area located in Toro for public use and a horse rental facility.

Recreational trail systems have been proposed in Monterey County several times in the past 30 years. Within Toro, the only riding (equestrian) and hiking trails which have been officially designated are inside the Toro Regional Park.

### ***Domestic Water Services***

Most of the potable water in Toro is provided by three privately owned water companies. All three are classified as investor-owned utility companies organized to deliver water to stockholders and others for profit. They are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. These investor-owned companies are: California Water Services Company serving Toro Park Estates, Serra Village, and Vista Del Rio with 735 connections; Toro Water Service, Inc., which serves Corral de Tierra Oaks, Vista Dorado, and El Rancho Corral de Tierra and has 174 connections; and Ambler Park Water Company with 230 connections in San Benancio Canyon. There are 72 mutual water companies which deliver water only to stockholders and members at cost in Toro. They serve 390 connections or about 1,200 people throughout Toro.

The 1980 U. S. Census indicates that 1,522 (or 70% of the 2,169 year-round housing units in Toro) units were connected to a public or private mutual water system, 623 units had a well source, and 24 used other sources.

### ***Wastewater Treatment***

There are two wastewater treatment plants in Toro. Both plants are privately owned. The Indian Springs plant serves the subdivision of that name, and Salinas Utilities serves the Meadows of Corral de Tierra, Corral de Tierra Villas, Toro Park Estates, as well as Toro Park School, three recreation buildings, and nineteen office and commercial sewer hookups. The remaining developed lots use septic systems.

The 1980 U. S. Census also provides data on the type of sewage disposal for the year-round housing units in Toro. The number of units connected to a public sewer system was 864 or 40%. The majority, 1,284, use septic tanks and a small number, 21, use other means such as an individual sewer line running to a creek. The County Environmental Health Division is investigating this situation.

Some recent requests for development in Toro have been delayed or denied until the wastewater/sewage treatment question is settled. For example, Salinas Utilities is currently under a Cease and Desist Order which places a ban on new hookups; the moratorium will remain until the State Public Utilities Commission approves a transfer of ownership and other problems with the plant are solved.

Individual septic systems are appropriate to an extent; however, such systems are unsuitable in many cases. Development density must be low, utilizing large lots to acceptably disburse wastes. Steep slopes and shallow bedrock are common throughout Toro, neither of which can accommodate septic systems. The County's general policy regarding septic tanks is that their installation is prohibited on new lots smaller than one acre.

## ***HOUSING***

The quantity of housing units in Toro has increased dramatically since 1960. In that year the U. S. Census Bureau counted 582 housing units in Toro. By 1970 the number of units had increased by 98% to 1,152. By 1980 the number had grown to 2,179 housing units in Toro, an additional 89% increase. During the two decades between 1960 and 1980, the amount of housing in Toro increased by 274% compared with an increase of 80% for all Monterey County in the same period.

The numbers of persons per housing unit have declined since 1960 in Toro as well as in the County as a whole. In 1960, 1970, and 1980 the persons per housing unit figures for Toro were 3.44, 3.35, and 3.13 persons, respectively. Countywide, these figures declined more rapidly, from 3.45 persons per housing unit in 1960 to 3.26 in 1970, and to 2.85 in 1980. These statistics reflect that there are now proportionately fewer one- and two-person households relative to larger households in

Toro than in Monterey County.

The 1980 U. S. Census tabulated housing units by type of structure. The occupied housing in Toro included 1,785 single family detached units, 132 single attached units (condominiums), 123 units in multi-family structures, and 9 mobile homes. Of the 2,049 total occupied housing units, 87% were single family detached. This includes owner and renter occupied housing.

Housing availability is generally shown through the balance between owner and rental housing. Ideally, the housing stock should be split fairly evenly between owner and rental units. This is more critical in times of high housing prices. In Toro, 87% of the units are owner occupied compared with 53% throughout the County.

The effective vacancy rate is the operative measure for describing housing availability. A "balanced" housing market, one with an adequate supply of housing, has an effective vacancy rate of three to five percent in for sale units and five to seven percent in rental units with an overall effective vacancy standard of about five percent. The vacant rates measured in the 1980 Census were low throughout the County both in rental and sale units. In Toro the vacancy rate for sale units was 2.1% versus 1.1% for the County; Toro's vacancy rate for rental units was 0.4% versus 2.3% for the County.

In 1980 the median home value in Toro was \$136,800; this is fairly high when compared to the County median home value for that year of \$86,000. The largest percentage of homes (85%) in Toro were listed in the \$100,000-200,000+ category. Median rent was \$377 compared with \$262 for the County.

Past housing condition surveys have indicated that the housing stock in Toro is in good condition and that a very small percentage of the homes are substandard and in need of repair. The lack of plumbing is a good indication of substandard housing and in Toro there were only three units which lacked plumbing. Overall home quality is reinforced by the higher than average home values and rent prices.

***PART II: AREA PLAN***

## ***CHAPTER V: THE PLAN***

# ***THE TORO AREA PLAN***

This plan focuses on the balancing of present character and future needs, conservation of resources and opportunities for development, and the sentiments of the local community. The foundation of the plan is the body of goals, objectives, and policies of the Monterey County General Plan. All of those goals, objectives, and policies shall apply to Toro and be supplemented by the policies in this plan. The Toro Land Use Plan, however, shall supersede previous general plans for this area, including the recently adopted countywide land use plan. The Toro Land Use Plan will be adopted as an amendment to the Monterey County General Plan and must be consistent with the intent and philosophy of that plan.

Major assumptions of the Toro Area Plan include:

1. Scenic qualities and open space in the Toro area are a valued resource, worthy of protection.
2. Agriculture (farming and grazing operations) will be viable in the foreseeable future.
3. There will be little appreciable increase in existing sewage treatment capacities in the Toro Planning Area unless major improvements are made.
4. Federal, state, and county standards for public health, safety, and welfare will not be changed significantly, and will be judiciously administered and enforced.
5. A number of roadway problem areas preclude significant increases in population until funds are available for road improvements.
6. Large scale residential projects will be built in phases.
7. County, state, and federal budget limitations will continue to significantly restrain construction of major capital improvements.
8. The private automobile will continue to be the dominant form of transportation in Toro despite the ever-increasing cost.

## ***ISSUES***

### ***Retention of Farmlands and Grazing Lands***

1. Viable farmlands and viable grazing lands in Monterey County are valuable long-term

resources. The County has taken a strong stand on this issue and has instituted a number of programs and policies to protect these resources.

2. Considerable development pressure exists to convert valuable agricultural lands to urban uses, particularly along River Road. Such lands may suffer in economic viability if conflicting land uses are introduced.
3. What methods should be incorporated in the Toro Area Plan for preserving viable agricultural lands?

### ***Adequacy of Water Resources***

1. Although a recent study indicates that the overall groundwater supply in the El Toro basin should be more than adequate to serve anticipated levels of growth, some particular sites may lack sufficient groundwater.
2. Distribution may be a problem due to the substantial number of mutual water companies and private wells which draw from common water tables. Additionally, well owners often face the problem of having to drill to deep aquifers where the water may be of a poorer quality or of insufficient quantity.
3. To what extent should public water systems be expanded and would this solve the distribution problem? To what extent would this be growth-inducing?
4. What role should the Toro Area Plan play in promoting water conservation?

### ***Adequacy of Water Quality***

1. Water quality in Toro's aquifers is generally rated fair to poor due to natural mineralization. Additionally, in some areas the water must be chlorinated due to the presence of coliform bacteria.
2. Septic tank pollution has not been a serious problem to date in Toro. However, poorly sited, improperly designed, or badly maintained septic systems may degrade the groundwater without adequate monitoring. What effect will additional septic systems have on water quality?
3. What steps should be taken to ensure adequate future capacity of wastewater treatment systems?

### ***Preservation of Scenic Resources***

1. The generally rural character and the variety of scenic aspects of Toro will require special attention if they are to be preserved. The interplay of vegetation and landform is particularly valued.

2. Development in certain areas of high or critical visual sensitivity such as on ridgelines, could be particularly damaging to Toro's scenic qualities. What methods can be employed to protect these areas of critical sensitivity?
3. Thousands are exposed to the scenic areas along major thoroughfares such as Highway 68, Laureles Grade, and River Road, interior roads such as Corral de Tierra and San Benancio, and numerous feeder roads. What methods should be pursued to maintain and enhance these scenic corridors?

### ***Transportation***

1. The volume of traffic carried by Highway 68 has been increasing annually. Incremental development along this corridor, in Monterey, and in Salinas, adds to the volume of traffic.
2. There are cumulative impacts of increased traffic, particularly during peak hours. State and local funding of highway improvements may not be forthcoming in the long term. What means, then, can be used to solve the Highway 68 traffic problem within financial constraints?
3. How can major highway improvements be made without compromising Highway 68's scenic corridor?
4. How can safety improvements be made without compromising the rural character and safety of interior roads?
5. What provisions should be made for public transit such as bus service and carpooling?

### ***Housing***

1. Should low and moderate income housing be available in Toro?
2. Most housing units in Toro are single family. Should there be a mix of housing types at higher densities in order to lower the cost of housing in Toro?

## ***SUPPLEMENTAL POLICIES\****

### ***Natural Resources***

#### ***Soil and Slope***

3.2.4 (T) Except in areas designated as medium or high density residential or in areas designated as commercial or industrial where residential use may be allowed, the following formula shall be used in the calculation of maximum possible residential density for individual parcels based upon slope:

1. Those portions of parcels with cross-slope of between zero and 19.9 percent shall be assigned 1 building site per each 1 acre.
2. Those portions of parcels with a cross-slope of between 20 and 29.9 percent shall be assigned 1 building site per each 2 acres.
3. Those portions of parcels with a cross-slope of 30 percent or greater shall be assigned zero building sites.
4. The density for a particular parcel shall be computed by determining the cross-slope of the various portions of the parcel, applying the assigned densities listed above according to the percent of cross-slope, and by adding the densities derived from this process. The maximum density derived by the procedure shall be used as one of the factors in final determination of the actual density that shall be allowed on a parcel.

Where an entire parcel would not be developable because of plan policies, an extremely low density of development should be allowed.

---

\*These policies are supplemental to the goals, objectives, and policies of the Monterey County General Plan; readers are reminded to use both documents when reviewing planning matters in the Toro area. In the event of conflict between the goals, objectives, and policies of the Toro Area Plan and the county wide General Plan, as adopted on September 30, 1982, the most environmentally and agriculturally protective goals, objectives, and policies shall prevail.

- 4.1.4 (T) The County shall preserve and expand the designated agricultural lands in Toro, as depicted on the Toro Area Plan Land Use Map.
- 4.2.2 (T) Large acreages in higher elevations and on steeper slopes shall be preserved and enhanced for grazing, where grazing is found to be a viable use.

### ***Water Resources***

- 5.1.2.1 (T) Developments shall be designed to maintain groundwater recharge capabilities on the property.
- 5.1.3 (T) The County should collect detailed information on primary recharge areas in the El Toro water basin.
- 6.1.3 (T) The County shall expand its ongoing groundwater monitoring system for particular aquifers in the El Toro groundwater basin so as to permit an informed decision on a water allocation system.
- 6.1.4 (T) New water supply wells for subdivisions shall require seventy-two hour pump tests.
- 6.1.5 (T) The County shall prepare a water allocation system for the El Toro water basin to ensure equitable use of limited and interrelated water resources.

### ***Vegetation***

- 7.2.3 (T) The preservation of oak trees in Toro shall be promoted by discouraging removal of healthy trees with diameters in excess of eight inches.

### ***Archaeological Resources***

- 12.1.4.1 (T) The Toro Archaeological/Historical Sites Map contained in the Inventory and Analysis shall be used in interpreting General Plan policies which address the requirements for field inspections in moderate and high archaeological sensitivity zones.

### ***Environmental Constraints***

#### ***Seismic, Geologic, Flood, and Fire Hazards***

- 15.1.16 (T) The Toro Seismic Hazards Map included in this report shall be used to delineate high seismic hazard areas addressed by the countywide General Plan. Areas shown as "moderately high, high, and very high hazard" shall be considered to high hazard areas for the purpose of applying General Plan policies in Toro. These maps may be revised as new accepted geotechnical investigations dictates.
- 16.2.11 (T) Practices which contribute to siltation and flood hazards of Toro Creek shall be

prohibited.

17.3.16 (T) Emergency access and facilities within the Toro area should be improved in order to reduce fire hazards (see also 46.1.2 (T)).

17.4.13 (T) The Toro Fire Hazards map shall be used to identify areas of high and very high fire hazard as addressed by policies in the countywide General Plan.

### ***Water Quality***

21.1.6.1 (T) The County shall require water quality analysis for all new domestic wells.

## ***Area Development***

### ***Land Use***

26.1.4.3 A standard tentative subdivision map and/or vesting tentative and/or Preliminary Project Review Subdivision map application for either a standard or minor subdivision shall not be approved until:

- 1) an applicant provides evidence of an assured longterm water supply in terms of yield and quality for all lots which are to be created through subdivision. A recommendation on the water supply shall be made to the decision making body by the County's Health Officer and the General Manager of the Water Resources Agency, or their respective designees.
- 2) The applicant provides proof that the water supply to serv the lots meets both the water quality and quantity standards as set forth in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, and Chapters 15.04 and 15.08 of the Monterey County Code subject to the review and recommendation by the County's Health Officer to the decision making body.

26.1.6.1 (T) Within areas of visual sensitivity as indicated on the Toro Visual Sensitivity Map, no development shall be permitted without a finding by the Board of Supervisors or its designee that such development will not adversely affect the natural scenic beauty of the area. Additionally, areas of visual sensitivity shall be reviewed critically for landscaping and building design and siting which will enhance the scenic value of the area.

26.1.7.1 (T) The County shall encourage in the Toro area, the use of optional design and improvement standards as described in Article VI of Title 19 of the Monterey County Code.

26.1.8.1 (T) Development in scenic road and highway corridors shall be governed by policies located in the transportation section of this Area Plan.

- 26.1.9.1 (T) Development on ridgelines and hilltops or development protruding above ridgelines shall be prohibited. Additionally, only minimal development on steeper and critical viewshed slopes shall be allowed.
- 26.1.11.1 (T) In order to preserve open space, clustered development or alternate techniques may be found appropriate in all areas where development is permitted, subject to environmental and health standards and limitations.
- 26.1.18.1 (T) Development proposals on Corral de Tierra Road from Four Corners to Corral del Cielo shall be deferred until safety improvements are made by the developer, as provided for in policy 39.1.1.1 (T), regardless of area plan land use designation.
- 26.1.20.1 (T) Lighting of outdoor areas shall be minimized and carefully controlled to preserve the quality of darkness. Street lighting shall be as unobtrusive as practicable and shall be consistent in intensity throughout the Toro area.
- 29.3.5 (T) Industrial land uses other than utilities shall not be permitted in the Toro area.
- 30.1.1.1 (T) The Greco property on River Road, APN 139-021-03 and 04, shall be designated as a "special treatment" area. In-stream sand extraction, a contractor's yard and shop building accessory to the extraction operation, and a single family residence may be conditionally allowed by use permit in the special treatment area. The uses may be allowed in accordance with a required general development plan and a reclamation plan. The special treatment should be zoned Planned General Commercial. (*ADDED 12/3/91*)
- 30.0.5.1 (T) Land designated for farmland and grazing uses shall be assessed and taxed accordingly.
- 36.0.4 (T) Except in areas designated as medium or high density residential or in areas designated as commercial or industrial where residential use may be allowed, an applicant wishing to apply for a subdivision under the countywide General Plan and Toro Area Plan must use the following procedures to calculate the maximum density that can be considered in order to prepare an application consistent with, or less than, the maximum allowable density:
1. One factor in density determination shall be the land use designation. The maximum density allowable under the Area Plan land use designation for a parcel shall be divided into the total number of acres found within the parcel. For example, a 100-acre parcel with a maximum density of 1 unit per 2.5 acres would have a density of 40 sites.
  2. The slope of the property shall be determined and the slope-density formula defined in Policy 3.2.4 (T) applied. For example, a 100-acre

parcel might consist of 50 percent of the land having a slope of over 30 percent and the other 50 percent below 19 percent. The maximum density allowable on that parcel as calculated according to slope would be 50 sites.

3. All of the policies of the Area Plan and countywide General Plan must be applied to the parcel. Any policies resulting in a decrease in density must be tabulated. This decrease in density would then be subtracted from the maximum density allowable under the slope formula.
4. The maximum density allowable according to the Area Plan land use designation (Step 1 above) and the maximum density allowable according to Plan policies (Steps 2 and 3 above) shall then be compared. Whichever of the two densities is the lesser shall be established as the maximum density allowable under this Area Plan.
5. The calculations of maximum density made by an applicant will be reviewed during public hearings prior to the approval of any permits pursuant to this Area Plan.

### ***Transportation***

- 38.1.3.1 (T) Employers in surrounding areas should be encouraged to stagger employees' work hours in order to ease peak hour traffic congestion on Highway 68 and in other areas.
- 38.1.3.2 (T) The County shall promote the use of Blanco and Reservation Roads as alternate routes between the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas to alleviate traffic on Highway 68.
- 39.1.1.1 (T) The County shall be encouraged to work with the state, local agencies, and citizens groups to alleviate traffic congestion on, and still maintain the scenic beauty of, Highway 68. With the goal of eventually constructing a scenic four-lane divided highway, the County shall support the following interim measures:
  1. extension of Portola Drive through Serra Village in order to alleviate the traffic load on Highway 68 and traffic hazards at the Toro Park intersection;
  2. construction of a two-lane bypass in the area north of the present Corral de Tierra/ San Benancio/Highway 68 intersections within present plan lines;
  3. methods of easing congestion at Toro Regional Park including, but not limited to, relocating entrance facilities, relocating the bus stop, and providing additional parking space;
  4. construction of a divided four-lane segment between River Road and Torero

Drive and a low profile interchange (or other acceptable traffic solutions) at Toro Park; and

5. construction of bus stops, pull-outs, and shelters where needed.
- 39.1.1.2 (T) Improvement of Highway 68 intersections, replacement of the Toro Creek bridge, construction of alternate passing lanes, public transit roadway improvements, and improved bicycle safety measures should be undertaken at the earliest time that funding becomes available.
- 39.1.1.3 (T) The County shall require significant financial contributions from each new subdivision in the Toro Planning Area in order to expedite funding and construction of Highway 68.
- 39.2.2.1 (T) Improvements to Corral de Tierra and San Benancio Roads shall be designed to accommodate bicycles, horses, and people.
- 39.2.2.2 (T) The County shall require developers to make safety improvements to Corral de Tierra Road with first priority given to pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle uses. Road improvements such as widening or straightening which may lead to increased vehicle speeds shall be discouraged.
- 39.2.5.1 (T) To minimize traffic safety hazards, creation of new direct access points should be prohibited from single-family residences onto Highway 68 and discouraged onto Laureles Grade, River Road, Corral de Tierra Road, and San Benancio Road.
- 40.1.2 (T) To enhance and promote sensitive visual resources, the County shall pursue measures to obtain official County Scenic Route designation from the state for Corral de Tierra, San Benancio, Corral del Cielo, and Underwood Roads. The County hereby designates these roads as county scenic routes and incorporates them into the Scenic Highways section of the countywide General Plan.
- 40.2.3 (T) Land use, architectural, and landscaping controls shall be applied and sensitive site designing encouraged to preserve Toro's scenic entrances--the River Road/Highway 68 intersection and the Laureles Grade scenic vista overlooking the Planning Area.
- 40.2.4 (T) The County shall require a 100 foot building setback on all parcels adjacent to County and State scenic routes. The 100 foot setback will also apply to areas designated on the Toro Visual Sensitivity Map (Toro Area Plan, Figure 9) as critical viewshed. This setback is established without causing existing structures to become nonconforming and without rendering existing lots of record unbuildable. Critical viewshed areas shall also have open space zoning applied to the 100 foot setback area. **(ADDED 7/31/84) (AMENDED 5/22/90)**
- 40.2.5 (T) The County shall require newly created parcels to have building sites outside of the

critical viewshed. (*ADDED 7/31/84*)

- 40.2.6 (T) Density transfer shall be allowed from the acreage within the critical viewshed to other contiguous portions of the same ownership, but must meet all other area and general plan policies. (*ADDED 7/31/84*)
- 40.2.7 (T) Where Plan policies would prohibit any development on a parcel, the density allowed by the land use designation shall be permitted in the critical viewshed. (*ADDED 7/31/84*)
- 40.3.3 (T) Scenic qualities of Laureles Grade should be improved through better management of shoulders and better marked and maintained selected vista viewing areas.
- 40.3.4 (T) Placement of existing utility lines underground shall be encouraged, particularly along Laureles Grade Road and Highway 68.
- 41.2.1.1 (T) If new sites for office employment, services, and local conveniences are found to be appropriate, such sites should incorporate designs to allow use of alternate modes of transportation.
- 41.2.3 (T) The County shall encourage a study of the feasibility of increasing the accessibility of Toro residents to mass transit, either through park and ride lots or new bus service, particularly in the Corral de Tierra, San Benancio, and River Road areas.

### ***Public Services and Facilities***

- 46.1.2 (T) Emergency access and facilities within the Toro area should be improved.
- 46.3.1 (T) The County shall encourage the use of crime prevention methods such as sequential house numbering and nonrepetitive street naming in subdivision design.
- 47.2.2 (T) Emergency access and facilities within the Toro area should be improved.
- 50.1.2 (T) The County shall encourage a study of the feasibility of locating a branch library in Toro.
- 54.1.5 (T) To ensure cost-effective and adequate levels of wastewater treatment, the County shall promote relatively higher densities in areas where wastewater treatment facilities can be made available.

### ***Housing***

- 57.1.4 (T) The County shall encourage the provision of a wider range of housing opportunities in Toro, particularly multi-family housing, where such housing preserves and promotes the rural character of the Toro area.



## ***AREA LAND USE PLAN***

The Toro Planning Area land use plan, as represented by Figure 10, is a graphic representation of the general distribution and location, extent, and intensity of future land uses and transportation routes in this planning area. The land use plan, which must be used in conjunction with countywide General Plan goals, objectives, and policies and the supplemental area policies contained within this Plan, constitutes a "blueprint for the future" of Toro for the next 20 years. It is important to note that this land use plan represents the desires of the Toro community, as expressed by the Toro Area Plan Citizens Advisory Committee, and as stated in the opening philosophy of this document.

The Toro Area Plan is intended to provide refinement to the countywide General Plan in order to reflect neighborhood concerns which could not be addressed at the countywide level. However, changes for this area plan must be consistent with the intent and overall direction of the countywide plan. Thus, changes at the area plan level which require changes in land use type or intensity must be consistent with the General Plan's goals, objectives, and policies.

### ***Preparation of the Land Use Plan***

The land use plan was prepared after careful consideration of various factors which are critical with regard to the County's planning program. These factors include countywide general plan policies and land uses, the Growth Management Policy, the existing land use pattern and emerging growth centers in Toro, current subdivision activity, adopted specific plans, and county and state plans for improvement and realignment of Highway 68. Finally, aspects of the land suitability study were incorporated into land use and density decisions.

### ***Land Suitability***

The first step in developing a land use plan for the Toro Planning Area was a comprehensive study of the area's resources and environmental constraints. The best available information for the area was collected, studied, and mapped where appropriate. Some of the subjects of study were soil characteristics, geologic and seismic hazards, topography, vegetation, flood hazards, fire hazards, road capacities and access, water quality and availability, and public services. Findings on these topics are summarized in the inventory and analysis section of this document.\* Areas subject to erosion, landslide, and seismic hazards are identified in Figures 4 and 5. Areas subject to flooding are identified in Figure 6. Areas of high and very high fire hazards are identified in Figure 7.

Some of the above subjects were examined more closely to determine the relative suitability of all areas for three general land uses: development, farmlands, and grazing. In developing land suitability maps for Toro, soil characteristics as described in the Soil Survey of Monterey County were used extensively. The original intent of the survey was to determine what types of soils are in the area, where they are located, and how they may be used.

---

\*The complete Toro Area Plan Inventory and Analysis is available at the Monterey County Planning Department.

Six factors from the Soil Survey were used in determining the suitability of each type of soil for development. These factors were: suitability for septic tank absorption fields, shallow excavations, dwellings with basements, dwellings without basements, small commercial buildings, and roads and streets. Generally, suitability for all of these types of construction was similar for each soil type. Soils were rated as having slight, moderate, or severe constraints for each of these factors. Those soils having severe constraints for all six factors were mapped as having a low suitability for development (see Figure 18 of the Inventory and Analysis). Those with generally slight or moderate constraints were mapped as having a high suitability for development. All areas which lie within the accepted 100-year floodplain have been shown as areas of low suitability for development.

Development should not necessarily be precluded in areas solely on the basis of their having low suitability and severe constraints for this land use. Often, careful site planning, extensive engineering, and appropriate building construction standards can alleviate problems associated with development in such areas. However, such development is necessarily at a higher cost and, in most cases, at a lower density than in areas with few constraints. Conversely, areas with moderate or high suitability should not necessarily be designated for development, since other uses may have greater relative value.

Classification of Toro's best farmlands was based primarily on the Important Farmlands Inventory developed by the USDA Soil Conservation Service. The Important Farmlands Inventory categorizes farmlands as prime, of statewide importance, unique, and of local importance (see Figure 4 of this document and Figure 17 of the Inventory and Analysis). Farmlands which are classified prime or of statewide importance are considered to have a high suitability for farming; farmlands of local importance have a moderate suitability and remaining land has a low suitability for use as farmland.

The Soil Conservation Service also prepared ratings for grazing suitability according to the potential of a soil to produce herbage when well managed. The high, moderate, and low ratings were used in mapping suitability for grazing (see Figure 16 of the Inventory and Analysis). However, since an area shown as having a low suitability for grazing merely has less ability to grow herbage, therefore, more acreage per head of cattle would be necessary for grazing purposes. Grazing may, in fact, be an appropriate use for much of the rugged, marginal lands because they are most likely unusable for anything more intensive.

Once the relative suitability of different areas for these three general land uses has been determined, policy decisions based on countywide and area policies must be made to weigh the relative values of each suitable use for different areas. By considering the suitability maps, the existing land use pattern, and the capacity of present and anticipated public services, a sound land use map may be developed.

### ***Land Use Designations***

All proposed major land uses are indicated by one of seven basic designations: residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, resource conservation, public/quasi-public, and transportation. These basic designations are discussed in the following paragraphs. It should be noted that all

reference to development densities are expressed in gross acres and all densities are maximum densities. These maximum densities will be allowed only where there is provision for an adequate level of facilities and services and where plan policy requirements and criteria can be met.

### ***Residential***

This category applies to areas to be used for the development of housing at various densities. Within the time frame of this plan, the County will direct residential development into areas designated according to the following density categories\*:

Rural Density--greater than 5 acres per unit;

Low Density--5 acres per unit up to 1 acre per unit;

Medium Density--less than 1 acre per unit up to 0.2 acres per unit (i.e., more than 1 unit per acre up to 5 units per acre); and

High Density--less than 0.2 acres per unit up to 0.05 acres per unit (i.e., more than 5 units per acre up to 20 units per acre).

### ***Commercial***

This category applies to areas which are suitable for the development of retail and service commercial uses, including visitor accommodation and professional office uses. In general, building intensity for commercial areas shall conform to standards which limit building height to a maximum of 35 feet and lot coverage to a maximum 50 percent, excluding parking and landscaping requirements.

### ***Industrial***

This land use category applies to areas designated for the development of suitable types of manufacturing, research, mineral extraction, and processing operations. In general, building intensity for industrial areas shall conform to standards which limit building height to a maximum range of 35 feet to 75 feet and lot coverage to a maximum of 50 percent, excluding parking and landscaping requirements.

### ***Agricultural***

This category includes the sub-categories of farmlands, rural grazing lands, and permanent grazing lands.

---

\*Where clustering is allowed, total site density shall not exceed the density allowed by the appropriate residential category. In addition, on development sites where clustering is allowed, minimum lot sizes may be reduced consistent with environmental, health, and other planning requirements.

The farmlands sub-category includes those farmlands designated by the USDA Soil Conservation Service as prime, of statewide importance, unique, or of local importance. The minimum parcel size for these farmlands shall be 40 acres.

The permanent grazing sub-category is applied to those portions of Toro in which grazing or other agricultural uses are to be preserved, enhanced, and expanded. On permanent grazing lands, minimum parcel sizes shall be 40 acres and larger, but they shall not be less than the existing zoning designation on the date of adoption of the countywide General Plan. Subdivision of land may be allowed only for agricultural purposes, for farm labor housing, or in order to create a building site for immediate family members and spouses. Only when they are clearly an accessory use to the exclusive agricultural use of the property, residential units may be developed at a density of 40 or more acres per unit. Additionally, the division of property to create a one-acre minimum building site (on lands designated permanent grazing) may be considered by the County if the division is to accommodate housing for members of the immediate family of the property owner who earn their livelihood from grazing use of the family land.

The rural grazing sub-category is applied to grazing lands which are located in the County's developing areas and on which the County intends to allow mixed residential and agricultural land uses. In rural grazing areas, minimum parcel sizes shall range from 10-acre minimum to a 160-acre minimum, but they shall not be less than the minimum on the date of adoption of the countywide General Plan.

Clustering of residential uses shall be encouraged provided that total site density shall not exceed that allowed by the rural grazing land use density; e.g., in an area which is designated rural grazing land with a 10-acre minimum, allowable density shall be 10 acres per unit. As a condition of clustered residential development approval, the developer shall be required to enter into a permanent restriction to ensure continued grazing use on those portions of the property not developed for residential use.

### ***Resource Conservation***

This category is intended to ensure conservation of a wide variety of the County's resources while allowing for some limited use of these properties. Typical of lands included in this category are watershed areas, riparian habitats, scenic resources, and lands which are generally remote, have steep slopes, or are inaccessible. This category also includes the floodways of the County's major rivers as well as its major water bodies. Uses in resource conservation areas must be in keeping with the conservation intent of this category. For example, allowed uses may include grazing and other agricultural uses and passive recreation such as camping, riding, and hiking.

Minimum parcel sizes in resource conservation areas shall range from 10-acre to 160-acre minimums but they shall not be less than the minimum on the date of adoption of the countywide General Plan. Residential uses are not a primary use in this category and will be allowed only if the applicant can demonstrate that conservation values are not compromised. Density for residential uses, where allowed, shall range from 10 acres or more per unit to 160 acres or more per unit.

### ***Public/Quasi-Public***

This category is applied to a wide variety of existing and proposed uses which are either operated by a public agency or which service a large segment of the public. Public/quasi-public uses include the following:

- o Schools, churches, hospitals, community halls
- o Parks, recreation areas, and public and privately operated recreational facilities (i.e., tennis clubs and golf courses with accessory uses such as a clubhouse, pro shop, restaurant and/or administrative/business office)
- o Natural reserves (includes areas such as Elkhorn Slough Estuarine Sanctuary and Los Padres National Forest)
- o Emergency services (i.e., police and fire)
- o Solid and liquid waste disposal
- o Military
- o Religious facilities
- o Other public facilities

### ***Transportation***

This category includes highways, major arterials (i.e., major county roads), scenic routes, recreational trails, railroads, airports, and harbors.

### ***Special Treatment***

The "special treatment" overlay is used in conjunction with the land use designation on the Land Use Plan. A "special treatment" area facilitates a planned approach which addresses unique circumstances of a property which must be treated differently than similar designated lands within the planning area. The Greco property on River Road, located 2,000 feet northwest of Pine Canyon Road, is designated as special treatment area on the Land Use Plan. (*ADDED 12/3/91*)

### ***Area of Development Concentration***

Areas of development concentration are those portions of the unincorporated area within which the County intends to concentrate development. Areas of development concentration shall provide adequate infrastructure to the development such as water, sewage treatment, roads, commercial facilities schools, and fire protection. Developments of this type are to be proposed as specific plan amendments to the General Plan, shall be in consonance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, and must meet criteria delineated in the Monterey County Growth Management Policy.

### ***Land Use Philosophy***

The preservation of Toro's rural character and quality of life is the philosophical underpinning of the

land use plan. The interplay of vegetation and land form and the combination of rolling hills, meadows, trees, and winding roads make up the scenic beauty that give Toro this rural character. Thus, some of the most critical policies are those which encourage open space preservation, special management of highly critical scenic areas, oak tree protection, and scenic road standards, and those which prohibit development on ridgelines and frontal slopes. A second philosophical consideration recognizes that growth is inevitable; therefore, sound planning must replace piecemeal development if Toro's character is to be preserved. Development should take place first along major road corridors; this is why densities in the plan are higher near Highway 68 and River Road and gradually decrease with distance from these roads. The slope density formula (policies 3.2.4 and 36.0.4) is a key element in prohibiting development on the steeper slopes and allowing it on the flatter lands. Finally, the retention of agricultural land along River Road and viable grazing lands is an important goal, both for Toro and Monterey County.

### ***Major Land Use Recommendations***

The following sections describe major recommendations for each of the designations shown graphically on the land use plan. The land uses and designated densities must be reviewed in conjunction with the plan policies. Certain areas may be less suited for a particular density due to environmental constraints or overriding scenic value than other areas with the same density. For example, areas with steep terrain will have a lower density because of the slope density policy. The oak groves along Corral de Tierra lie within a low density residential category; yet the oaks are protected by two policies--one regarding tree cutting, the other regarding visual resources.

#### ***Residential***

The plan concentrates new residential development in areas which, for the most part, are already committed to some degree of residential development.

Rural density residential use is designated in the Laureles Grade corridor, on the Pattee and Markham Ranches, and along Calera Canyon; on the Broccoli Ranch; and west and east of Pine Canyon Road along the Buena Vista Rancho boundary. The density for most of the rural density residential areas is 5+ acres per unit; the density on the Pattee and Markham Ranches is 10 acres per unit.

In the countywide General Plan, the low density residential category has a range of 1 acre per unit to 5 acres per unit. The Toro Area Plan defines low density as 1, 2, or 5 acres per unit for different areas. The 1 acre density is shown on the land use plan along Highway 68 between Laureles Grade and Corral de Tierra; along San Benancio Road up to Harper Canyon Road; and along River Road between Highway 68 and Pine Canyon Road. The Walter Markham and Marks properties are designated 2 acres per unit. Areas in the 5 acre density include properties along a portion of San Benancio Road, Highway 68, and River Road.

Medium density residential is designated on a portion of Markham Ranch; on the Corral de Tierra Villas and Meadows of Corral de Tierra subdivisions; on portions of Las Palmas Ranch; on Toro Park Estates, Serra Village, and Creekside; and on River Road in the Pedrazzi subdivision.

Sewage treatment facilities or capacity must be available in those areas where new development at medium densities is proposed.

It is important to note that designated densities may not be allowed on Corral de Tierra Road, from Four Corners to Corral del Cielo, as provided for in policy 26.1.18.1(T). The policy states that "development proposals on Corral de Tierra Road shall be deferred until safety improvements are made . . . regardless of area plan land use designations."

### ***Commercial and Industrial***

The plan shows that existing areas designated for commercial uses on Corral de Tierra, Highway 68, and River Road will be retained but not significantly expanded. One of the commercial parcels adjacent to the Toro Park shopping center is for an animal hospital only. Two additional commercial sites are proposed for Las Palmas Ranch. The only industrial uses shown on the plan are utilities and an inactive mine quarry. Policy 29.3.5(T) indicates that "industrial land uses other than utilities shall not be permitted in the Toro area."

### ***Agricultural***

The plan designates as farmland the entire area north and northeast of River Road and, beginning with two parcels west of Pine Canyon Road, the area south of River Road to Limekiln Road. The entire southern portion of the planning area is designated as permanent grazing. One area along Corral de Tierra is designated rural grazing at a density of 20 acres per unit.

### ***Resource Conservation***

Resource conservation is shown on the land use plan for most of the Corral de Tierra/San Benancio loop and south of Toro Regional Park with densities ranging from 10 to 40 acres per unit.

### ***Public/Quasi-Public***

Major uses in this category include Toro Regional Park, Titus Park, Corral de Tierra Golf Course, Chamisal Tennis Club, the Cypress Church property, the Good Shepard Church, Camp Chaneya on Underwood Road, public schools, and the permanent open space within the Indian Springs subdivision.

Lands administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are indicated with solid boundary lines; they are not, however, designated public/quasi-public. Although the County has no jurisdiction over BLM lands at the present time, a land use of permanent grazing is shown in the event that the land is sold to a private individual and becomes subject to County jurisdiction.

FIGURE 10  
LAND USE PLAN

Two proposed school sites are shown in areas planned for future residential growth. One is on the Toro Vista project site and the other is on the Las Palmas Ranch site.

### ***Transportation***

The only major improvement to the transportation system in Toro that is shown on the land use plan is the upgrading of Highway 68 to a four-lane divided highway. The County has designated Official Plan Lines along Highway 68, from River Road to Highway 1. That portion of the County Streets and Highways Plan which establishes Official Plan Lines (Ordinance No. 499) has been incorporated by reference into the countywide General Plan in order to protect the future alignments of proposed new or improved highways and roads.

In addition, the Toro Area Plan proposes interim measures for improving Highway 68:

1. extension of Portola Drive through Serra Village;
2. construction of a two-lane bypass in the area north of the present Corral de Tierra/San Benancio/Highway 68 intersections within present plan lines;
3. methods of easing congestion at Toro Regional Park including, but not limited to, relocating entrance facilities and the bus stop and providing additional parking space;
4. construction of a divided four-lane segment between River Road and Torero Drive and a low profile interchange at Toro Park;
5. improvement of Highway 68 intersections, replacement of Toro Creek bridge, construction of alternate passing lanes, and improved bicycle lanes;
6. construction of bus stops, pull-outs, and shelters where needed.

The Toro Area Plan also proposes safety improvements to Corral de Tierra Road with first priority given to pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle uses.

Toro contains two state-designated scenic routes--State Highway 68 and Los Laureles Grade Road. The County Board of Supervisors has also designated Corral de Tierra, San Benancio, Corral del Cielo, and Underwood Roads as county scenic routes.

The County Recreational Trails Plan, adopted in 1971, is the basis for a countywide trails system which was incorporated into the countywide General Plan. The trails plan is represented by Figure 14 in that document. The part of the trails system which traverses the Toro Planning Area is shown on the land use map.

The trails plan shows a proposed equestrian and hiking trail running through Toro Regional Park; the trails shown in the General Plan extending north and south from the Park have been deleted and are not part of this Toro Area Plan. The proposed bicycle trail traverses Toro along Highway 68 (it is

not shown separately on the land use map).

### ***Area of Development Concentration***

On March 22, 1983 the Monterey County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 83-121 establishing the River Road Area of Development Concentration (ADC). The resolution amended the General Plan which, previously, had delineated ADC study areas. Toro is, therefore, the first planning area to have a designated ADC.

The River Road ADC is bounded by Pine Canyon Road on the east, River Road on the north, Highway 68 on the west, and Toro Regional Park on the south, excluding the St. John's College and Marks properties. Also, excluded from the ADC are two prime agricultural land parcels located immediately southwest of the Pine Canyon/River Road intersection.

Among the development criteria adopted by the Board is the residential density designation of one unit per gross developable acre and the requirement for a development incentive zone (DIZ). The DIZ contains 10 acres and has a maximum residential density of 10 units per acre.

### ***Specific Plans***

There are two adopted specific plans within the Toro planning area. The Toro Vista Specific Plan was adopted on December 16, 1980 and is incorporated by reference into the Toro Area Plan. The approximate location of land uses and the boundary of the Specific Plan are shown on the Toro land use plan.

The Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan was adopted on September 20, 1983 and is incorporated by reference into the Toro Area Plan. The boundary of the Specific Plan and the approximate location of land uses are shown on the Toro land use plan.

## ***CHAPTER VI: PLAN IMPLEMENTATION***

## ***PLAN IMPLEMENTATION\****

As in the Monterey County General Plan, the Toro Area Plan consists of policies and a future land use map, and is a comprehensive long-range plan designed to guide the area's development and resource conservation. It is the product of an analysis of information found in a background report and resource maps compiled in a study of the planning area. It reflects physical opportunities and limitations for growth.

The Toro Area Plan, as part of the General Plan, is to be used as the basis for discretionary actions by the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission. While the General Plan sets the framework for community development, the day-to-day actions of the County truly shape the community. Thus, the manner in which the Plan is implemented is the real test of the worth of its goals, objectives, and policies, and eight area plans.

The following sections discuss aspects of implementing the countywide General Plan which will also apply to the eight area plans. Because each area plan is a sub-unit of the General Plan, references to the "General Plan" are intended to include the Toro Area Plan.

Most tools for implementation of the General Plan derive from the County's corporate powers and police powers. State law requires the County to have subdivision and building regulations; most other measures are optional. If the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan are to be served effectively, the implementing measures must be carefully chosen, adapted to local needs, and carried out as an integrated program of complementary and mutually reinforcing actions. In addition to the requirements that the General Plan address nine specific elements and be internally consistent, implementing measures must be consistent with the General Plan. Ordinarily an action, program, or project is consistent with the General Plan if it will further the objectives and policies of the General Plan and not obstruct their attainment.

Some of the more important implementation measures for the County include zoning regulations, subdivision regulations, capital improvements programming, preparation of specific plans, and project review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

---

\*Excerpted from Chapter 6 of the Monterey County General Plan.

## ***ORDINANCES***

### ***Zoning Ordinance***

Zoning is the primary tool for implementing the General Plan. In its simplest form, zoning is the division of a geographical area into districts, accompanied by a written description of allowable land uses and development standards for each of the districts. The function of zoning is to translate the comprehensive, long-range, and relatively broad policies of the General Plan into single purpose, short-range, and specific development standards for each piece of property in the County. Proper zoning will help to ensure that development on any parcel in the County is in conformance with the updated General Plan.

Planning law stipulates that no open space zoning ordinance may be adopted, no building permits issued, and no subdivision map approved unless consistent with the Plan's policies regarding open space. Revising the zoning ordinance to secure conformity with the General Plan will include the establishment of appropriate zoning districts and densities to implement the Plan, specification of zoning for each parcel, and continued enforcement and amendment as appropriate.

### ***Subdivision Ordinance***

In order to ensure conformity to the General Plan, the County is directed to regulate the "design and improvement" of subdivisions, which includes the physical layout of lots, dedication of public improvements and easements, and other measures. Furthermore, the County is authorized by the Subdivision Map Act to require dedication of public improvements or require payment of in-lieu fees for improvements such as streets, drainage, local transit, school sites, parks and recreation, coastal access, and erosion control.

The subdivision ordinance should address the issues of on-site improvements, off-site improvements, and protection of environmentally sensitive areas. Specific subdivision proposals must demonstrate consistency with the General Plan on these points as well as on the issue of proper timing or other issues addressed in the subdivision ordinance.

### ***Other Ordinances***

Other existing ordinances and policies which will be reviewed in the interest of consistency with the General Plan and to facilitate its implementation include the Erosion Control Ordinance, the Noise Pollution Ordinance, the Official Plan Line (OPL) Ordinance, the Building Ordinance, energy policies, and the Growth Management Policy. These must reflect the goals, objectives, and policies adopted in the Monterey County General Plan.

## ***CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM***

The network of publicly owned facilities such as roads, streets, water and sewer facilities, public buildings, and parks forms the skeletal structure of a community. Certain public facilities, particularly water and sewer facilities and roads and streets, play a major role in determining the location, intensity, and timing of future development.

Because of their importance in the growth of the community, state law requires that decisions about capital facilities be reviewed for consistency with the adopted General Plan. All departments within the County and all other local governmental agencies, including cities, school districts, and special districts that construct capital facilities, must annually submit to the Planning Commission a list of projects being planned or constructed in the coming year. The Planning Commission must review the projects for conformity to the General Plan. A similar review for individual capital projects is also required.

Rather than consider individual capital improvement projects or only those projects to be undertaken in a single year, the County will prepare and annually revise a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) covering a period of at least six years. Because of the tremendous influence that capital improvement projects have on physical development within a jurisdiction, the Capital Improvements Program has important strategic value for implementing General Plan policies. It can help shape and phase growth according to adopted policies.

Major steps in the development of a CIP are (1) selection of necessary improvements and projects to implement the General Plan, (2) establishment of priorities to promote staged development of capital facilities in a manner consistent with the General Plan, and (3) development of adequate and equitable financing for each project. The CIP should be reviewed annually and revised to reflect the County's evolving needs and fluctuating budgetary constraints.

## ***ONGOING REVIEW***

Due to the nature of the General Plan, most of its implementation is an ongoing process. Further specification and guidance is extended through the development of area plans, specific plans, and review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Specific plans may be used in all or part of the County to ensure systematic execution of the General Plan. A specific plan must include all detailed regulations, conditions, programs, and proposed legislation to implement each of the required General Plan elements. By coordinating efforts of the public and private sectors in a detailed manner, specific plans provide for the efficient and focused application of General Plan policies in developing portions of the County.

Every proposed development project must be evaluated for potential environmental effect under regulations set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act. This review ensures that the same

concern for the environment which went into the formulation of the General Plan will be brought to bear on each development project proposed under the Plan. Preparation of an environmental impact report will be required for those projects which may have significant effects on the environment.

The General Plan may be amended to reflect changing community values, conditions, and needs. With a few exceptions, no mandatory element may be amended more frequently than four times during any calendar year. Each amendment may encompass several different changes. General Plan amendments are considered projects and are subject to environmental review under CEQA. The Plan should only be considered for amendment when the County determines, based on new information, that a change is necessary.

Monterey County's Growth Management Policy and its General Plan must be consistent with one another. Data and policies in the Plan supporting the objectives of growth management can provide a solid rationale upon which the regulations may rest.

The Growth Management Policy and the General Plan should be in harmony to avoid conflicts. Competing interests, obligations, and objectives are balanced in the General Plan. Furthermore, certain tools used to implement the General Plan are often used to implement the Growth Management Policy, that is, zoning and subdivision regulations and capital improvements program.

***CHAPTER VII:  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT***

# ***TORO AREA PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT\****

## ***INTRODUCTION***

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is an informational document required by Section 21083 of the California Public Resources Code. On May 25, 1982, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare and circulate an EIR for the new countywide General Plan. The Plan and its EIR were adopted on September 30, 1982.

The Toro Area Plan presents policies which are supplemental to those of the 1982 County General Plan. Similarly, this Toro Area Plan EIR is supplemental to the EIR for the 1982 General Plan and incorporates the findings of that earlier report by reference. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (14 Cal. Admin. Code, Sec. 15037), this EIR assesses the potential of the Toro Area Plan to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Only changes to the adopted 1982 General Plan and Land Use Map, as listed below and on the Environmental Impacts Matrix (Table 6), shall be addressed by this report. The reader is directed to the EIR for the 1982 Plan for an assessment of the environmental effects which could result from the land use designations and general plan policies which were determined by the 1982 countywide General Plan.

## ***PROJECT DESCRIPTION***

This EIR addresses those elements of the Toro Area Plan which could have an impact on the human or biotic environment and which are not discussed in the previous EIR prepared for the countywide General Plan in 1982. Consequently, the "project" discussed in this EIR consists of two elements: a list of policies supplemental to those listed in the 1982 countywide General Plan and a list of changes to the Land Use Map which accompanied the 1982 countywide General Plan. The supplemental policies are listed on pages 39-45 of the Toro Area Plan text. The changes to the 1982 countywide Land Use Map are similarly listed in Table 7 of this report and are mapped in Figure 11. For a discussion of the possible environmental effects of any policy or Land Use Map designation not given in these two tables, the reader is directed to the EIR for the 1982 General Plan.

---

\*The EIR was certified by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors on December 13, 1983. It should be noted that this EIR analyzes the draft Plan; because the Plan as revised by the Board provides for less intensive uses than the draft Plan and will have less impact on the environment, the EIR remains adequate for assessing the environmental effects of the revised Plan.

In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, the format of the "Impacts and Mitigation Measures" section of this report will be to identify those areas of the environment which may be impacted by the full implementation of the Toro Area Plan, and then identify the number and page location of the policy or policies which would either eliminate these impacts or reduce them to an insignificant level. The reader should note that these mitigating policies may be drawn from either the Toro Area Plan or the 1982 General Plan.

## ***ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING***

A description of the Toro Planning Area is given on page 4 of the Toro Area Plan, with brief descriptions of the area's climate, geography, soils, farmlands and water resources on pages 3 through 6. Vegetation and wildlife are generally discussed on page 6.

For a more specific description of the Las Palmas Ranch and River Road areas, the reader is directed to the Final EIR for the River Road Area of Development Concentration/Final EIR for the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan. This is a single document incorporating two EIRs (County file number EIR 80-100 and EIR 81-111), and is available for public review at the County Planning Department, the Steinbeck Library in Salinas, and at the Monterey County Courthouse Annex in Monterey. This document was certified by the Board of Supervisors on December 7, 1982.

## ***IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES***

The EIR for the 1982 General Plan has a list of environmental concerns resulting from the full implementation of the 1982 General Plan. As per the State EIR Guidelines (Section 15000 et seq. of the Public Resources Code) only significant adverse environmental impacts were addressed. It is assumed that beneficial impacts and those impacts having only a negligible impact are not sources of concern.

The 1982 Plan EIR addressed the areas of environmental concern that have been specified for all EIRs by the State Guidelines: Natural Resources, Geology, Soils, Vegetation, Wildlife, Hazards, Air and Water Quality, Noise, and Housing. Concerns in each of these categories are identified and the proposed General Plan policies which would reduce each to an insignificant level are specified. Page numbers locating these policies in the General Plan text are also given.

Table 6 of this report, the Environmental Effects Matrix, addresses only the supplemental policies and Land Use Plan changes which differ from those approved for the General Plan in September of 1982. Table 6 identifies the impacts of these supplemental policies and Land Use Map changes as positive (beneficial) or negative (adverse) impacts. Only the adverse impacts shall be discussed below with the appropriate mitigating General Plan and Area Plan policies referenced.

TABLE 6  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS MATRIX

TABLE 6  
(CONTINUED)

Those proposed policies listed in Table 6 which were found to have adverse impacts (-) are discussed as follows in numerical order.

### ***Water Resources***

#### ***Impact***

6.1.4                   The requirement for all new subdivisions to complete 72-hour pump tests could adversely impact housing by restricting the supply and increasing the cost of housing in Toro.

#### Mitigation Measure

1.       If the number of units lost due to expensive pump tests becomes large enough to affect the cost and supply of housing, then the number could be large enough to support the provision of water service via a private utility. This would be reinforced by supplemental policy 54.1.5, which encourages higher density developments where wastewater treatment facilities are feasible. Current county policy allows developers the alternative of providing off-site water through the formation of a "mutual water system," where a specific number of lots is served by one or more wells. This option would distribute the costs of testing over a larger number of lots.

### ***Vegetation***

#### ***Impact***

7.2.3                   The policy discouraging the removal of mature trees could have an adverse impact on housing by reducing the lot yield of future subdivisions, thereby restricting housing supply.

#### Mitigation Measure

1.       Impacts to the supply of housing could be mitigated by the County's policy of density transfer within each proposed development, and by policy 58.1.5 of the 1982 Plan which allows the granting of density bonuses in return for affordable housing units.

### ***Land Use***

#### ***Impacts***

26.1.9.1               The policy to prohibit development on ridgelines could adversely impact housing by limiting supply.

- 26.1.11.1 The policy of encouraging clustered residential development where appropriate could adversely impact soils and hydrology, since concentrated development would result in concentrated runoff and an increased incidence of erosion. Visual impacts could also result from clustered development, although the increased open space allowed by such development could have a beneficial visual impact. Increased noise, the need for sewer and water utilities, water quality degradation, and more concentrated traffic flow are additional adverse impacts which could result from clustered development.
- 26.1.18.1 This policy defers further development on Corral de Tierra Road until improvements to that road, including pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle access, are constructed. An adverse impact which could result from this deferment would be a short-term restriction in housing supply which may affect housing cost in Toro. However, it must be understood that this policy is itself a mitigation measure in preventing a worsening of the existing traffic problems on Corral de Tierra Road.
- 26.1.20.1 The policy of encouraging minimized and unobtrusive levels of outdoor lighting could adversely impact public safety by restricting nighttime visibility, security, and emergency vehicle access.
- 29.3.5 This policy prohibits industrial land uses from the Toro Planning Area and could further impact traffic congestion by preventing such land uses from locating closer to employees.

#### Mitigation Measures

1. Housing impacts resulting from ridgeline development could be mitigated by policy 26.1.12 of the 1982 Plan which allows the transfer of development rights to protect open space, and by policy 58.1.5 of the 1982 Plan which allows the granting of density bonuses in return for affordable housing units.
2. Soils impacts due to the increased erosion hazard resulting from clustered residential development would be mitigated by the enforcement of the County's Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapter 18.12 of County Code) and Grading Ordinance (Chapter 16.12 of County Code). Policy 3.1.3 of the 1982 Plan (described in mitigation measure #1 above) would also reduce the potential for development where soils hazards exist.
3. Hydrologic impacts as a result of the concentrated drainage typical of higher-density developments would be mitigated by

policy 5.1.2 of the 1982 Plan, which states that all development shall minimize runoff and maintain groundwater recharge. In addition, supplemental policy 5.1.3 of the Toro Area Plan requires that all new developments in Toro be designed to retain all runoff on-site for groundwater recharge. This would theoretically eliminate concerns for concentrated runoff downstream of these developments.

4. Visual impacts resulting from clustered developments would be mitigated by policy 26.1.7 of the 1982 Plan which states that, where appropriate, the County shall develop standards to control development siting, design, and landscaping. Supplemental policies 26.1.6.1, 26.1.7.1, and 26.1.9.1 will provide additional mitigation. The first requires that development in those areas of Toro identified as having high visual sensitivity be accompanied by landscaping and design review plans. The second states that the County shall encourage the use of optional design and improvement standards as described in article VI of Chapter 19 of the County Code. The last of these policies states that development on ridgelines and hilltops shall be prohibited.
5. Water quality impacts resulting from clustered developments would be mitigated by policy 17.3.13 of the 1982 Plan which states that drainage details for any road or driveway shall include erosion control measures, and policy 21.2.3 which requires developments above a certain size to install and maintain grease and silt traps in their drainage systems.
6. Noise impacts resulting from clustered developments would be mitigated by policies 22.2.1, 22.2.2, and 22.2.3 of the 1982 Plan. The first policy requires all new development to be designed to conform to a given noise level. The second policy requires sound-proofing construction as per the Uniform Building Code, and the third requires environmental review of all proposed new development which may increase noise levels greater than those indicated in Table 6 of the 1982 Plan.
7. Traffic impacts resulting from the more concentrated vehicle flows generated by cluster developments would be mitigated by supplemental policy 39.1.1.1, requiring the County to work with the state and the local community in order to alleviate congestion on Highway 68. Supplemental policies 39.1.1.2, 39.2.2.1, and 39.2.2.2 also specify road improvements to Highway 68, Corral de Tierra Road, and San Benancio Road which would significantly reduce congestion on those roads.

8. Impacts resulting from the sewer services which cluster developments require would be mitigated by policy 21.3.3 of the 1982 Plan which states that no new development shall be approved without proof that an adequate waste disposal system can be developed. Policy 54.1.1 of the same plan requires sewage treatment plants for residential development within areas of development concentration. Policies 54.1.2, 54.1.3, and 54.1.4 on the same page require the County to explore several alternatives for the financing of such facilities.
9. Impacts resulting from the water service which cluster developments require would be reduced by policy 53.1.4 of the 1982 Plan which requires all new development, where feasible, to connect to existing water service providers which are public utilities. Supplemental policy 21.1.6.1 of the Toro Plan states that the County shall require water quality analysis for all new domestic wells. Supplemental policy 6.1.4 also states that 72-hour pump tests shall be required of all new subdivision water supply wells in the Toro area.
10. Impacts to the supply of housing which may result from the deferment of development until certain road improvements are made would be mitigated by supplemental policies 39.2.2.1 and 39.2.2.2 which require the County to complete the necessary road improvements.
11. Impacts to public safety as a result of reduced outdoor lighting would be mitigated somewhat by policy 46.2.1 of the 1982 Plan which encourages the County to support organized neighborhood crime prevention programs and to conduct residential security surveys. Policy 17.4.4 also requires that house numbers be posted where visible from the street. This requirement of all new residential developments would assist emergency vehicles which would otherwise require street lighting to render house numbers visible.
12. The high commute-hour traffic volumes which would be sustained by the policy to prohibit industrial land uses in the Toro area would be mitigated by supplemental policy 38.1.3.1. This policy encourages the staggering of work hours to ease congestion on major routes. Supplemental policy 41.2.3 also states that the County shall study the feasibility of mass transit options in Toro, providing residents with a viable commute alternative.

## ***Transportation***

### ***Impacts***

39.2.5.1 This policy, which prohibits new access points onto Highway 68 and discourages them on Laureles Grade, River Road, and Corral de Tierra Road, could adversely impact emergency vehicle access.

40.3.4 The requirement to encourage underground utilities for new developments could adversely impact the housing supply by increasing the cost per unit of housing in the Toro area. While a negligible impact in itself, this may be part of a cumulative impact on housing in which there are several other contributing factors.

### **Mitigation Measures**

1. Impacts to emergency vehicle access resulting from the prohibition of new access points on Highway 68 and Laureles Grade would be mitigated by supplemental policy 46.1.2, which would improve emergency access and facilities throughout Toro.
2. Housing impacts resulting from increased costs would be mitigated by policy 58.1.5 of the 1982 Plan, which allows the granting of density bonuses in return for affordable housing units.

## ***Public Services and Utilities***

### ***Impacts***

46.1.2 The policy to improve emergency access throughout the Toro area could have adverse impacts on vegetation, wildlife, and visual resources as a result of extensive grading and roadwork in areas having difficult access due to topography and vegetative cover.

54.1.5 The policy of requiring relatively higher densities in areas where wastewater treatment facilities are feasible could adversely impact hydrology, visual resources, noise, and transportation.

### **Mitigation Measures**

1. Impacts to vegetation, wildlife, and visual resources which could result from extensive roadwork would be mitigated by policy 7.2.1 of the 1982 Plan, which states that landowners and developers (including the County itself) shall be encouraged to preserve existing terrain and natural vegetation.

2. Impacts to hydrology, visual resources, noise, and transportation which would result from higher density residential developments would be mitigated by measures #2 through 9 under the Land Use heading of this chapter.

## ***Housing***

### ***Impact***

57.1.4 This policy requires the County to encourage the provision of a wide range of housing in the Toro area, including multi-family housing. The higher residential densities of some of these housing alternatives could adversely impact hydrology, visual resources, water quality, noise, and transportation.

### Mitigation Measure

1. Impacts to hydrology, visual resources, water quality, noise, and transportation which would result from higher density residential developments would be mitigated by measures 2 through 9 under the Land Use portion of this chapter.

### ***Land Use Plan Map*** (refer to Figure 11 and Table 7)

#### Modification:

7. This reduction of the ultimate lot yield of the 2,200-acre Corral de Tierra area by 1,125 units could be construed to have an adverse impact on the supply of housing and the cost of housing countywide.
13. The change in designation for this 66-acre parcel would increase its lot yield from 0 to 66, resulting in possible adverse impacts to hydrology, transportation, and public services and facilities.
14. This reduction of the ultimate lot yield of the 467-acre Buena Vista area by 1,868 units could be construed to have an adverse impact on the supply of housing and the cost of housing countywide.
16. The reduction of the ultimate lot yield of the 1,523 acre Las Palmas area by approximately 550 units could be construed to have an adverse impact on the supply of housing and the cost of housing countywide.

## Mitigation Measures

1. The significance of the adverse impacts resulting from proposed Land Use Plan Map modifications #7, 14, and 16 is difficult to determine, as it was never the intent of the 1982 countywide General Plan Land Use Map to propose site-by-site lot yields. The scale of the countywide Land Use Map, in fact, makes such determinations practically impossible. In fulfilling its purpose to be more specific in designating land uses and densities, the Toro Area Plan should be expected to reduce lot yields when such limiting factors as circulation, water supply, and geological hazards are considered. However, any impacts to the supply of housing would be mitigated by policy 58.1.5 of the 1982 Plan which states that density bonuses may be granted in exchange for affordable housing units.
2. The impacts to hydrology, transportation, and public services and facilities which could result from the increased residential allowed by modification 13 to the Land Use Map would be mitigated by measures 2 through 9 as discussed in the Land Use section of this chapter.

Table 7 shows the ultimate lot yields that would be permitted under the changes to the adopted 1982 countywide Plan Land Use Map compared to the existing designations. It is important for the reader to understand that the intent of these sixteen changes is to refine the 1982 Land Use Map to more realistically reflect the optimum lot yield of the Planning Area. Consequently, most of the changes are a reduction in density from the 1982 Plan.

Lot yields based on Land Use Plan designations are, not surprisingly, higher than the actual number of lots that will be created with full build-out. This is primarily due to on-site limitations that will be evaluated on a site-by-site basis during the subdivision review process. In addition, individual choice on the part of developers and owners of large parcels may further reduce the final lot yield of the Toro Planning Area.

### ***UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS***

In spite of the mitigation measures proposed in the preceding section, there will be several significant adverse environmental impacts resulting from these supplemental changes to the 1982 General Plan's policies and Land Use Map. These are listed by subject heading as follows:

TABLE 7  
PROPOSED LAND USE MAP CHANGES

FIGURE 11  
LOCATION OF PROPOSED LAND USE MAP CHANGES

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Vegetation:                     | 1. The proliferation of non-native tree species as the result of a non-selective tree preservation policy.                                    |
| Wildlife:                       | 2. Degradation of wildlife habitat as a result of concentrated development.   |
| Visual Resources:               | 3. The visual impacts of concentrated development.  |
| Transportation:                 | 4. Increased traffic congestion on major roads as a result of more concentrated development.  |
| Public Services and Facilities: | 5. Increased demand for public sewer and water utilities as a result of more concentrated residential development.                            |
| Housing:                        | 6. Housing costs in Toro may be affected by increased development costs and reduced availability due to a significant reduction in lot yield. |

These impacts are supplemental to those resulting from the 1982 countywide Plan itself, as listed in Table 12 on page 196 of that plan.

### ***IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES TO THE ENVIRONMENT***

Those irreversible changes which would have resulted from the implementation of the 1982 countywide General Plan are discussed and hereby incorporated into this EIR by reference. Given the overall reduction in the total number of housing units from the 1982 Plan to the Toro Area Plan (10,094 units), the irreversible changes to the environment discussed in the EIR for the 1982 Plan would be significantly reduced as a result of the implementation of the Toro Area Plan as proposed.

### ***SHORT-TERM USES VERSUS LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY***

This section of the EIR is intended to discuss the need both for growth and development, and for the conservation of resources in the future. The EIR for the 1982 countywide General Plan discusses the short-term uses versus long-term productivity of that plan and its Land Use Map on page 197 of that plan. These are hereby incorporated by reference. Given the overall reduction in the total number of housing units from the 1982 plan to the Toro Area Plan, the balance between short-term uses and long-term productivity as discussed in the 1982 Plan EIR would not be worsened by the

implementation of the Toro Area Plan. It is reasonable to assume, in fact, that this balance would greatly improve.

## ***GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS***

The tendency for the 1982 countywide General Plan to induce growth and development as provided for in its policies and Land Use Map is discussed on pages 198-199 of the 1982 Plan EIR. Those growth-inducing impacts which apply to the Toro area are generally concerns for increased development pressure once limiting constraints (i.e., water and sewer systems) are removed.

In considering the amendments to the 1982 Plan's policies and Land Use Map, as contained in the Toro Area Plan, no new growth-inducing impacts can be foreseen. While it may be argued that the supplemental policies in the Toro Plan may lead to higher-density developments in some portions of the Planning Area, the overall density shall remain unchanged. It may also be argued that the amendments to the Land Use Map could so limit future supplies of available housing countywide that development pressure would increase elsewhere in the County. This is highly unlikely, now that a new general plan has just been adopted countywide, with more detailed area plans soon to follow. Any redirected residential growth, for example, in the Cachagua or North County Planning Areas, must conform to the 1982 countywide General Plan and the other area plans.

## ***ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT***

1. ***No Project.*** Under this alternative to the project discussed in this EIR, the supplemental policies and modifications to the 1982 Land Use Map would be discarded. The 1982 countywide General Plan would then be used exclusively for policies to direct growth in Toro and the current Land Use Map would remain unchanged. The residential densities then allowed would be much greater than under the Toro Area Plan. The impacts discussed in the EIR for the countywide plan would then be maximized in the Toro area.
2. ***Reversion to 1960 Toro Master Plan.*** This alternative is a reversion to the plan in effect prior to the adoption of the 1982 countywide General Plan. Consequently, the effects of this alternative are discussed in the 1982 Plan EIR as that project's "No Project" alternative.
3. ***Las Palmas Ranch Alternative Plans.*** The EIR for Las Palmas Ranch (item #16 on Figure 11 and Table 7), certified by the Board of Supervisors on December 7, 1982, identifies two project alternatives (page 109 of the Las Palmas Ranch/ River Road ADC EIR). The discussion of these alternatives and their impacts is hereby incorporated into this report by reference.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **GLOSSARY**

**ACTIVE FAULT:** A fault along which there has been displacement during the last 11,000 years.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND USES:** Those uses of an agricultural nature which occur on farmlands designated as prime, of statewide importance, unique, or of local importance. Agricultural land uses also include grazing and any other uses which occur on properties designated as "agricultural" on the area plan land use map.

**AMBAG:** Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments--a voluntary association of local governments organized under the California Joint Powers Authority for the purpose of providing regional planning services in the areas of the economy, transportation, land use, housing, air quality, and water quality.

**AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT):** The average number of vehicles traveling (in both directions) on a particular section of road during a 24-hour period.

**BROADLEAF EVERGREEN:** A plant community encompassing the evergreen oak woodlands and forests whose representative species include madrone, tan oak, live oak, blue oak, and valley oak.

**CEQA:** California Environmental Quality Act of 1970--a public law requiring all public agencies (state and local) to prepare and certify an environmental impact report on any project they propose to carry out which may have a significant effect on the environment.

**CHAPARRAL:** An evergreen plant community of drought-adapted shrubs usually found on dry slopes and ridges.

**COUNTY SCENIC ROUTE:** A segment of roadway that has been officially designated by the Director of California Department of Transportation.

**DEVELOPABLE LANDS:** Those lands which are considered developable with regard to the County's policies, criteria, and standards as well as state law.

**DEVELOPMENT:** Any activity which occurs on land or water that involves the placement of any structure, the discharge or disposal of any waste material, grading, dredging, or mineral extraction. This definition includes any change in density and/or intensity of use including the subdivision of land, construction of any structure, and the harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes.

## ***APPENDIX B***

### ***MONTEREY COUNTY GENERAL PLAN BACKGROUND REPORTS***

Monterey County Planning Department, Agricultural Background Study of Monterey County, January, 1982.

Monterey County Planning Department, Current Holding Capacity Analysis of Monterey County, January, 1981.

Monterey County Planning Department, Demographic Analysis of Monterey County, April, 1980.

Monterey County Planning Department, Environmental Constraints Analysis of Monterey County: Part II--Flood, Fire and Miscellaneous Hazards; Emergency Preparedness, April, 1981.

Monterey County Planning Department, Environmental Constraints Analysis of Monterey County: Part III--Air and Water Quality, April, 1981.

Monterey County Planning Department, Environmental Constraints Analysis of Monterey County: Part IV--Noise Hazards, March, 1981.

Monterey County Planning Department, Evaluations of Past Planning Documents, December, 1979.

Monterey County Planning Department, Existing Land Use Analysis of Monterey County, May, 1980.

Monterey County Planning Department, Fiscal Capacity Analysis of Monterey County, April, 1981.

Monterey County Planning Department, Historical Overview of Monterey County, August, 1981.

## ***APPENDIX C***

### ***SELECTED REFERENCES***

- Alden Barstad and Associates, Las Palmas Ranch ADC Policy Specific Plan, 1982.
- Burkland and Associates, Geotechnical Study for the Seismic Safety Element, 1975.
- California Department of Transportation et.al., Route 68 Corridor Study, 1982.
- California Department of Transportation, Traffic Counts/ADTs-Highway 68, computer printout, October, 1981.
- California Office of Planning and Research, General Plan Guidelines, September, 1980.
- California Planning, Zoning, and Development Laws, 1983 Edition.
- Cooper and Clark, Las Palmas Ranch Geotechnical Evaluation (2 Vols.), 1980.
- Dryden Engineers, Highway 68 Level of Service Analysis, 1981.
- Environmental Management Consultants, General Development Report - Markham Ranch, September, 1981.
- A.J. Gianascol, Comments Regarding the Anderson-Nichols Final Report "El Toro Area Groundwater Study", October, 1981.
- A.J. Gianascol, Questions Concerning the Final Report "El Toro Area Groundwater Study", November, 1981.
- Grunwald, Crawford, and Associates, Final Environmental Impact Report for the River Road Area of Development Concentration, 1982.
- Grunwald, Crawford, and Associates, Las Palmas Ranch (Existing Policy) Specific Plan, 1982.
- Madrone Associates, Final Environmental Impact Report - Laureles Grade Area, July, 1979.
- Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, El Toro Area Groundwater Study, Final Report, prepared by Anderson-Nichols and Co., October, 1981.
- Monterey County Planning Department, Toro Area Master Plan, 1960.