

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

919B



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:  
May 26, 2010

**SUBJECT: PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 / VARIANCE NO. 1839** – EA41927 – Applicant: Frank Aglio – Engineer/Representative: Markham Development Management Group, Inc. - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **REQUEST: Plot Plan No. 23376** proposes a winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. In addition, the project proposes a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,861 square foot gathering room, a 1-bedroom 4,659 square foot Bed & Breakfast facility, a 7,450 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 192 square foot guard office, a 400 square foot dance facility, and to permit an existing garage/storage building. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 108 parking spaces and an area for overflow parking. The project also proposes 134 special events including 99 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts. **Variance No. 1839** proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet. APN: 942-050-004. (Quasi Judicial)

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:**

**RECEIVE AND FILE** The Notice of Decision for the above referenced case acted on by the Planning Commission on May 5, 2010.

The Planning Department recommended Approval; and,

Ron Goldman  
Planning Director

Initials:  
RG:vc

(continued on attached page)

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
DATE 5/20/10  
Tina Grande  
Departmental Concurrence

- Dept't Recomm.:  Consent  Policy
- Per Exec. Ofc.:  Consent  Policy

Prev. Agn. Ref. | District: Third | Agenda Number: 1.5

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

Re: **APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 / VARIANCE NO. 1839**

Page 2 of 2

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**ADOPTED** a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41927**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

**APPROVED** **VARIANCE NO. 1839**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**APPROVED** the **APPLICANT'S APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376**, subject to the attached conditions of approval and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

**APPROVED** **PLOT PLAN NO. 23376**, subject to the attached conditions of approval and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**BACKGROUND:**

Plot Plan No. 23376 was approved at Director's Hearing on 7/27/09 with a reduction in weddings from 130 to 30 per year. The applicant appealed the Planning Director's Decision to reduce the weddings and the decision to end weekend operating hours at 9:00 PM. The appeal was set for hearing with the Planning Commission on 9/30/09. Project revisions were made over the course of several months and on 5/05/10, the Planning Commission approved the project and appeal and allowed wedding events to increase from 30 to 99 weddings per year with an opportunity to increase to 130 weddings per year if no significant noise complaints are received, and also allowed weekend hours of operation to extend to 10:00 PM. During the months prior to the project being approved at Planning Commission, the applicant was requested to reinstate the variance to reduce the setback requirement of an existing storage building from 50 feet to 20 feet from the side yard property line. The applicant complied with the Planning Commission's request to reinstate the variance and the project was re-advertised to include the variance application. This caused the need for the project with the variance to be placed on the Board of Supervisor's Receive and File agenda.

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER MAY 5, 2010  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

I. **AGENDA ITEM 7.8: APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 / VARIANCE NO. 1839** - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration - Applicant: Kelly Smith - Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) - Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area - Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way - 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **APN: 942-050-004** - (Continued from 1/13/10 and 4/7/10) - (Quasi-judicial)

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The plot plan proposes a winery, bed & breakfast facility and special events facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. The project proposes a 4,288 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,950 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 9,205 square foot 10 room bed & breakfast facility, a 192 square foot guard office, a 690 square foot storage building and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project proposes 108 parking spaces. The appeal request is for the increase of wedding events from 30 to 130 and that the hours of operation of wedding events are extended from 9:00 PM to 10:00 PM on Friday and Saturday. The project also proposes 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts. The variance proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet.

III. **MEETING SUMMARY**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Jeff Horn. Ph: (951) 955-4641 or E-mail [jhorn@rctlma.org](mailto:jhorn@rctlma.org)

The following spoke in favor of the subject proposal:

Sam Alhadeff, Applicant's Representative, Temecula, CA 92591

Larry Markham, Applicant's Representative, 41635 Enterprise Circle, Temecula, CA 92590-5614

No one spoke in a neutral position or in opposition of the subject proposal.

IV. **CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

Several project revisions, including: the number of weddings allowed, site plan revisions, and conditions of approval.

V. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 4-0 (Commissioner Zuppardo absent) took the following action:

**ADOPTED** a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41927**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study, and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

**APPROVED** **VARIANCE NO. 1839**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report;

**APPROVED** the **APPLICANTS APPEAL OF NO. 23376**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER MAY 5, 2010  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

**APPROVED PLOT PLAN NO. 23376**, subject to the attached conditions of approval and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**VI. CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at [cgriffin@rctlma.org](mailto:cgriffin@rctlma.org).

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER APRIL 7, 2010  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 7.2: APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 / VARIANCE NO. 1839** - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration - Applicant: Kelly Smith - Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) - Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area - Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way - 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **APN: 942-050-004** - (Quasi-judicial) (Continued from 1/13/10)
- II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**  
The plot plan proposes a winery, bed & breakfast facility and special events facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. The project proposes a 4,288 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,950 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 9,205 square foot 10 room bed & breakfast facility, a 192 square foot guard office, a 690 square foot storage building and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project proposes 108 parking spaces. The appeal request is for the increase of wedding events from 30 to 130 and that the hours of operation of wedding events are extended from 9:00 PM to 10:00 PM on Friday and Saturday. The project also proposes 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts. The variance proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet.
- III. MEETING SUMMARY**  
The following staff presented the subject proposal:  
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly, Ph: (951) 955-1888 or E-mail [khesterl@rctlma.org](mailto:khesterl@rctlma.org)
- The following spoke in favor of the subject proposal:  
Larry Markham, Applicant's Representative, 41635 Enterprise Circle N, Ste. B, Temecula, CA 92590
- No one spoke in a neutral position or in opposition of the subject proposal.
- IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**  
Applicant asked to provide evidence that 75% planting can be achieved among other things.
- V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**  
The Planning Commission, by a vote of 4-0 (Commissioner Roth absent); continued the subject proposal with discussion to May 5, 2010.
- VI. CD**  
The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at [cgriffin@rctlma.org](mailto:cgriffin@rctlma.org).

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER JANUARY 13, 2010  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 3.1: APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - APN(s): 942-050-004. (Continued from 9/30/09, 10/28/09 and 12/2/09). (Quasi-Judicial)

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 103 parking spaces. The project will have 65 special events comprised of 30 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

**III. MEETING SUMMARY**

Subject proposal did not require a presentation.

Project Planner, Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or e-mail [khesterl@rctlma.org](mailto:khesterl@rctlma.org).

No one spoke in favor, neutral or in opposition of the subject proposal.

**IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

NONE

**V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 4-0 (Commissioner Porras absent), continued the subject proposal to April 7, 2010.

**VI. CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at [cgriffin@rctlma.org](mailto:cgriffin@rctlma.org).

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER DECEMBER 2, 2009  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.2: APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration - Applicant: Kelly Smith - Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) - Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area - Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way - 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **APN: 942-050-004** - (Continued from 9/30/09 and 10/28/09) (Quasi-Judicial)

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 103 parking spaces. The project will have 65 special events comprised of 30 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

III. **MEETING SUMMARY**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner, Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or e-mail [khesterl@rctlma.org](mailto:khesterl@rctlma.org).

No one spoke in favor, neutral or in opposition of the subject proposal.

IV. **CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

NONE

V. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0, continued the subject proposal to January 13, 2010.

VI. **CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at [cgriffin@rctlma.org](mailto:cgriffin@rctlma.org).

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER OCTOBER 28, 2009  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 6.2: APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - APN(s): 942-050-004. (Continued from 9/30/09). (Quasi-Judicial)

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 103 parking spaces. The project will have 65 special events comprised of 30 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

**III. MEETING SUMMARY**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner, Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or e-mail [khesterl@rctlma.org](mailto:khesterl@rctlma.org).

The following did not wish to speak but would like to be recorded as in favor of the subject proposal:

Larry Markham, Applicant's Representative, 41635 Enterprise Circle N., Ste. B., Temecula, California 92590

**IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

NONE

**V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0, continued the subject proposal to December 2, 2009.

**VI. CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at [cgriffin@rctlma.org](mailto:cgriffin@rctlma.org).

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTE ORDER SEPTEMBER 30, 2009  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER**

**I. AGENDA ITEM 6.3: APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** - Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration - Applicant: Kelly Smith - Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) - Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area - Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way - 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - APN: 942-050-004 - (Quasi-Judicial)

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 103 parking spaces. The project will have 65 special events comprised of 30 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

**III. MEETING SUMMARY**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner, Kinika Hesterly, 951-955-0879 or email [khesterl@rctlma.org](mailto:khesterl@rctlma.org).

No one spoke in neutral or in opposition of the subject proposal.

**IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

NONE

**V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0, continued subject proposal to October 28, 2009.

**VI. CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Chantell Griffin, Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-3251 or E-mail at [cgriffin@rctlma.org](mailto:cgriffin@rctlma.org).

Agenda Item No.:  
Area Plan: Southwest  
Zoning Area: Rancho California  
Supervisory District: Third  
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly  
Planning Commission: May 5, 2010  
Continued From: 4/07/10, 1/13/10, 12/2/09,  
10/28/09, 9/30/09

Plot Plan No. 23376  
Variance No. 1839  
E.A.: 41927  
Applicant: Frank Aglio  
Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley  
Development

## COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM STAFF REPORT

On May 5, 2010, the Planning Department recommended to continue the project to a subsequent hearing and the Planning Commission adopted a mitigated negative declaration, approved the variance, applicant's appeal and plot plan. This approval included the increase in the number of weddings per year from 30 to 99 (further discussion is included in the issues of concern section below). Also, per the Planning Commission, the applicant would be allowed to modify the site plan after hearing to reflect how the project will meet the 75% vineyard planting requirement in Ordinance No. 348. Though changes to the site plan will be made, no further Land Development Committee (LDC) review will be required per the Planning Commission.

The project description in the Environmental Assessment was changed per revisions that were discussed at Planning Commission.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION REVISED AT PLANNING COMMISSION:

**Plot Plan No. 23376** proposes a winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. In addition, the project proposes a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,861 square foot gathering room, a 1-bedroom 4,659 square foot Bed & Breakfast facility, a 7,450 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 192 square foot guard office, a 400 square foot dance facility, and to permit an existing garage/storage building. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 108 parking spaces and an area for overflow parking. The project also proposes 134 special events including 99 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

**Variance No. 1839** proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet.

### ISSUES OF CONCERN RESOLVED AT PLANNING COMMISSION:

#### **1. Number of Events - Resolved**

99 weddings per year are allowed, with the possibility of increasing the number of weddings to 130 per year if significant complaints are not received.

#### **2. Extend hours from 9:00 PM to 10:00 PM - Resolved**

Hours of operation for special events are allowed to extend until 10 p.m. Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

#### **3. 75% Planting Requirement - Resolved**

The applicant will provide proof that the 75% vineyard planting will be achieved.

#### **4. 400 square foot Permanent Building – Resolved**



The structure will be finished within 120 days of project approval. Once this structure is built, the noise will be reduced at the project site.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**ADOPTION** of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41927**, based on the findings incorporated in the initial study and the conclusion that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and,

**APPROVAL** of **VARIANCE NO. 1839**, based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

**APPROVAL** of the **APPLICANT'S APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376**, subject to the attached conditions of approval and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

**APPROVAL** of **PLOT PLAN NO. 23376**, subject to the attached conditions of approval and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

Additional variance findings were presented at Planning Commission on May 5, 2010.

**FINDINGS:** The following findings are in addition to those incorporated in the summary of findings, which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site contains an existing structure which is located twenty (20) feet from the side property line. Ord. 348, Section 14.74 d. (7), requires a side yard setback of fifty feet. A variance application has been submitted to allow the setback for the existing structure to vary from the required setback by thirty (30) feet.
2. The proposed variance was submitted based upon the topography restraints of the land. Significant alteration to the parcel would be necessary to locate the barn elsewhere on-site.
3. Surrounding properties have varying topography. Parcels to the west are more flat, the parcel to the east consists of a knoll. The subject parcel consists of steepness near the entrance and east side of the parcel and significant lowering towards the rear and west. Based upon the topography of the lot, a variance is required for the existing storage building to remain and to allow a reduction of the 50 foot setback requirement described in Ordinance No. 348, Article XIVb, Section 14.74, item d.(7).
4. The variance request to allow a reduction in the 50' setback to 20,' will eliminate the potential to disturb the existing topography of the site and location of the subject storage building which, if moved, would cause vineyard planting areas to face being damaged or destroyed as well as impact proposed and existing buildings at the project site. A variance is required because of Ordinance No. 348, Article XIVb, Section 14.74, item e.(7), which states that minimum setbacks shall be 50.'

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

Additional support letters were received:

- a. One (1) letter of support was received from Bill Wilson, President of the Temecula Valley Winegrower's Association, not dated.
- b. One (1) letter of support was received from Ed Meyers, dated May 3, 2010.

Agenda Item No.: 7.8  
Area Plan: Southwest  
Zoning Area: Rancho California  
Supervisorial District: Third  
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly  
Planning Commission: May 5, 2010  
Continued From: 4/07/10, 1/13/09, 12/2/09,  
10/28/09, 9/30/09

Plot Plan No. 23376  
Variance No. 1839  
E.A.: 41927  
Applicant: Frank Aglio  
Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley  
Development

## COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

**Plot Plan No. 23376** proposes a winery, bed & breakfast facility and special events facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. The project proposes a 4,288 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,950 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 9,205 square foot 10 room bed & breakfast facility, a 192 square foot guard office, a 690 square foot storage building and a 400 square foot permanent structure to be used for events before the banquet hall is constructed and for small gatherings afterwards. The project proposes 108 parking spaces and an area for overflow parking, 130 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

**Variance No. 1839** proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet.

The project site is located in the community of Rancho California of the Southwest Area Plan in Western Riverside County; more specifically, southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way.

### REASON FOR THE APPEAL

The project was approved at Director's Hearing on July 27, 2009. However, the special events allowed were reduced from 165 to 65. More specifically, the number of weddings was reduced by 100 (from 130 to 30). The applicant is appealing the limitation of 30 weddings per year and the hours of operation for wedding events being limited to 9:00 PM. The applicant requests that 130 weddings per year be allowed and that the hours of operation of wedding events be extended to 10:00 PM on Friday and Saturday.

### ISSUES OF CONCERN (4):

**1. Number of Events - Unresolved**

The appropriate number of events needs to be determined.

**2. Extended hours from 9:00 PM to 10:00 PM - Unresolved**

**3. 75% Planting Requirement - Unresolved**

The applicant is required to provide proof that 75% vineyard planting can be reached and maintained and, as of this writing, this proof has not been provided.

**4. 400 square foot Permanent Building – Unresolved**

The timing on when this structure must be constructed and finalized needs to be determined.

Once this structure is built, the noise will be reduced at the project site.

**FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**Planning Commission April 7, 2010**

The project was continued to allow the applicant to provide: neighborhood outreach, proof that the 75% planting requirement could be met, and a schedule of upcoming events.

**Planning Commission January 13, 2010**

This project was continued to allow the revised exhibits, with the bed & breakfast addition, to be transmitted to Land Development Committee departments for review.

**Planning Commission December 2, 2009**

The project was continued pending the applicant's submittal of project revisions, including the addition of a bed and breakfast facility and revising the site plan to indicate the change in use of existing buildings that will be proposed for storage and wine production.

**Planning Commission October 28, 2009**

The project was continued based on the results of the site visit conducted on October 13, 2009. At this site visit, attended by the applicant, representative, County staff, and a member of the Planning Commission. The applicant was asked to make revisions to the current proposal. These revisions include: adding a Bed & Breakfast facility, removing safety hazards from the parking area, utilizing existing buildings for wine production and storage, and proposing a variance application. As of this writing, the applicant is pending submittal of these revisions to the project.

**Planning Commission September 30, 2009**

The project was continued at the request of the Planning Commission on September 30, 2009. The Planning Commission requested a site visit to be attended by the applicant, County staff, and a member of the Planning Commission.

**Director's Hearing July 27, 2009**

On July 27, 2009, the Planning Director modified the project's conditions of approval. The number of weddings allowed was reduced from 130 to 30. The following changes were also made: no outdoor receptions will be allowed on or after July 1, 2010; all receptions shall be held in the banquet hall on or after July 1, 2010; if the banquet hall has not been constructed by July 1, 2010, no special events are allowed at the site (including but not limited to, weddings, business meetings/small group gatherings, jazz concerts, movie nights); no special events, with the exception of small meetings and rehearsal dinners, will be allowed in the outdoor pavilion after July 1, 2010; no outdoor special events are allowed during the months of November, December, January and February; the temporary dance (outdoor) pavilion shall be constructed prior to November 1, 2009, all music and dancing associated with the outdoor receptions shall occur within the temporary dance pavilion; if the temporary dance pavilion has not been constructed by November 1, 2009, no outdoor special events are allowed at the site; the existing trailers shall be removed from the site on or before July 1, 2010; the structures to be removed include the two trailers located southeast portion of the site and two trailers in the southwest portion of the site; parking was revised to reflect maximum 150 guests allowed.

The following special events shall be allowed:

- 30 weddings with a maximum of 150 guests.
- With the exception of the jazz concerts and movie nights, the special events shall be held indoors.

- Weddings can be held everyday between the hours of 4:00 pm and 9:00 pm.
- The small group gatherings shall occur Monday through Thursday between the hours of 11:00am - 2:00pm and 4:00pm – 9:00pm.
- The family movie nights will occur on Wednesday nights between 6:00pm – 9:00pm
- Jazz concerts will be on Saturday night between 5:00pm – 9:00pm

The allowance for special events is dependent on the remodel of the winery production room. Per the Citrus Vineyard zone, incidental commercial uses (i.e. special events), shall be secondary to the agricultural use of the site.

The following condition was removed at Director's Hearing (COA 20. PLANNING. 7- Banquet Hall):

The conditions of approval have been modified as noted above, and are included within the staff report package.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Existing General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5):    | Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum)  |
| 2. Surrounding General Plan Land Use (Ex. #5): | Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum)  |
| 3. Existing Zoning (Ex. #2):                   | Citrus Vineyard (C/V)   |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #2):                | Citrus Vineyard (C/V)   |
| 5. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1):                 | Oak Meadows Special Occasion Facility   |
| 6. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1):              | Single family residences to the east, south, and west and vacant land to the north.       |
| 7. Project Data:                               | Total Gross Acreage: 10.25<br>Total Buildings: 8<br>Total Building Square Footage: 24,575 |
| 8. Environmental Concerns:                     | Mitigated Negative Declaration  |

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**DISCUSS AND CONTINUE PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 AND VARIANCE NO. 1839 to June 2, 2010.**

**CONCLUSIONS:**

1. The proposed project is in conformance with the Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) Land Use Designation.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area.
3. The proposed project is consistent with the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, or with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
4. The public's health, safety and general welfare are protected through project design.
5. The proposed project is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.

- 
6. The variance request, submitted due to the topography and location of the subject property, will allow the existing building used as a storage/barn facility to remain at its current location without causing disturbance to the existing topography and proposed and existing location of buildings used for the proposed special occasion facility.
  7. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
  8. The proposed project will not preclude reserve design for the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

**FINDINGS:** The following findings are in addition to those incorporated in the summary of findings, which is incorporated herein by reference.

1. The project site is designated Agriculture: Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum) on the Southwest Area Plan.
2. The proposed winery, vineyard, tasting room, and special occasion facility is a permitted use in the Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) designation.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Agriculture: Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum).
4. The zoning for the subject site is Citrus Vineyard (C/V).
5. The proposed winery, vineyard, tasting room, and special occasion facility, is a permitted use, subject to approval of a plot plan in the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) zone.
6. The proposed winery, vineyard, tasting room, and special occasion facility, is consistent with the development standards set forth in the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) zone.
7. The project site is located within the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area. The proposed project provides vineyards within 75% of the site, produces over 3,500 gallons of wine annually, and is consistent with the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area Design Guidelines. The proposed project is consistent with the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area.
8. The project site contains an existing structure which is located twenty (20) feet from the side property line. Ord. 348, Section 14.74 d. (7), requires a side yard setback of fifty feet. A variance application has been submitted to allow the setback for the existing structure to vary from the required setback by thirty (30) feet.
9. The proposed variance was submitted based upon the topography restraints of the land. Significant alteration to the parcel would be necessary to locate the barn elsewhere on-site.
10. The variance request to allow a reduction in the 50' setback to 20,' will eliminate the potential to disturb the existing topography of the site and location of the subject storage building which, if moved, would cause vineyard planting areas to face being damaged or destroyed as well as impact proposed and existing buildings at the project site. A variance is required because of Ordinance No. 348, Article XIVb, Section 14.74, item e.(7), which states that minimum setbacks shall be 50.'

11. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to the north, south, east, and west.
12. This project is not located within a Criteria Area of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).
13. Environmental Assessment No. 41927 identified the following potentially significant impacts:
  - a. Biological Resources
  - b. Cultural Resources (Paleontological Resources)
  - c. Noise
  - d. Transportation/Traffic
  - e. Water Quality/Hydrology

These listed impacts will be fully mitigated by the measures indicated in the environmental assessment, conditions of approval and attached letters. No other significant impacts were identified.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:**

1. As of this writing, staff has received seventeen (17) letters in opposition including a petition, three (3) phone calls in opposition, eight (8) letters in support of the proposed project and a petition from the applicant which include approximately 111 signatures, 20 letters in support, and thank you letters from wedding parties.
2. The project site is not located within:
  - a. A city sphere of influence.
  - b. A 100-year flood plain, an area drainage plan, or dam inundation area.
  - c. An MSHCP Core Reserve Area.
3. The project site is located within:
  - a. The boundaries of the Temecula Valley Unified School District;
  - b. County Service Area No. 149;
  - c. The Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area;
  - d. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area
4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 942-050-004.
5. This project was filed with the Planning Department on 4/10/08.
6. This project was reviewed by the Land Development Committee four (4) times on the following dates: 5/29/08, 12/18/08, 4/23/09, and 6/18/09.
7. Deposit Based Fees charged for this project, as of the time of staff report preparation, total \$48,055.24.

### Findings

1. The barn in question existed prior to implementation of the Citrus Vineyard Policy and the C/V zoning which established the 50' setback.
2. The barn conformed to the set back standard of the R-R zoning classification when it was constructed.
3. The topography of the land dictated that the only reasonably level area to put a barn was the location it is at. That significant alteration to the parcel would have been required to locate a barn elsewhere.
4. Strict implementation of the ordinance would deprive the owner of the privileges of surrounding land owners who have barns that pre-date this ordinance which are being allowed to remain without repercussion.

James R. Bach  
Project Manager

# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

## TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

### Planning Department

*Ron Goldman · Planning Director*

## APPLICATION FOR APPEAL

DATE SUBMITTED: 8/3/09

Appeal of application case No(s): PP23376

*List all concurrent applications*

Name of Advisory Agency: County of Riverside Planning Commission

Date of the decision or action: 07/27/09

Appellant's Name: Frank Aglio

E-Mail: frankaglio@yahoo.com

Mailing Address: 36101 Glen Oaks

Temecula

Street  
CA 92592

City

State

ZIP

Daytime Phone No: ( 951 ) 676-6162

Fax No: (      )                     

ADVISORY AGENCY WHOSE ACTION IS BEING APPEALED	HEARING BODY TO WHICH APPEAL IS BEING MADE	APPEAL TO BE FILED WITH
Planning Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Board of Supervisors</b> for: Temporary Outdoor Events, Substantial Conformance Determination for WECS, Variances, and Fast Track Plot Plans.</li> <li>• <b>Planning Commission</b> for: all other decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clerk of The Board</b> for: Appeals before the Board of Supervisors.</li> <li>• <b>Planning Department</b> for: Appeals before the Planning Commission.</li> </ul>
Planning Commission	<b>Board of Supervisors</b>	<b>Clerk of the Board of Supervisors</b>

TYPE OF CASES BEING APPEALED	FILING DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change of Zone denied by the Planning Commission</li> <li>• Commercial WECS Permit</li> <li>• Conditional Use Permit</li> <li>• Hazardous Waste Facility Siting Permit</li> <li>• Public Use Permit</li> <li>• Variance</li> <li>• Specific Plan denied by the Planning Commission</li> <li>• Substantial Conformance Determination for WECS</li> <li>• Surface Mining and Reclamation Permit</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 days after the notice of decision appears on the Board of Supervisors Agenda.</p>

**APPLICATION FOR APPEAL**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land Division (Tentative Tract Map or Tentative Parcel Map)</li> <li>• Revised Tentative Map</li> <li>• Minor Change to Tentative Map</li> <li>• Extension of Time for Land Division (not vesting map)</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 days after the notice of decision appears on the Board of Supervisor's Agenda.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of Time for Vesting Tentative Map</li> </ul>	<p>Within 15 days after the notice of decision appears on the Board of Supervisor's agenda.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Plan or Specific Plan Consistency Determination</li> <li>• Temporary Outdoor Event</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 days after date of mailing or hand delivery of decision of the Planning Director.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Impact Report</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 days of receipt of project sponsor or Planning Director determination, or within 7 days after notice of decision by Planning Commission appears on the Board's agenda.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plot Plan</li> <li>• Second Unit Permit</li> <li>• Temporary Use Permits</li> <li>• Accessory WECS</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 calendar days after the date of mailing of the decision.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of Substantial Conformance for Specific Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Within 7 days after the notice of decision appears on the Board of Supervisor's agenda.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised Permit</li> </ul>	<p>Same appeal deadline as for original permit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certificate of Compliance</li> <li>• Tree Removal Permit</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 days after the date of the decision by the Planning Director.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revocation of Variances and Permits</li> </ul>	<p>Within 10 days following the mailing of the notice of revocation by the Director of Building and Safety, or within 10-days after the notice of decision of the Planning Commission appears on the Board of Supervisor's agenda.</p>

**PLEASE STATE THE REASONS FOR APPEAL.**

Please state the basis for the appeal and include any supporting evidence if applicable. If appealing one or more specific conditions of approval, indicate the number of the specific condition(s) being protested. In addition, please include all actions on related cases, which might be affected if the appeal is granted. This will allow all changes to be advertised and modified at the same time. AN APPEAL OF ONE OR MORE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL SHALL BE DEEMED AS AN APPEAL OF THE ACTION AS A WHOLE, AND THE APPEAL BODY MAY APPROVE OR DENY THE ENTIRE MATTER, AND CHANGE ANY OR ALL OF THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.

**APPLICATION FOR APPEAL**

Please see attached.

Use additional sheets if necessary.

Frank Aglio Frank Aglio  
PRINTED NAME OF APPELLANT SIGNATURE OF APPELLANT

7/31/09  
DATE

- THE APPEAL FILING PACKAGE MUST CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING:
1. One completed and signed application form.
  2. Public Hearing Notice Label Requirements mailing address labels for notification of the appeal hearing.
  3. All appropriate filing fees (the base fee, plus other fees specifically for the Department of Building and Safety, Fire Department, Flood Control District and/or Transportation Department conditions, if applicable).

PLEASE NOTE: Obtain surrounding property owners label package/instructions (Form 295-1051) from a County Public Information Services Center or download it from the Planning Department web page.

Application for Appeal

PP23376

Date of Decision: 07/27/09

We are appealing the limitation of 30 wedding events per year and the hours of operation of wedding events being limited to 9:00 p.m.

The applicant requests that 130 wedding events per year be permitted and that the hours of operation of wedding events be extended to 10:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday.

The construction of the temporary indoor dance floor facility and the permanent banquet facility mitigates any noise impacts to surrounding residents, from all wedding events.

The construction of the widening of Glen Oaks Road, providing for safe turn, acceleration and deceleration lanes mitigates any traffic impacts to the traveling public due to ingress and egress movements of wedding attendees. The additional entrance signage and lighting further provides for safe ingress and egress of wedding attendees.

The construction of the onsite fire access lanes, fire hydrant systems and building sprinkler systems mitigates any life safety impacts to attendees and the surrounding residents.

The parking facilities constructed as a part of this proposal provides for all required parking for the wedding events and will not impact surrounding residents.

The sanitary sewer septic systems constructed as a part of this proposal provides for the sanitary sewer needs for both the individual wedding event and the cumulative 130 events per year.

The onsite detention basins and water quality basins constructed as a part of this proposal mitigates all drainage and water quality impacts.

The CEQA initial study points out the impacts to water quality, noise and traffic and provides mitigation measures for the applicant proposal for 130 wedding events and the hours of operation extending to 10:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday nights yet the Director placed limitations on the project for which no findings of fact were provided to support the limitations.

The project as conditioned shall construct and operate a winery, shall meet the C / V planting requirement and shall hold the wedding events in an indoor facility.

These conditions establish this project as being consistent with the C / V Zone and Policy Area. Additionally the Director adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration for EA 41927, which provides for 130 wedding events and a 10:00 p.m. closing.

Thus we feel that the decision is not based on the facts of the case and will place limitations on this project that others in the C / V Zone and Policy Area are not subject to, and we appeal to the Planning Commission to modify the requested conditions.



MARKHAM DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC.

## ***TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN for PP 23376***

Date 6-17-2009

The purpose of this Traffic Management Plan is describe the proposed project details for Plot Plan 23376 located at 36101 Glen Oaks Rd. Temecula.

This project is on 10 gross acres and is currently an existing wedding facility holding weddings in an outdoors setting. Several phases of Plot Plan 23376 will improve the facility with a banquet hall, barrel room, tasting room, gift shop, and appurtenances. Following are several event scenarios describing hours and number of guest. Seventy five percent of the 10 acres will remain vineyard.

### **Ingress/Egress**

The project takes access from Glen Oaks Rd at 2 points. The existing street is paved to a width of 28 feet on a ROW of 88'.

Access to this site is provided by two 24 ft. wide driveways connecting directly to Glen Oaks Rd.

The driveway connections to Glen Oaks Rd. will include left turn pockets and A.C pavement transitions to taper between the existing road, and the proposed driveways. Driveways will be design in accordance with the following design parameters:

1. Edge of pavement returns shall be a 35 foot radius.
2. Left turn pockets shall be 12 foot wide and 100 feet long, with a 120 foot transition.
3. Provide 330 feet A.C. pavement transitions on each side of the left turn pockets (deceleration transition).

### **Parking**

Onsite parking is in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 348, Section 18.12. Ordinance requires 108 parking spaces. A total of 112 parking spaces are provided, with an additional 42 spaces for overflow. Seven spaces have been designated as handicap accessible. The overflow spaces are located between the rows of grapes west of the primary parking area. When parking requires the use of overflow spaces Lake Oak Meadows staff will "valet park" vehicles to avoid damage to vines and vehicles.

### **Hours of Operation/Employees**

The winery will be open for wine tasting 7 days a week from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

The winery is operated by The Aglio Family. In addition to family members, there will be 2 -4 employees working at the winery.

### **Special Events**

A maximum of 130 weddings, 30 Fundraisers/Corporate/Small Gatherings, 2 Jazz Concerts, and 3 Movie Nights will be held per year. These events will be held inside the temporary pavilion until completion of the Banquet facility in Phase I.

When larger attendance events take place such as concerts or larger weddings additional traffic management devices will be put in place. These devices will warn drivers along Glen Oaks Rd. of special event traffic ahead. In a capacity scenario approximately 150 cars may enter or exit within a 1 hour period. Typically for concerts where there is a definite start and stop time. Further this would occur in non peak times in the evening.

### **Signage**

A winery sign exist at the entrance to the site. Signage has been noted on the Plot Plan as well as a proposed/existing signage report. All signage will conform to Riverside County Ord. 348 Sec 19.4.

Stop signs will be placed on the driveways where the driveways meet Glen Oaks Rd. They will be located 55 feet south of the centerline of Glen Oaks Rd. and 6 feet east of the edge of the pavement for the driveway.

No Parking signs will be posted along Glen Oaks Rd. along the length of the subject property unless directed otherwise by County Transportation.

James R. Bach  
Project Manager

## Lake Oak Meadows - Plot Plan 23376

### Proposed Special Events

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>1 - Small Group Gathering</b>
<b>Event Description</b>	Community Fundraisors Private Small Group Luncheons Private Dinner Parties Special Wine Tasting Events Small Business Meetings/Conference Meetings
<b>Number of Guests</b>	60 - 100
<b>Annual Amount of Events</b>	30
<b>Days and Times of Operation</b>	Monday thru Thursday -  Lunch Hours:           11 am - 2 pm Dinner Hours:         4 pm - 9 pm  Most likely weekdays, some weekends.
<b>Can Concurrent Events Be Held At Facility?</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Existing/Proposed Facilities</b>	Primary Venue: Banquet Hall  Banquet Hall Capacity 140/ 2,100 sq. ft.  112 Spaces for Facility total:  7 Employee (max.) 70 Banquet Hall 27 Wine Tasting Facility
<b>Number of Parking Stalls</b>	2 events will not occur at the same time Tasting Room open. Limo/Bus Parking to be provided parallel to Glen Oaks Rd. Additional Limo/Bus Parking located on Plot Plan 23376 space numbers 73-84 and 1-3. 112 spaces less 14 spaces for max Limo/Bus-98 spaces remain.  Overflow Parking: Located within vineyards. NW Vineyard can accommodate 42 additional cars.

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>1 - Small Group Gathering</b>
<b>Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures, if any</b>	None proposed given small size of event and guests.
<b>Number of Employees &amp; Duties</b>	2-6 to serve guests - wine, food, clean up. Service/wait staff. Kitchen staff of 2.
<b>Hours of Outdoor Music</b>	Not Applicable.
<b>Maximum decibel (db) level for outdoor music</b>	Not Applicable.
<b>Proposed Buffering or Noise Reduction Mitigation</b>	Not applicable. Bringing events indoors, will reduce and buffer any existing noise concerns.
<b>Landscaping Plan</b>	Nothing additional. Within landscaping design plan for Plot Plan 23376

## Lake Oak Meadows - Plot Plan 23376

### Proposed Special Events

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>2 - Weddings</b>
<b>Event Description</b>	Wedding I
<b>Number of Guests</b>	60 - 250
<b>Annual Amount of Events</b>	130
<b>Days and Times of Operation</b>	Weekends mostly, with occasional ceremonies on Thursday or Friday evenings. All other facilities close, and only the ceremonies occur. Events begin generally about 4 pm until no later than 9 pm. Occasionally two ceremonies a day on weekends: midday ceremony and then evening ceremony.
<b>Can Concurrent Events Be Held at Facility?</b>	It is the intention of Lake Oak Meadows to host only one wedding at a time, and close all other facilities @ 4 pm.
<b>Existing/Proposed Facilities</b>	<p>Primary Venue: Banquet Hall</p> <p>Secondary Venue: The peninsula adds outdoor seating for wedding ceremonies, and the lake a viewpoint.</p> <p>Banquet Hall Capacity 140/ 2,100 sq. ft.</p>
<b>Number of Parking Stalls</b>	<p>112 Spaces for Facility total:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">7 Employee (max.) 27 Wine Tasting Facility 70 Banquet Hall</p> <p>Limo/Bus Parking to be provided parallel to Glen Oaks Rd. Additional Limo/Bus Parking located on Plot Plan 23376 space numbers 73-84 and 1-3. 112 spaces less 14 spaces for max Limo/Bus-98 spaces remain.</p> <p>Overflow Parking: Located within vineyards. NW Vineyard can accommodate 42 additional cars.</p>

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>2 - Wedding I</b>
<b>Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures, if any</b>	Acel/Decal lane and left turn lane will allow the safe enter/exit of the guests.
<b>Number of Employees &amp; Duties</b>	4-8 to serve guests - wine, food, cleanup, etc. General service/wait staff. Kitchen staff 4.
<b>Hours of Outdoor Music</b>	Soft outdoor music played during wedding ceremony. Music to be contained in Banquet Hall or Barrel Room.
<b>Maximum decibel (db) level for outdoor music</b>	Outdoor background music, as per current Riverside County Noise Ordinance.
<b>Proposed Buffering or Noise Reduction Mitigation</b>	Not applicable. Bringing events indoors, will reduce and buffer any existing noise concerns.
<b>Landscaping Plan</b>	Nothing additional. Within landscaping design plan for Plot Plan 23376

## Lake Oak Meadows - Plot Plan 23376

### Proposed Special Events

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>3 - Family Movie Night</b>
<b>Event Description</b>	Family Movie Night
<b>Number of Guests</b>	40 - 50 high estimate
<b>Annual Amount of Events</b>	3 Total - 1 monthly Summer Months: July thru September
<b>Days and Times of Operation</b>	Wednesday Nights, Summer Months. 6 pm - 9pm
<b>Can Concurrent Events Be Held at Facility?</b>	It is the intention of Lake Oak Meadows to only host Movie Night.
<b>Existing/Proposed Facilities</b>	The Peninsula will serve as a setting for a big screen for movies, with individual headphones provided for noise reduction.  A nice summer evening with the family around the lake, watching a movie under the stars. Snacks provided.
<b>Number of Parking Stalls</b>	112 Spaces for Facility total:  7 Employee (max.) 10 Bed and Breakfast 70 Banquet Hall 27 Wine Tasting Facility  Limo/Bus Parking to be provided parallel to Glen Oaks Rd. Additional Limo/Bus Parking located on Plot Plan 23376 space numbers 73-84 and 1-3. 112 spaces less 14 spaces for max Limo/Bus-98 spaces remain. Overflow Parking: Located within vineyards. NW Vineyard can accommodate 42 additional cars.

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>3 - Movie Night</b>
<b>Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures, if any</b>	None proposed given small size of event and guests.
<b>Number of Employees &amp; Duties</b>	5 maximum. Set up, take down, and service.
<b>Hours of Outdoor Music</b>	N/A
<b>Maximum decibel (db) level for outdoor music</b>	N/A
<b>Proposed Buffering or Noise Reduction Mitigation</b>	Individual sound devices will be provided.
<b>Landscaping Plan</b>	Nothing additional. Within landscaping design plan for Plot Plan 23376.

## Lake Oak Meadows - Plot Plan 23376

### Proposed Special Events


<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>4 - Summer Concerts</b>
<b>Event Description</b>	Summer Concerts
<b>Number of Guests</b>	100 - 250 high estimate
<b>Annual Amount of Events</b>	2 Summer Months: July thru September
<b>Days and Times of Operation</b>	Saturday Night 5 pm - 9 pm
<b>Can Concurrent Events Be Held at Facility?</b>	It is the intention of Lake Oak Meadows to only host Concerts.,
<b>Existing/Proposed Facilities</b>	The Peninsula will serve as a setting for a possible Jazz Band and etc....  A nice summer evening with the family around the lake, watching a concert under the stars. Snacks provided.
<b>Number of Parking Stalls</b>	112 Spaces for Facility total:  7 Employee (max.) 27 Wine Tasting Facility 70 Banquet Hall  Limo/Bus Parking to be provided parallel to Glen Oaks Rd. Additional Limo/Bus Parking located on Plot Plan 23376 space numbers 73-84 and 1-3. 112 spaces less 14 spaces for max Limo/Bus-98 spaces remain. Overflow Parking: Located within vineyards. NW Vineyard can accommodate 42 additional cars. 164 total with overflow.

<b>Special Event Scenario</b>	<b>6 - Summer Concerts</b>
<b>Proposed Traffic Mitigation Measures, if any</b>	For larger events Lake Oak Meadows will provide traffic management services to help guide guests entering and leaving the event to advise oncoming traffic along Glen Oaks Rd. of departing guests and help direct traffic.
<b>Number of Employees &amp; Duties</b>	6 - 8 maximum. Set up, take down, and service.
<b>Hours of Outdoor Music</b>	6 pm - 9 pm
<b>Maximum decibel (db) level for outdoor music</b>	As per current Riverside County Noise Ordinance
<b>Proposed Buffering or Noise Reduction Mitigation</b>	Nothing additional.
<b>Landscaping Plan</b>	Nothing additional. Within landscaping design plan for Plot Plan 23376.

Supervisor Stone  
District 3  
Date Drawn: 12/11/08

# PP23376 VICINITY MAP

Planner: Alisa Krizek  
Date: 01/12/09  
Vicinity Map




## RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Rancho California  
Township/Range: T7SR1W  
Section: 19



Assessors  
Bk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7  
6,900 Feet

**DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY**



**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

District: Rancho California  
Township/Range: T7SR1W  
Section: 19




Assessors  
Bk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7  
3,750

Supervisor: Stone  
District 3  
Date Drawn: 12/11/08

# PP23376


## Existing General Plan

Planner: Alisa Krizek  
Date: 01/12/09  
Exhibit 5




### RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Rancho California  
Township/Range: T7SR1W  
Section: 19



Assessors  
Bk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7

**PP23376**  
**EXISTING ZONING**




**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

Area: Rancho California  
Township/Range: T7SR1W  
Section: 19



Assessors  
Bk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7

**PP23376**  
**Land Use**



**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

District: Thousand Palms  
Township/Range: T4SR6E  
Section: 19




Assessors  
Bk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7



Supervisor Stone  
District 3  
Date Drawn: 12/11/08

# PP23376 POLICY AREAS

Planner: Alisa Krizek  
Date: 01/12/09  
Exhibit 8



## RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT


Area: Rancho California  
Township/Range: T7SR1W  
Section: 19



0 1,150 2,300 4,600 6,900

Feet

Assessors  
Bk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7



April 6, 2010

County of Riverside  
Supervisor Jeff Stone, 3rd District  
4080 Lemon St., Riverside, CA 92502-1527

Dear Supervisor Stone,

The current 2020 Vision to expand the Temecula Valley Wine Country and the new policy area requirements may be one of the final and most important changes that directly affect the quality, feel and importance of Temecula Valley as a world class Wine Growing region. The spirit of the current C/V zone and the purpose/mission statement of the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association is to grow quality wine grapes, produce world class wines, and to promote the interest of wineries and vineyards in Riverside County and the California wine industry as a whole. Our purpose is very clear and the C/V policy within Riverside County has been consistent in limiting uses and requiring fully operational agricultural businesses.

The policy area requires the growing of grape vines, the onsite crushing and producing of wine, and allows for the direct selling of wine to the public. Secondary to each of these mission purposes is a provision that may allow a fully operational winery to promote and produce weddings, corporate events and limited entertainment for clients as an incidental and secondary use. The county of Riverside at one time had a "Special Occasion Facility" designation within the C/V zone but it was determined that this use was not compatible with the nature of the Vineyard Policy area and was not the mission of the TVWA.

The act of creating and constructing a wedding facility that includes multipurpose structures is a somewhat simpler task when compared with the act and passion of building a winery and making wine. Winemaking and wineries require an incredible investment in research, planting, nurturing, producing, selling, and ultimately waiting many years to confirm that you "got it right". This expense is incurred annually. The nature of quality is time and commitment. To ensure the legacy of great wines in the Temecula Valley we must demand that the C/V policy regulates new wineries and requires new partners to commit to the mission and purpose set forth. Building a wedding facility with a winery theme, or a bottle shop with Crate and Barrel gifts, is not fair. It violates the Riverside County required conditions, the spirit of the vineyard policy area, and the spirit of the community as a whole. Any applicant needs only to read the Sonoma / Napa policy area requirements to understand the greater flexibility and opportunity present here in Riverside County. Lake Oak Meadows has taken that flexibility too far.

The location and grounds of Lake Oak Meadows provide a natural appeal and the presentation and operation appears to be first class and is well advertised. At issue is the protection of the C/V policy area and the promotion of wineries. Weddings are a component of our wine country but we are first and foremost a wine country that grows grapes and employs vineyard workers and winemakers, not wedding coordinators, photographers, and DJ's.



This application and appeal requires additional review and mandatory compliance conditions. With the size of the man-made lake, gross acres, parking, legitimate planted vineyard acreage totaling 75%, the combined 10 rooms and the present nature of the advertised operation, it must be confirmed that this is a winery first. The vineyard area policy is clear in that the primary purpose must be to make wine. The nature of this appeal is not.

The Riverside County Planning Commission and County Code Enforcement have been very reasonable and willing to bring each applicant into compliance and approve fully operational wineries that make wine with the additional benefit of producing weddings and events.

The applicant can be assured that the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association seeks to be an inclusive entity. Once specific required conditions are met, and the "winery first" approach is taken, we will support them and welcome them with open arms. We are looking for responsible partners with first class operations that are committed to the future quality of the Temecula Valley AVA. Our mission and purpose toward this end will not change.

Sincerely,

Board of Directors  
Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association Board

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Bradley".

David Bradley, Secretary

cc: Supervisor Bob Buster, 1<sup>st</sup> District  
Supervisor John F. Tavaglione, 2<sup>nd</sup> District  
Supervisor John Benoit, 4<sup>th</sup> District  
Supervisor Marion Ashley, 5<sup>th</sup> District  
Mr. John Petty, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Planning Commissioner  
Mr. Frank Anglio, Lake Oak Meadows



### Building / Parking / Fire Matrix

Building	Use	Total Sq Ft	Occupancy Sp	Const Type	Parking Ratio	Parking Required	Parking Provided
A	Venue	76%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
B	Temporary Dance Pavilion	400	A-3	V-B	1 per 30sf	14 Imp	14
C	Storage/Office	5,950	A-2	V-B	1 per 30sf	70*	6
D	Wine Production	1,750	F-2S-2	V-D	1 per Employee		
E	Tasting Room	4,288	A-2	V-D	1 per 45sf	24	
F	Gift Shop	2,560	M	V-B	1 per 200sf	13	
G	Guard House	192	B	V-B	1 per Employee	1	
H	Barrel Room	2,100	M	V-B	1 per 30sf	70*	
I	Bed & Breakfast	9,205	R-1	V-B	1 per 2 beds	5*	
J	Garage/Storage	690	U-1	U-1	N/A	0	
Total		14,850				108	112

\* Only one room in use at a time.  
 \*\* B&B guest are patrons of the facility and considered under building B or F for parking calculations.


### AREA CALCULATIONS

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	TOTAL
SITE AREA (GROSS)	10.33	ACRES	
BEYOND DANCE ROAD	0.11	ACRES	
SITE (NET)	2.24	ACRES	
UNPAVED USES	2,111	SQ. FT.	
PAVED USES	2,741	SQ. FT.	
LANDSCAPING / ASSE	54	SQ. FT.	
SITE AREA (NET)	2.49	ACRES	

### PRELIMINARY YEAR-TO-DATE WORK QUANTITIES

PHASE	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
EXCAVATION (CUY)	0	500	125	1200	700
EMBANKMENT (CY)	0	300	0	600	475


EXCESS CUT MATERIAL TO BE STOCKPILED FOR FUTURE USE ON-SITE WITHIN LANDSCAPE AREAS PERMIT PURPOSES




COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
 PLOT PLAN 23376  
 PHASE 1

TEMPORARY DANCE PAVILION  
 PARKING CALCULATION-SCHEDULES & DETAILS  
 SHEET 2  
 OF 5 SHEETS



REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	12/20/23	ISSUED FOR PERMIT
2	12/20/23	ISSUED FOR PERMIT
3	12/20/23	ISSUED FOR PERMIT




TEMPORARY DANCE PAVILION  
 SCALE: 1"=20'




DETENTION BASIN DETAILS  
 SCALE: 1"=20'




INSTALL 100 L.C. 18" CUP & L.C. 18" RISER PIPE  
 SCALE: 1"=20'




EXISTING BUILDING  
WINE PRODUCTION / WINE MAKING FACILITY  
SCALE: 1"=30'




EXISTING BUILDING  
GARAGE & STORAGE AREA  
SCALE: 1"=30'



BANQUET HALL SECTION  
SCALE: 1"=30'



BANQUET HALL SECTION A-A  
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0" 1/4"




REV#	DATE	REVISIONS
1	1/2/25	ISSUED FOR PERMIT FOR THE INITIAL

GENERAL PROFESSIONAL & ARCHITECTURAL  
CIVIL ENGINEERING  
PLANNING  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
INTERIOR DESIGN  
CONSTRUCTION SERVICES  
TAMERLA, GA


OWNER: [ ]  
DESIGNER: [ ]  
DATE: 02/20/25

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
PLOT PLAN 23376  
PHASE I / PHASE II  
WINE PRODUCTION / BANQUET HALL  
EXIST. GARAGE


DATE: 02/20/25  
PAGE: 02/03/25




**STRIPING DETAIL**  
SCALE: 1"=40'



**TASTING ROOM / OFFICES**  
SCALE: 1"=20'




**BANQUET HALL SECTION B-B**  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0" PER 1"=2'



**GUARD HOUSE**  
SCALE: 1"=20'

GUARD HOUSE TO BE INSTALLED  
AT EXISTING GROUND LEVEL  
MINOR EXTERIOR GRADING AROUND  
BUILDING



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
PLOT PLAN 23376  
PHASE III  
TASTING ROOM / GUARD HOUSE

REV.	DATE	REVISIONS

DATE OF RECORDATION: 05/28/07  
DRAWN BY: [blank]  
CHECKED BY: [blank]  
SCALE: AS SHOWN

DATE: 05/28/07  
DRAWN BY: [blank]  
CHECKED BY: [blank]  
SCALE: AS SHOWN





ADRIAN PHOTOGRAPHY &  
REPRODUCTION  
COURTESY OF:  
DAVID R. GARDNER, INC.  
CRESTON SHAKING  
TABLES, CA



REVISION	BY

FRANKS & ASSOCIATES  
 98101 GLENDALE ROAD  
 OAK HEAVENS RANCH  
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA  
 92591-2443  
 VICKI WOODWARD  
 PROJECT ARCHITECT

DATE	07/27/06
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DRAWN	WJW
CHECKED	WJW
DATE	07/27/06
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DRAWN	WJW
CHECKED	WJW



FUTURE PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION (FROM BANQUET HALL)

FUTURE PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION (FROM BANQUET HALL)

COLOR REFERENCE (PER MATERIAL BOARD)

1	STONE	ELDORADO STONE VENEER - TUSCANY STONE RUBBLE - TYPICAL ALLOCATIONS FOR VENEER
2	STUCCO	COLOR OF STUCCO & TRIM DETERMINED BY COLOR CHART FROM MANUFACTURER'S CO. 81 - DEC 201 - SLOPER (LIGHT) 82 - DEC 785 - BURRIT CRIMSON (DARK)
3	TRIM	81 - BURET 118 47 - DEC 29 - BURRIT CRIMSON (DARK)
4	ROOF TILE	US 2008 MALORCA 40% TERRAZZO BLEND 40% PAVENHO BLEND

REVISIONS	BY


PROJECT: OAK MEADOWS RANCH  
 ADDRESS: 56101 GLENDALE ROAD  
 CITY: TEMESCUA, CALIFORNIA  
 CLIENT: FRANK A. JACOBI  
 DATE: 06/20/2007  
 DRAWN BY: J. J. JACOBI  
 CHECKED BY: J. J. JACOBI  
 SCALE: AS SHOWN

NO.	DATE
1	06/20/07
2	07/20/07
3	08/20/07
4	09/20/07
5	10/20/07
6	11/20/07
7	12/20/07
8	01/20/08
9	02/20/08
10	03/20/08
11	04/20/08
12	05/20/08
13	06/20/08
14	07/20/08
15	08/20/08
16	09/20/08
17	10/20/08
18	11/20/08
19	12/20/08
20	01/20/09
21	02/20/09
22	03/20/09
23	04/20/09
24	05/20/09
25	06/20/09
26	07/20/09
27	08/20/09
28	09/20/09
29	10/20/09
30	11/20/09
31	12/20/09
32	01/20/10
33	02/20/10
34	03/20/10
35	04/20/10
36	05/20/10
37	06/20/10
38	07/20/10
39	08/20/10
40	09/20/10
41	10/20/10
42	11/20/10
43	12/20/10
44	01/20/11
45	02/20/11
46	03/20/11
47	04/20/11
48	05/20/11
49	06/20/11
50	07/20/11
51	08/20/11
52	09/20/11
53	10/20/11
54	11/20/11
55	12/20/11
56	01/20/12
57	02/20/12
58	03/20/12
59	04/20/12
60	05/20/12
61	06/20/12
62	07/20/12
63	08/20/12
64	09/20/12
65	10/20/12
66	11/20/12
67	12/20/12
68	01/20/13
69	02/20/13
70	03/20/13
71	04/20/13
72	05/20/13
73	06/20/13
74	07/20/13
75	08/20/13
76	09/20/13
77	10/20/13
78	11/20/13
79	12/20/13
80	01/20/14
81	02/20/14
82	03/20/14
83	04/20/14
84	05/20/14
85	06/20/14
86	07/20/14
87	08/20/14
88	09/20/14
89	10/20/14
90	11/20/14
91	12/20/14
92	01/20/15
93	02/20/15
94	03/20/15
95	04/20/15
96	05/20/15
97	06/20/15
98	07/20/15
99	08/20/15
100	09/20/15
101	10/20/15
102	11/20/15
103	12/20/15
104	01/20/16
105	02/20/16
106	03/20/16
107	04/20/16
108	05/20/16
109	06/20/16
110	07/20/16
111	08/20/16
112	09/20/16
113	10/20/16
114	11/20/16
115	12/20/16
116	01/20/17
117	02/20/17
118	03/20/17
119	04/20/17
120	05/20/17
121	06/20/17
122	07/20/17
123	08/20/17
124	09/20/17
125	10/20/17
126	11/20/17
127	12/20/17
128	01/20/18
129	02/20/18
130	03/20/18
131	04/20/18
132	05/20/18
133	06/20/18
134	07/20/18
135	08/20/18
136	09/20/18
137	10/20/18
138	11/20/18
139	12/20/18
140	01/20/19
141	02/20/19
142	03/20/19
143	04/20/19
144	05/20/19
145	06/20/19
146	07/20/19
147	08/20/19
148	09/20/19
149	10/20/19
150	11/20/19
151	12/20/19
152	01/20/20
153	02/20/20
154	03/20/20
155	04/20/20
156	05/20/20
157	06/20/20
158	07/20/20
159	08/20/20
160	09/20/20
161	10/20/20
162	11/20/20
163	12/20/20
164	01/20/21
165	02/20/21
166	03/20/21
167	04/20/21
168	05/20/21
169	06/20/21
170	07/20/21
171	08/20/21
172	09/20/21
173	10/20/21
174	11/20/21
175	12/20/21
176	01/20/22
177	02/20/22
178	03/20/22
179	04/20/22
180	05/20/22
181	06/20/22
182	07/20/22
183	08/20/22
184	09/20/22
185	10/20/22
186	11/20/22
187	12/20/22
188	01/20/23
189	02/20/23
190	03/20/23
191	04/20/23
192	05/20/23
193	06/20/23
194	07/20/23
195	08/20/23
196	09/20/23
197	10/20/23
198	11/20/23
199	12/20/23
200	01/20/24
201	02/20/24
202	03/20/24
203	04/20/24
204	05/20/24
205	06/20/24
206	07/20/24
207	08/20/24
208	09/20/24
209	10/20/24
210	11/20/24
211	12/20/24
212	01/20/25
213	02/20/25
214	03/20/25
215	04/20/25
216	05/20/25
217	06/20/25
218	07/20/25
219	08/20/25
220	09/20/25
221	10/20/25
222	11/20/25
223	12/20/25
224	01/20/26
225	02/20/26
226	03/20/26
227	04/20/26
228	05/20/26
229	06/20/26
230	07/20/26
231	08/20/26
232	09/20/26
233	10/20/26
234	11/20/26
235	12/20/26
236	01/20/27
237	02/20/27
238	03/20/27
239	04/20/27
240	05/20/27
241	06/20/27
242	07/20/27
243	08/20/27
244	09/20/27
245	10/20/27
246	11/20/27
247	12/20/27
248	01/20/28
249	02/20/28
250	03/20/28
251	04/20/28
252	05/20/28
253	06/20/28
254	07/20/28
255	08/20/28
256	09/20/28
257	10/20/28
258	11/20/28
259	12/20/28
260	01/20/29
261	02/20/29
262	03/20/29
263	04/20/29
264	05/20/29
265	06/20/29
266	07/20/29
267	08/20/29
268	09/20/29
269	10/20/29
270	11/20/29
271	12/20/29
272	01/20/30
273	02/20/30
274	03/20/30
275	04/20/30
276	05/20/30
277	06/20/30
278	07/20/30
279	08/20/30
280	09/20/30
281	10/20/30
282	11/20/30
283	12/20/30
284	01/20/31
285	02/20/31
286	03/20/31
287	04/20/31
288	05/20/31
289	06/20/31
290	07/20/31
291	08/20/31
292	09/20/31
293	10/20/31
294	11/20/31
295	12/20/31
296	01/20/32
297	02/20/32
298	03/20/32
299	04/20/32
300	05/20/32
301	06/20/32
302	07/20/32
303	08/20/32
304	09/20/32
305	10/20/32
306	11/20/32
307	12/20/32
308	01/20/33
309	02/20/33
310	03/20/33
311	04/20/33
312	05/20/33
313	06/20/33
314	07/20/33
315	08/20/33
316	09/20/33
317	10/20/33
318	11/20/33
319	12/20/33
320	01/20/34
321	02/20/34
322	03/20/34
323	04/20/34
324	05/20/34
325	06/20/34
326	07/20/34
327	08/20/34
328	09/20/34
329	10/20/34
330	11/20/34
331	12/20/34
332	01/20/35
333	02/20/35
334	03/20/35
335	04/20/35
336	05/20/35
337	06/20/35
338	07/20/35
339	08/20/35
340	09/20/35
341	10/20/35
342	11/20/35
343	12/20/35
344	01/20/36
345	02/20/36
346	03/20/36
347	04/20/36
348	05/20/36
349	06/20/36
350	07/20/36
351	08/20/36
352	09/20/36
353	10/20/36
354	11/20/36
355	12/20/36
356	01/20/37
357	02/20/37
358	03/20/37
359	04/20/37
360	05/20/37
361	06/20/37
362	07/20/37
363	08/20/37
364	09/20/37
365	10/20/37
366	11/20/37
367	12/20/37
368	01/20/38
369	02/20/38
370	03/20/38
371	04/20/38
372	05/20/38
373	06/20/38
374	07/20/38
375	08/20/38
376	09/20/38
377	10/20/38
378	11/20/38
379	12/20/38
380	01/20/39
381	02/20/39
382	03/20/39
383	04/20/39
384	05/20/39
385	06/20/39
386	07/20/39
387	08/20/39
388	09/20/39
389	10/20/39
390	11/20/39
391	12/20/39
392	01/20/40
393	02/20/40
394	03/20/40
395	04/20/40
396	05/20/40
397	06/20/40
398	07/20/40
399	08/20/40
400	09/20/40
401	10/20/40
402	11/20/40
403	12/20/40
404	01/20/41
405	02/20/41
406	03/20/41
407	04/20/41
408	05/20/41
409	06/20/41
410	07/20/41
411	08/20/41
412	09/20/41
413	10/20/41
414	11/20/41
415	12/20/41
416	01/20/42
417	02/20/42
418	03/20/42
419	04/20/42
420	05/20/42
421	06/20/42
422	07/20/42
423	08/20/42
424	09/20/42
425	10/20/42
426	11/20/42
427	12/20/42
428	01/20/43
429	02/20/43
430	03/20/43
431	04/20/43
432	05/20/43
433	06/20/43
434	07/20/43
435	08/20/43
436	09/20/43
437	10/20/43
438	11/20/43
439	12/20/43
440	01/20/44
441	02/20/44
442	03/20/44
443	04/20/44
444	05/20/44
445	06/20/44
446	07/20/44
447	08/20/44
448	09/20/44
449	10/20/44
450	11/20/44
451	12/20/44
452	01/20/45
453	02/20/45
454	03/20/45
455	04/20/45
456	05/20/45
457	06/20/45
458	07/20/45
459	08/20/45
460	09/20/45
461	10/20/45
462	11/20/45
463	12/20/45
464	01/20/46

BY	

FRANK MASLO  
 38101 GLENDALES ROAD  
 OAK MEADOWS RANCH  
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA  
 92591-4433  
 951-244-4233  
 FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS  
 25255 CALLE DEL ESTRENO

DATE	12/21/2015
PROJECT	FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS
DATE	12/21/2015
PROJECT	FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS
DATE	12/21/2015
PROJECT	FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS
DATE	12/21/2015
PROJECT	FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS
DATE	12/21/2015
PROJECT	FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS
DATE	12/21/2015
PROJECT	FRANK MASLO ARCHITECTS








DATE	
BY	

FRANK AGUILO  
 OAK MEADOWS RANCH  
 95101 GLENDALE ROAD  
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92592


PLANS PROVIDED BY  
 VICKI FORDWARD  
 761-544-2233

DATE	11
BY	6
PROJECT	
DATE	
BY	
PROJECT	
DATE	
BY	



FRANK AGUILO  
 EAST ELEVATION (LEFT SIDE)  
 GIFT SHOP / OFFICES / WINE TASTING ROOM

COLOR REFERENCE (PER MATERIAL BOARD)	
①	STONE ELDORADO STONE VENEER - TURQUAN STONE RUBBLE - TYPICAL ALL LOCATIONS FOR VENEER
②	STUCCO COLOR OF STUCCO & TRIM DETERMINED BY COLOR CHART #1000 FROM THE STUCCO MANUFACTURING CO. #1 - DEC 70% - SANDY CRIMSON (DARK) #2 - DEC 70% - BURNT CRIMSON (DARK)
③	TRIM #1 - BURNT CRIMSON #2 - DEC 70% - SANDY CRIMSON (DARK)
④	ROOF TILE 40% MALORCA 40% TERRAZZO BLEND 40% PALERMO BLEND



FRANK AGUILO  
 WEST ELEVATION (RIGHT SIDE)  
 GIFT SHOP / OFFICES / WINE TASTING ROOM

FRANK AGUILO  
 EAST & WEST ELEVATIONS  
 GIFT SHOP / OFFICES / WINE TASTING ROOM








NO.	DATE	BY	REVISIONS

FRANK AGUIO ARCHITECT 36101 GLENDALE ROAD LAKE OAK MEADOWS TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA	951-244-0033 VICKI WOODWARD PLANS MANAGER HANNING ENGINEERING	951-244-1044 HANNING ENGINEERING
---	--	-------------------------------------

NO.	DATE	BY	REVISIONS



**ELEVATION NOTES:**

1. 1/2" STUCCO OVER PAPER BACKED LATH 1/2" LAYERS GRADE UP PAPER, APPLIED OVER WOOD SHEATHING PANELS
2. 1/2" STUCCO OVER WOOD SHEATHING PANELS
3. INSTALL 1/2" ROUGH BERNI TRIM BOARDS AROUND WINDOWS AND OPENINGS.
4. STONE VENEER BY EL DORADO STONE, STYLE AND FINISH TO MATCH EXISTING.
5. PREFORMED FOAM ARCHITECTURAL CORNICES BY GAF, STYLE AND COLOR ARE PER OWNERS SPECIFICATIONS. APPLY ONE LAYER 30# FELT OVER STRUCTURAL PANELS.

FRONT ELEVATION (West)

LEFT SIDE ELEVATIONS (North)

RIGHT SIDE ELEVATIONS (South)




DATE	
BY	
CHECKED	
APPROVED	
SCALE	
PROJECT	
CLIENT	
ADDRESS	
CITY	
STATE	
ZIP	

PRANK ASLKO  
 3001 ALBUQUERQUE ROAD  
 TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA


ARCHITECTURAL  
 951-941-4070

DRAWN  
 CHECKED  
 DATE  
 SCALE  
 PROJECT  
 CLIENT  
 ADDRESS  
 CITY  
 STATE  
 ZIP


**2**




REAR ELEVATION  
(EXIST)



FRONT ELEVATION  
(EXIST)



LEFT SIDE ELEVATION



RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

- REVISION NOTES:
1. ADD DOOR AND WINDOW TO REAR WALL OVER LANTERN
  2. USE CEDAR TRIM AROUND ALL OPENINGS
  3. USE CEDAR TRIM AROUND ALL INTERIORS
  4. APPROXIMATE WALLS TO MATCH EXISTING WALLS TO SITE AND COURT


EXISTING  
 WAS BUILT PLANS  
 BABY/GARAGE

DATE	
BY	
CHECKED	
DATE	
BY	
CHECKED	
DATE	
BY	
CHECKED	
DATE	

FRANK DALO  
3501 ALVARO ROAD  
TEMPERUA, CALIFORNIA

PLANS PREPARED BY  
MAY WOODWARD  
5-24-40

PROJECT NO.	2-2-40
DATE	5-24-40
BY	M.W.
CHECKED	
DATE	
BY	
CHECKED	
DATE	



FLOOR PLAN

- ELECTRICAL NOTES**
1. THE ELECTRICAL SYMBOLS AND NOTATION ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE WORK TO BE DONE AND ARE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED AS A GUARANTEE OF THE WORK TO BE DONE.
  2. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  3. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  4. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  5. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  6. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  7. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  8. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  9. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  10. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  11. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  12. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  13. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  14. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  15. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  16. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  17. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  18. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  19. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.
  20. ALL WORK IS TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE LOCAL ORDINANCES THEREUNDER.

- ELECTRICAL SYMBOLS**
- DIRECT CURRENT
  - ALTERNATING CURRENT
  - HIGH SPEED MOTOR
  - MOTOR CONTROL
  - SWITCH
  - DIMMER
  - DIMMER LIGHT (SEE MAIN HOUSE)
  - FLOOR/CEILING FAN
  - HANGING/RECESSED BOX

NO.	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE	TOTAL
1	...	...	...	...	...
2	...	...	...	...	...
3	...	...	...	...	...
4	...	...	...	...	...
5	...	...	...	...	...
6	...	...	...	...	...
7	...	...	...	...	...
8	...	...	...	...	...
9	...	...	...	...	...
10	...	...	...	...	...
11	...	...	...	...	...
12	...	...	...	...	...
13	...	...	...	...	...
14	...	...	...	...	...
15	...	...	...	...	...
16	...	...	...	...	...
17	...	...	...	...	...
18	...	...	...	...	...
19	...	...	...	...	...
20	...	...	...	...	...
21	...	...	...	...	...
22	...	...	...	...	...
23	...	...	...	...	...
24	...	...	...	...	...
25	...	...	...	...	...
26	...	...	...	...	...
27	...	...	...	...	...
28	...	...	...	...	...
29	...	...	...	...	...
30	...	...	...	...	...
31	...	...	...	...	...
32	...	...	...	...	...
33	...	...	...	...	...
34	...	...	...	...	...
35	...	...	...	...	...
36	...	...	...	...	...
37	...	...	...	...	...
38	...	...	...	...	...
39	...	...	...	...	...
40	...	...	...	...	...
41	...	...	...	...	...
42	...	...	...	...	...
43	...	...	...	...	...
44	...	...	...	...	...
45	...	...	...	...	...
46	...	...	...	...	...
47	...	...	...	...	...
48	...	...	...	...	...
49	...	...	...	...	...
50	...	...	...	...	...

EXISTING  
VAC BUILT PLANS - DRAIN/SEWER

REVISIONS	BY

PROJECT NO. 100-1000000  
 DRAWN BY: J. L. HARRIS  
 CHECKED BY: J. L. HARRIS  
 DATE: 10/15/50  
 PROJECT: 100-1000000

DATE	10/15/50
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
PROJECT NO.	100-1000000
SHEET NO.	4
TOTAL SHEETS	4



**FOUNDATION NOTES:**

1. FOUNDATION TO BE CONCRETE ON 4" SAND AND VAPOR BARRIER.
2. ALL CONNECTIONS TO BE BY SHEAR PLATES OR BY AN APPROVED EQUAL.

**FRAMING NOTES:**




1. USE 2" x 4" @ 16" O.C. (VERTICAL).
2. ALL CONNECTIONS TO BE BY SHEAR PLATES OR BY AN APPROVED EQUAL.

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1-1	FOUNDATION	10-15-50



**MAILING SCHEDULE**

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	FOUNDATION PLAN	10-15-50
2	FRAMING PLAN	10-15-50
3	SECTION A-A	10-15-50
4	SECTION B-B	10-15-50
5	SECTION C-C	10-15-50





EXISTING  
 WAS BUILT IN 1945 - PARAGARAGE



NO. 1
NO. 2
NO. 3
NO. 4
NO. 5
NO. 6
NO. 7
NO. 8
NO. 9
NO. 10
NO. 11
NO. 12
NO. 13
NO. 14
NO. 15
NO. 16
NO. 17
NO. 18
NO. 19
NO. 20
NO. 21
NO. 22
NO. 23
NO. 24
NO. 25
NO. 26
NO. 27
NO. 28
NO. 29
NO. 30
NO. 31
NO. 32
NO. 33
NO. 34
NO. 35
NO. 36
NO. 37
NO. 38
NO. 39
NO. 40
NO. 41
NO. 42
NO. 43
NO. 44
NO. 45
NO. 46
NO. 47
NO. 48
NO. 49
NO. 50
NO. 51
NO. 52
NO. 53
NO. 54
NO. 55
NO. 56
NO. 57
NO. 58
NO. 59
NO. 60
NO. 61
NO. 62
NO. 63
NO. 64
NO. 65
NO. 66
NO. 67
NO. 68
NO. 69
NO. 70
NO. 71
NO. 72
NO. 73
NO. 74
NO. 75
NO. 76
NO. 77
NO. 78
NO. 79
NO. 80
NO. 81
NO. 82
NO. 83
NO. 84
NO. 85
NO. 86
NO. 87
NO. 88
NO. 89
NO. 90
NO. 91
NO. 92
NO. 93
NO. 94
NO. 95
NO. 96
NO. 97
NO. 98
NO. 99
NO. 100

PROJECT NO. 11  
 DATE 11/15/11  
 DRAWN BY [REDACTED]  
 CHECKED BY [REDACTED]  
 SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 SHEET NO. 11 OF 11

PROJECT NO. 11  
 DATE 11/15/11  
 DRAWN BY [REDACTED]  
 CHECKED BY [REDACTED]  
 SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 SHEET NO. 11 OF 11







PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN				
SYMBOL	ITEM	SQUARE FEET	ACREAGE	PERCENTAGE
	SITE GROSS	446,490 S.F.	10.25 ACS.	
	SITE NET	432,987 S.F.	9.94 ACS.	
	NON-DISTURBANCE AREA	20,010 S.F.	.46 ACS.	
	ADJUSTED OVERALL SITE	412,977 S.F.	9.48 ACS.	100%
	BUILDINGS	15,892 S.F.	.36 ACS.	4%
	PARKING & DRIVEWAYS	85,134 S.F.	1.9 ACS.	16%
	EXISTING LAWN	16,529 S.F.	.38 ACS.	4%
	PLANTING	5,874 S.F.	.13 ACS.	1%
	VINEYARDS	309,688 S.F.	7.11 ACS.	75%

# LAKE OAK MEADOWS

## SITE BREAKDOWN PLAN

# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

**Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number:** 41927  
**Project Case Type (s) and Number(s):** Plot Plan No. 23376 and Variance No. 1839  
**Lead Agency Name:** County of Riverside Planning Department  
**Address:** 4080 Lemon Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409  
**Contact Person:** Kinika Hesterly, Project Planner  
**Telephone Number:** (951) 955-1888  
**Applicant's Name:** Frank Aglio  
**Applicant's Address:** 31915 Rancho California Rd, Suite 200-334, Temecula, CA 92591  
**Representative's Name:** Larry Markham  
**Representative's Address:** 41635 Enterprise Circle North, Temecula, CA 92590

### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

#### A. Project Description:

**Plot Plan No. 23376** proposes a winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. In addition, the project proposes a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,861 square foot gathering room, a 1-bedroom 4,659 square foot Bed & Breakfast facility, a 7,450 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 192 square foot guard office, a 400 square foot dance facility, and to permit an existing garage/storage building. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 108 parking spaces and an area for overflow parking. The project also proposes 134 special events including 99 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

**Variance No. 1839** proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet.

**B. Type of Project:** Site Specific ; Countywide ; Community ; Policy .

**C. Total Project Area:** 10.25 Gross Acres

Residential Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Units: 10 room Bed & Breakfast facility and 1 caretaker's unit	Projected No. of Residents: 6
Commercial Acres: 10.25	Lots: 1	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 24,575	Est. No. of Employees: 8
Industrial Acres: N/A	Lots: N/A	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: N/A	Est. No. of Employees: N/A
Vineyard Acres: 7.48			

**D. Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 942-050-004

**E. Street References:** The project site is located southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, northerly of Monte De Oro, and easterly of Milkweed Way.

**F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:**  
 Section 19, Township 7 South, Range 1 West

**G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings:** The project site is dominated by existing developed wedding reception area,

single family residence, ornamental landscaping, a manmade lake, and a parking area. The project site contains oak trees, vineyards and ornamental landscaping. Onsite elevations range from 1,509 to 1,532 feet above mean sea level. Surrounding land uses include vacant land to the north, and single family residences to the east, south, and west.

## II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

### A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The project implements Policy LU 4.1, requiring new developments to be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade the character of the surrounding area. The proposed project is consistent with the Agriculture: Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum) land use designation and the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area and all other applicable land use policies within the General Plan.
2. **Circulation:** Adequate circulation facilities exist and will serve the proposed project upon approval of improvement plans. The proposed project meets with all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** No natural open space land was required to be preserved within the boundaries of this project. The project is not within an MSHCP Criteria Area or cell. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed project is not located within any special hazard zone (including FEMA flood zone, fault zone, high fire hazard area, dam inundation zone, area with high liquefaction potential, etc.). The proposed project is located within ½ a mile of the Buck Mesa Fault. Adherence to the California Building Code will mitigate impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed project has allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the future residents of this project through the project design and payment of development impact fees. The proposed project meets with all other applicable Safety element policies.
5. **Noise:** Sufficient mitigation against any foreseeable noise sources in the area has been provided for in the design of the project. The proposed project meets all other applicable Noise element policies.
6. **Housing:** The project does not impact housing.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project has been conditioned to control any fugitive dust during grading and construction activities. The proposed project meets all other applicable Air Quality Element policies.

B. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area Plan

C. **Foundation Component(s):** Agriculture

D. **Land Use Designation(s):** Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum)

E. **Overlay(s), if any:** N/A

F. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area

**G. Adjacent and Surrounding:**

- 1. **Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area Plan
- 2. **Foundation Component(s):** Agriculture
- 3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum)
- 4. **Overlay(s):** N/A
- 5. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area

**H. Adopted Specific Plan Information**

- 1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** N/A
- 2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** N/A

**I. Existing Zoning:** Citrus Vineyard (C/V)

**J. Proposed Zoning, if any:** N/A

**K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:** Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to the south, east and west and Citrus Vineyard – 10 Acre Minimum (C/V-10) to the north.

**III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below ( x ) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**IV. DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<b>A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project <b>COULD NOT</b> have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. <b>A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project <b>MAY</b> have a significant effect on the environment, and an <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</b> is required.


**A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED**

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.



Signature

3/11/10

Date

Kinika Hesterly, Project Planner

Printed Name

For Ron Goldman, Planning Director

**V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000-21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the project. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>AESTHETICS</b> Would the project				
<b>1. Scenic Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-9 "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, northerly of Monte De Oro, and easterly of Milkweed Way. The General Plan indicates that the project is not located within a designated scenic corridor; therefore the project will have no impact.

b) The project site contains a manmade lake, oak trees and ornamental landscaping consisting of dense tree cover. The project proposes to maintain these scenic resources to use for the proposed special events. The character of the area is a mix of wineries with associated vineyards, rural residences, and vacant land. The project proposes to construct a bed and breakfast, winery and tasting room, which is fitting for the general area. Furthermore, the project will be consistent with the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area Design Guidelines. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the area and would not create an aesthetically offensive project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

<b>2. Mt. Palomar Observatory</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, the project site is located 16.14 miles away from the Mt. Palomar Observatory; which is within the designated 45-mile (ZONE B) Special Lighting Area that surrounds the Mt. Palomar Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 contains approved materials and methods of installation, definition, general requirements, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. With incorporation of project lighting requirements of the Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 into the proposed project, this impact will be reduced to a less than significant impact. A condition of approval will be placed on the project that the properties are located within Zone B of County Ordinance 655 and are subject to outdoor lighting restrictions. (COA 10.PLANNING.33) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**3. Other Lighting Issues**

a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source: Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The proposed project will introduce new sources of light which includes exterior building illumination, indoor winery and lodge room lighting, and parking lot lighting. During the day, lighting has a limited potential to impacts views; potential impacts from glare would be the primarily occur from reflective building surfaces. However, the proposed project would not include large, uninterrupted expanses of glass and/or any other highly reflective material. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in substantial glares which would adversely affect the daytime views in the area.

Nighttime views could be impacted from new light and glare in a previously undeveloped area. The project will be required to comply with County Ordinance 655, which restricts lighting hours, types, and techniques of lighting. Ordinance 655 requires the use of low pressure sodium fixtures and requires hooded fixtures to prevent spillover light or glare. As a result, compliance with Ordinance 655 will reduce the potential impact to the surrounding residences to less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> Would the project				
<b>4. Agriculture</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is not located within the boundaries of designated farmland – as designated by the most recent version of the Important Farmland Map (as prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program). Additionally, the project proposes a primarily agriculture use with seventy-five (75) percent of the net project area planted in vineyards. Therefore the proposed project will not impact land designated as Prime, Unique, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

b) According to the General Plan, the project is not located within an Agriculture Preserve or under a Williamson Act contract; therefore, no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.

c) The project site is surrounded by agriculturally zoned land (Citrus Vineyard). However, the project proposes a primarily agriculture use with seventy-five (75) percent of the net project area planted in vineyards and the production of those vineyards into wine. Therefore, the project will not cause development of a non-agricultural use within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property.

d) The project will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, would result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

<b>AIR QUALITY</b> Would the project				
<b>5. Air Quality Impacts</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

**Findings of Fact:** Appendix G of the current State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project will significantly impact air quality if the project violates any ambient air quality standard, contributes substantially to an existing air quality violation, or exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

a) The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Governing Board adopted its most recent Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB on August 1, 2003. The AQMP is a plan for the regional improvement of air quality. As part of adoption of the County's General Plan in 2003, the General Plan EIR (SCH No. 2002051143) analyzed the General Plan growth projections for consistency with the AQMP and concluded that the General Plan is consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP. The project is consistent with the County General Plan and would therefore be consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP.

b) & c) The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is in a non-attainment status for federal ozone standards, federal carbon monoxide standards, and state and federal particulate matter standards. Any development in the SCAB, including the proposed Project, would cumulatively contribute to these pollutant violations.

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the Southwest Area Plan land use designations. The General Plan (2003) is a policy document that reflects the County's vision for the future of Riverside County. The General Plan is organized into eight separate elements, including an Air Quality Element. The purpose of the Air Quality Element is to protect County residents from the harmful effects of poor air quality. The Air Quality Element identifies goals, policies, and programs that are meant to balance actions regarding land use, circulation, and other issues with their potential effects on air quality. The Air Quality Element, in conjunction with local and regional air quality planning efforts, addresses ambient air quality standards set forth by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Potential air quality impacts resulting from the proposed Project would not exceed emissions projected by the Air Quality Element. The County is charged with implementing the policies in the General Plan Air Quality Element, which are focused on reducing concentrations of criteria pollutants, reducing negative impacts to sensitive receptors, reducing mobile and stationary pollutant sources, increasing energy conservation and

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

efficiency, improving the jobs to housing balance, and facilitating multi-jurisdictional coordination for the improvement of air quality.

Implementation of the project would not impact air quality beyond the levels documented in EIR No. 441 prepared for the General Plan. The project would impact air quality in the short-term during construction and in the long-term through operation. Construction activities associated with the Project would result in emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic gases (VOC), nitrogen dioxide (NOX), particulate sulfate (SOX) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Construction emissions are expected from the use of construction equipment (including heavy diesel trucks) and fugitive dust (associated with site preparation and equipment travel on paved and unpaved roads). Construction emissions would occur in close proximity to the disturbance area, but some spillover into the surrounding community may occur. In accordance with standard county requirements, dust control measures and maintenance of construction equipment shall be utilized on the property to limit the amount of particulate matter generated. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

The proposed project would primarily impact air quality through increased automotive emissions. Single projects typically do not generate enough traffic and associated air pollutants to violate clean air standards or contribute enough air pollutants to be considered a cumulatively considerable significant impact. Operational impacts associated with the project would be expected to result in emissions of VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, PM2.5 and SOX. Operational emissions would result from vehicle emissions, fugitive dust associated with vehicle travel, combustion emissions associated with natural gas use, emission related to electricity generation, and landscape equipment maintenance emissions. In the long term, emissions of VOC, NOX, CO, PM10 and PM2.5 and could exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds (in pounds per day). In addition, another potential impact is emissions from the project that may contribute to green house gases (GHGs) and therefore to global climate change. An individual project cannot generate enough GHG emissions to individually influence global climate change. However, the project may have an incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions. To date, no Federal, State, or project area local agencies have developed thresholds against which a proposed project can be evaluated to assist lead agencies in determining whether or not the proposed project is significant. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines (section 15064 (h) (3)) a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact may be considered less than significant if the Project will comply with a mitigation program that addresses the impact. The project will primarily impact GHGs by emissions of carbon dioxide in the form of vehicle exhaust and use of electricity. However, with compliance with standard requirements for use of low VOC paints and compliance with California Energy Commission Title 24 requirements for building energy efficiency, direct and cumulative air quality impacts would be reduced to a level below significance. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. Surrounding land uses include residential,

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

which is considered a sensitive receptor, however, a winery is not considered a substantial point source emitter or a sensitive receptor.

e) Surrounding land uses do not include significant localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants, or odors. A winery is not considered a substantial point source emitter or a sensitive receptor.

f) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**6. Wildlife & Vegetation**

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, PDB05386 – Focused Assessment for Burrowing Owl, prepared by Jeff Kidd, dated 5/10/08, Oak Tree Survey, prepared by Jeff Kidd, dated 8/22/08

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project site is located within the Riverside County Southwest Area Plan for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The property does not occur within a Criteria Cell (i.e., the property is not a Criteria Area proposed for conservation under the MSHCP) and as such, development of the site is not subject to the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process or the Joint Project Review (JPR) process. A Burrowing Owl Report was required. The project will not conflict with the provisions of the MSHCP.

b) According to the Burrowing Owl Report, no sensitive species were observed on the project site.

c) According to the Burrowing Owl Report, the project site lacks suitable habitat for burrowing owls. No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project.

d) A persistently flowing watercourse is not present on the project site; therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) & f) No natural water exists on the project site. According to the Burrowing Owl Report, the site does not support vernal pools, depressions, ruts, suitable soils or any other habitats that could support various species of fairy shrimp.

g) According to the Oak Tree Survey, a total of nine (9) coast live oaks were recorded and mapped throughout the site. The project proposes to avoid these oaks. To ensure these oaks remain undisturbed, the project shall follow the County design Provisions for tree preservation. (COA 60.PLANNING.19) With incorporation of this mitigation measure, the project will not conflict with the Oak Tree Guidelines and Design Provisions.

Mitigation: The tree preservation guidelines shall be incorporated into the projects approved grading and landscape plans. (COA 60.PLANNING.19)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted through the Building and Safety Plan Check Process.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**7. Historic Resources**

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, PD-A-4536 Phase I Archaeological Assessment, prepared by CRM Tech, dated July 7, 2008

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) A records search was conducted on May 7, 2008 by CRM Tech at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), University of California, Riverside. According to the report, the historical maps consulted

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

during the search suggest that the project area is relatively low in sensitivity for cultural resources from the historic period. As of the late 1970s, the project area remained vacant and undeveloped. None of the existing facilities encountered on the project site are older than 50 years of age; therefore, the project will not alter or destroy a historical resource.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

8. Archaeological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, PD-A-4536 Phase I Archaeological Assessment, prepared by CRM Tech, dated July 7, 2008

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) A records search was conducted on May 7, 2008 by CRM Tech at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), University of California, Riverside. According to the records on file, the project area had not previously been surveyed for cultural resources. Within a one-mile radius of the project site; however, at least 23 previous cultural resources studies have been conducted. As a result of these studies, ten historical/archaeological sites and six isolates were previously recorded. None of these previously recorded sites or isolates are located within the immediate vicinity of the project site.

No archaeological resources were encountered during the field survey. The proposed project is not expected to impact archaeological resources. If, however, during ground disturbing activities, unique cultural resources are discovered, all ground disturbances shall halt until a meeting is held between the developer, archaeologist, and Native American representative to discuss the significance of the find (COA 10.PLANNING.2). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

c) There may be a possibility that ground disturbing activities will expose human remains. The project is subject to State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 if human remains are discovered during ground disturbing activities. (COA 10.PLANNING.1) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

d) The project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**9. Paleontological Resources**

a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, or site, or unique geologic feature?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity", PD-P-1334 Paleontological Resources Assessment, prepared by CRM Tech, dated July 7, 2008

Findings of Fact:

a) A records search was conducted by CRM Tech at the San Bernardino County Museum and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County; no paleontological localities are known within the project area or within a one-mile radius. However, several paleontological localities have been reported nearby from the same sediment lithologies of the fossiliferous Pauba Formation that occur within the project area.

The field survey yielded no evidence of paleontological resources on the ground. However, the project is located upon surface exposures of the sandstone facies of the Pauba Formation, which as yielded elsewhere vertebrate and invertebrate fossils and is considered to have a high paleontological sensitivity. With incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures, the project will have a less than significant impact on paleontological resources.

Mitigation: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) shall be submitted and approved by the County Geologist. (COA 60.PLANNING.1)

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety Permit process.

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS** Would the project

**10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones**

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?

b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) According to Figure S-2, no active faults are known to traverse the subject site. The project site does not lie within a State of California Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone (formerly called an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone). The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in southern California. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**11. Liquefaction Potential Zone**

a) Be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", GIS Database

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, the project site is not located within an area subject of liquefaction; therefore no impacts will occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**12. Ground-shaking Zone**

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk)

Findings of Fact:

a) There are no known active or potentially active faults that traverse the site and the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along several major active or potentially active faults in southern California. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**13. Landslide Risk**

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map" and Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope"

Findings of Fact:

a) According to Figure S-4, the project site is located in an area of low to locally moderate susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls. The project will be required to implement the site-specific recommendations in the Geological Soils Report. These site-specific recommendations address temporary and permanent slopes, drainage, site preparation including any structural removals, compaction, utility trenches, fill materials, soils observation, post-tensioned foundation and slab systems, preliminary foundations design parameters, slab-on-grade, settlement considerations, retaining walls, seismic coefficients, corrosion, and preliminary pavement design parameters. The project site is characterized by flat terrain. Therefore, according to the existing conditions and with the implementation of recommended procedures, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**14. Ground Subsidence**

a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

Source: General Plan Fig. S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas", RCLIS

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, the project site is not located within an area subject of subsidence; therefore no impacts will occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**15. Other Geologic Hazards**

a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located near any large bodies of water or in a known volcanic area; therefore, the project site is not subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**16. Slopes**

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Source: GENERAL PLAN figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slopes", Building and Safety – Grading Review

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The project site is dominated by existing developed wedding reception area, single family residence, ornamental landscaping, a manmade lake, and a parking area. The project site does not support any native vegetation or ground cover. Onsite elevations range from 1,509 to 1,532 feet above mean sea level. The project proposes to construct a winery, underground tasting room, bed and breakfast, and banquet hall. To construct these buildings, the project proposes to restrict the grading around the building to maintain the natural/existing conditions. The project does not propose cut/fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet. As a result, the topography of the site will not be significantly altered.

c) The project will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems as no sewage disposal systems exist on the project site.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**17. Soils**

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Source: General Plan figure S-6 "Engineering Geologic Materials Map", Flood Control review, Building and Safety Grading review, application materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The development of the site could result in the loss of topsoil from grading activities, but not in a manner that would result in significant amounts of soil erosion. Implementation of Best Management

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Practices (BMPs) would reduce the impact to below a level of significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The project may be located on expansive soil; however, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

<b>18. Erosion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?				
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Flood Control District review, Project Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Implementation of the proposed project will involve grading and various construction activities. Standard construction procedures, and federal, state and local regulations implemented in conjunction with the site's storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and its Best Management Practices (BMPs) required under the National Pollution Discharge System (NPDES) general construction permit, will minimize potential for erosion during construction. These practices will keep substantial amounts of soil material from eroding from the project site and prevent deposition within receiving waters located downstream.

b) The potential for on-site erosion will increase due to grading and excavating activities during the construction phase. However, BMPs will be implemented for maintaining water quality and reducing erosion.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

<b>19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?				

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map," Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) The project site lies within a moderate area of wind erosion. The project will decrease the amount of exposed dirt, which is subject to wind erosion, with the incorporation of concrete, asphalt, and landscaping. No changes will be made on adjacent properties that would increase wind erosion offsite that would impact this project. Current levels of wind erosion on adjacent properties that would impact this site are considered less than significant. A condition has been placed on the project to control dust created during grading activities. (COA 10.BS GRADE.5) This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** Would the project

**20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The public or the environment will not be impacted as a result the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials associated with this project due to the nature of a winery. The source and amounts of hazardous material will result from the operation of certain agricultural equipment including combustion engine equipment and household hazardous waste. Due to the size and scope of the project, the amount of hazardous materials generated for from this project as consider less than significant.

(c) The Riverside County General Plan includes a Standardized Emergency Management System Multi-Hazard Functional Plan that establishes the responsibilities of the various County agencies in times of a disaster. As the proposed project would not prohibit any of the Plan's policies from being

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

enacted in the event of an emergency, the project will not interfere with the establishment and maintenance of this plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to hamper or create any significant impact on the ability of the County to implement disaster plans in the event of an emergency. Impacts are considered less than significant.

(d) No portions of the proposed project are within a quarter-mile of a school site nor will the project emit hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials. No Impacts are anticipated.

(e) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>21. Airports</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore, the project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan.

b) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore will not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission.

c) The project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

d) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**22. Hazardous Fire Area**

a) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-11 "Wildfire Susceptibility," GIS database

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, the proposed project site is not located within a hazardous fire area. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** Would the project

**23. Water Quality Impacts**

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in ~~significant~~ environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition.

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is subject to local offsite runoff from a tributary drainage area of approximately 10 acres from the east. Most of these flows are tributary to the existing pond. There are no streams or rivers which run through the site. The project has been designed to perpetuate the site's natural drainage patterns. Therefore, the project shall not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) In order to mitigate for water quality impacts the project shall provide best management treatment practices, including a water quality basin and grassy swales. Prior to grading permit issuance the applicant/developer is required to submit copies of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. In addition, prior to grading permit issuance, a copy of the project specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to the District for review and approval. All proposed BMP's shall be shown on the grading plan. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Additionally, the project has been conditioned to provide to the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement and to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) prior to issuance of any grading or construction permit. The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger (the project site is 2.73 acres). The owner/operator would comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) The development of this site will adversely impact downstream property owners by increasing the rate and volume of flood flows. To mitigate this impact, ~~the developer has proposed~~ a basin. The applicant/developer is required prior to grading permit issuance to submit copies of the plans for the basin and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. In addition, prior to grading permit issuance, a copy of the project specific WQMP shall be submitted to the District for review and approval. All

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

proposed BMP's shall be shown on the grading plan. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project shall not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there is no impact.

f) The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project shall not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there is no impact.

g) The proposed project is not anticipated to otherwise substantially degrade water quality. To avoid the substantial degradation of water quality, the project has been conditioned prior to the issuance of any grading or construction permits, to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, by developing and implementing a storm water pollution prevention plan, as well as a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. The project has also been conditioned to submit a Final Water Quality Management Plan prior to grading permit issuance for review and approval. The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and re-development projects. These are standard conditions of approval and are not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

h) The proposed project will include the construction of new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands). The project will include a detention basin. Prior to grading permit issuance, a copy of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. The plans must receive District approval prior to the issuance of grading permits to ensure that the operation of the BMP's shall not result in significant environmental effect. The infiltration trench/bio swales will require maintenance by a public agency or commercial property owners association. To ensure that the public is not unduly burdened with future costs, prior to final approval or recordation of this case, the district will require an acceptable financial mechanism to be implemented to provide for maintenance of the infiltration trench/bio swales. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The applicant/developer shall submit copies of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review prior to grading permit issuance (COA 60. Flood RI. 2).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Riverside County Flood Control District during the Building and Safety plan check process.

**24. Floodplains**

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable       U - Generally Unsuitable       R - Restricted

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database

Findings of Fact

- a) The proposed project is not located within a 100 year flood plain. Therefore, the project shall not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.
- b) The project is not within a 100-year Floodplain. Therefore, the project shall not result in changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.
- c) The project is not within a 100-year Floodplain. Therefore, the project shall not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.
- d) The project is not within a 100-year Floodplain. Therefore, the project shall not result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**LAND USE/PLANNING** Would the project

<b>25. Land Use</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?				
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) The project site is located on a 10.25-acre site in the County of Riverside’s Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area, which was established to ensure the continuation of the rural lifestyle and wine production in southwestern Riverside County. The project is located within the Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum) land use designation, which includes uses such as row crops, nurseries, dairies, ranches, poultry, and other agricultural related uses. The project is zoned Citrus Vineyard (C/V), which allows limited incidental commercial uses such as wine sales, sampling rooms, restaurants, delicatessens, bed and breakfast inns, hotels and hotels when they are secondary and directly related to the winery.

The proposed project would involve the legalization of a special occasion facility and the construction of a bed and breakfast, winery and tasting room which is consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning classification.

b) The project site is not located within a city sphere of influence.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

<b>26. Planning</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Be consistent with the site’s existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is zoned Citrus Vineyard (C/V), which allows limited incidental commercial uses such as wine sales, sampling rooms, restaurants, delicatessens, bed and breakfast inns, hotels and hotels when they are secondary and directly related to the agricultural operation. The proposed project would involve the legalization of a special occasion facility and the construction of a winery and tasting room which is permitted within the C/V zone. In addition, 75% of the site shall be planted in vineyards. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the existing zoning classification.

b) The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to the south, east and west and Citrus Vineyard – 10 Acre Minimum (C/V-10) to the north. The surrounding zoning allows for similar uses as those proposed by the project. Therefore, the project is consistent with the surrounding zoning.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

c) Surrounding land uses include vacant land to the north, and single family residences to the east, south, and west. The proposed project has the potential to conflict with the existing residences to the east, south, and west due to the proposed special events. The project shall host special events indoors; however, wedding ceremonies and movie nights will occur outdoors. Guest attending movie nights will be provided individual head sets to listen to the movies. No amplified music shall be allowed outside, with the exception of the two jazz concerts. The hours of operation of the facility shall be 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Monday through Thursdays and 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on Friday through Sundays, in order to reduce potential conflicts with neighbors. The variance request, submitted due to the topography and location of the subject property, will allow the building on the westerly property line to continue to be used for storage. The adjacent property owner does not have habitable dwellings closer than 50 feet to the building. The variance will allow the building to remain at its current location without causing disturbance to the existing topography and building placement at the site. Therefore, the project is consistent with its surroundings. The impact shall be less than significant.

d) The project site is located on a 10.25-acre site in the County of Riverside's Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area, which was established to ensure the continuation of the rural lifestyle and wine production in southwestern Riverside County. The project is located within the Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum) land use designation, which includes uses such as row crops, nurseries, dairies, ranches, poultry, and other agricultural related uses. The project is zoned Citrus Vineyard (C/V), which allows limited incidental commercial uses such as wine sales, sampling rooms, restaurants, delicatessens, bed and breakfast inns, hotels and hotels when they are secondary and directly related to the agricultural operation.

The proposed project would involve the legalization of a special occasion facility and the construction of a winery, tasting room and special occasion facility which is consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning classification.

e) Surrounding land uses include vacant land to the north, and single family residences to the east, south, and west. The proposed project will not disrupt or divide any existing community.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the project

**27. Mineral Resources**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

d) Expose people or property to hazards from

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is within MRZ-3, which is defined as areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined.

The General Plan identifies policies that encourage protections for existing mining operations and for appropriate management of mineral extraction. A significant impact that would constitute a loss of availability of a known mineral resource would include unmanaged extraction or encroach on existing extraction. No existing or abandoned quarries or mines exist in the area surrounding the project site. The project does not propose any mineral extraction on the project site. Any mineral resources on the project site will be unavailable for the life of the project; however, the project will not result in the permanent loss of significant mineral resources.

b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

c) The project will not be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine.

d) The project will not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**NOISE** Would the project result in

**Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings**

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

**28. Airport Noise**

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA  A  B  C  D

b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

b) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip that would expose people residing on the project site to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**29. Railroad Noise**      
 NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to a rail line. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**30. Highway Noise**      
 NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or near any highways. No impacts will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**31. Other Noise**      
 NA  A  B  C  D

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact: No other noise sources have been identified near the project site that would contribute a significant amount of noise to the project.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**32. Noise Effects on or by the Project**

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Operation of the proposed winery would result in an increase in ambient noise levels as the result of increased entertainment and special event venues. The project proposes to host approximately 100 special events that could include large gatherings of people and/or amplified music. The impact of these events would depend on the number of attendees in a given crowd, the number of amplified sound equipment and the time of occurrence of such an event. Ordinance No. 847 prohibits sounds in excess of land use specific standards. An Acoustical Report was submitted and reviewed by the Office of Industrial Hygiene. The project has been conditioned to comply with the recommendations of the Office of Industrial Hygiene which include: Facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home" must not exceed the following worst case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am and 65 dB(A) – 10 minute leq between 7:00 am and 10:00pm (COA 10. Planning. 48). In addition, in order to mitigate the effects of the winery, the hours of operation for the facility have been limited to 10:00 am to 9:00 pm Sunday through Thursday and 10:00 am to 10:00pm Friday and Saturday (COA 10. Planning. 9). No amplified music will be allowed outside, except for two jazz concerts which will end at 9:00 pm (COA 10. Planning. 47). Guests attending movie night shall be provided individual headsets to listen to the movies. Additionally, if a significant amount of excessive noise complaints have been received, one year after issuance of occupancy, the Planning Director and the Director of Building and safety may reconsider the hours of operation and annual amount of special events (COA 20. Planning. 3). Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b) The project may create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, all noise generated during project

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

construction and the operation of the site must comply with the County's noise standards, which restricts construction (short-term) and operational (long-term) noise levels. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) Operation of the proposed winery would result in an increase in ambient noise levels as the result of increased entertainment and special event venues. The project proposes to host approximately 165 special events that could include large gatherings of people and/or amplified music. The impact of these events would depend on the number of attendees in a given crowd, the volume of amplified sound equipment and the time of occurrence of such an event. Ordinance No. 847 prohibits sounds in excess of land use specific standards. An Acoustical Report was submitted and reviewed by the Office of Industrial Hygiene. The project has been conditioned to comply with the recommendations of the Office of Industrial Hygiene which include: Facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home" must not exceed the following worst case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am and 65 dB(A) – 10 minute leq between 7:00 am and 10:00pm (COA 10. Planning. 48). In addition, in order to mitigate the effects of the winery, the hours of operation for the facility have been limited to 11:00 am to 9:00 pm Sunday through Thursday and 11:00 am to 10:00pm Friday and Saturday (COA 10. Planning. 9). No amplified music will be allowed outside, except for two jazz concerts which will end at 9:00 pm (COA 10. Planning. 47). Guests attending movie night shall be provided individual headsets to listen to the movies. Additionally, if a significant amount of excessive noise complaints have been received, one year after issuance of occupancy, the Planning Director and the Director of Building and Safety may reconsider the hours of operation and annual amount of special events (COA 20. Planning. 3). Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

d) During the operational phase, the proposed project will not generate excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels. However, groundborne vibrations may be generated infrequently by use of heavy construction machinery during the construction of the proposed project. This type of construction will be temporary and infrequent, and would be considered a less than significant adverse impact.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to comply with the recommendations of the Office of Industrial Hygiene which include: Facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home" must not exceed the following worst case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am and 65 dB(A) – 10 minute leq between 7:00 am and 10:00pm (COA 10. Planning. 48). In addition, in order to mitigate the effects of the winery, the hours of operation for the facility have been limited to 11:00 am to 9:00 pm Sunday through Thursday and 11:00 am to 10:00pm Friday and Saturday (COA 10. Planning. 9). No amplified music will be allowed outside, except for two jazz concerts which will end at 9:00 pm (COA 10. Planning. 47). Additionally, if a significant amount of excessive noise complaints have been received, one year after issuance of occupancy, the Director may reconsider the hours of operation and annual amount of special events (COA 20. Planning. 3).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

---

**POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>33. Housing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, Riverside County General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

- a) The existing residence will be remodeled to include a bed and breakfast. However, the conversion will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- b) The project may create employment opportunities, but not substantial enough to create a demand for additional housing.
- c) The existing residence will be remodeled to include a bed and breakfast. However, the conversion will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- d) The project is not located within or near a County Redevelopment Project Area.
- e) The project will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections.
- f) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**PUBLIC SERVICES** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

**34. Fire Services**

Source: Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact: The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Fire Department. Any potential significant effects will be mitigated by the payment of standard fees to the County of Riverside. The project will not directly physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to fire services. (COA 90.PLANNING.29) This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**35. Sheriff Services**

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact: The proposed area is serviced by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The proposed project would not have an incremental effect on the level of sheriff services provided in the vicinity of the project area. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. The project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to sheriff services. (COA 90.PLANNING.29) This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA, is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**36. Schools**

Source: Temecula Valley Unified School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The proposed project is located within the Temecula Valley Unified School District. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. This project has been conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

to school services. (COA 80.PLANNING.17) This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**37. Libraries**

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact: The proposed project will not create a significant incremental demand for library services. The project will not require the provision of new or altered government facilities at this time. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. This project shall comply with County Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to library services. (COA 90.PLANNING.29) This is a standard condition of approval and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**38. Health Services**

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact: In the event of an emergency, employees of the proposed project may access several hospitals located is located within the service parameters of County health centers. Because the project involves business development, the demand for health services will remain relatively constant over time. Because the project is located within the service area of several health care facilities, the project impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**RECREATION**

**39. Parks and Recreation**

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

facility would occur or be accelerated?

c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: GIS database, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35 (Regulating the Division of Land – Park and Recreation Fees and Dedications), Ord. No. 659 (Establishing Development Impact Fees), Parks & Open Space Department Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The proposed winery will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts associated with recreational facilities are anticipated.

c) The project site is located within County Service Area (CSA) No. 149, which is a maintenance district for streets and roadways within the Temecula Valley Wine Country. However, the proposed project is not subject to Quimby Fees (Section 10.35 of Ordinance No. 460) as these fees only apply to residential developments. Therefore, there will be no impacts associated with recreational facilities.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

<b>40. Recreational Trails</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: Riverside County Parks, General Plan Figure C-7 "Trails and Bikeway System"

Findings of Fact: The General Plan does not identify any trails located along Glen Oaks Road; therefore, there will be no impacts to recreational trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** Would the project

<b>41. Circulation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?

d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
that results in substantial safety risks?				
e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GENERAL PLAN

Findings of Fact: The Transportation Department has not required a traffic study for the proposed project. The Transportation Department determined that the project is exempt from traffic study requirements. However, the project was required to submit a traffic management plan.

a) Access to and from the project site will be via Glen Oaks Road. The project will be required to provide for a left turn lane and acceleration and deceleration lane on Glen Oaks Road. With the recommended improvements, the project will not negatively impact the existing traffic capacity of the street. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b) The project is consistent with the parking requirements of Ordinance No. 328, Section 18.12. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) With the improvements to Glen Oaks Road described above, the project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

d) The project does not propose any uses, design features, or other obstacles (i.e. blinking strobe lights, high-rise towers, etc.) which would impact air traffic patterns.

e) Project implementation would not alter waterborne, rail, or air traffic.

f) The project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature.

g) The project would contribute to the cumulative deterioration of nearby roadways. The assessment of County fees, such as Development Impact Fees (DIF) and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), however, would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

(h) Considering the temporary nature of construction activity, the nature of traffic circulation in the project area, and established County requirements for traffic control on public roadways during construction, potential impacts to traffic circulation are considered less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

i) The proposed project will not restrict access to nearby uses. Additionally, considering the temporary nature of project construction, the volume of traffic circulation in the area, and established County requirements for traffic control on public roadways during construction, the project is expected to have less than significant impacts upon emergency access during construction. Emergency access throughout the project site will be developed in accordance with County ordinances, standard conditions of approval, and permits related to emergency access.

j) Currently, the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) does not operate a bus route within close proximity to the project area. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation: The project will be required to provide road improvements on Glen Oaks Road.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Transportation Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

**42. Bike Trails**

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact: The General Plan does not identify any trails located along Glen Oaks Road; therefore, there will be no impacts to recreational trails.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** Would the project

**43. Water**

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will be served by Rancho California Water District (RCWD) pursuant to the arrangement of financial agreements. The project will not physically alter existing facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) The project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project by Rancho California Water District (RCWD) pursuant to the arrangement of **financial agreements**. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**44. Sewer**

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project shall utilize septic systems. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant must provide a satisfactory detailed soils percolation test in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health Technical Manual. (COA 80. E Health. 3). Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant must provide a set of three detailed contoured plot plans drawn to an appropriate scale, wet stamped and signed by the Professional of Record (individual or firm who is responsible for the soils percolation report) showing the location of all applicable detail as required in the Department of Environmental Health Technical Manual. If grading is proposed, the applicant must show all pertinent detail on scaled Precise Grading Plans wet stamped and signed by the Professional of Record. Furthermore, a floor plan of the proposed structure showing all proposed plumbing fixtures must also be submitted to DEH for review to ensure proper septic tank sizing (COA 80. E Health. 4). These are standard Condition of Approvals and pursuant to CEQA is not considered mitigation. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**45. Solid Waste**

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

(County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

Source: General Plan, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

a-b) According to the Riverside County Waste Management Department, the proposed project has the potential to impact landfill capacity from the generation of solid waste during construction. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. Any construction of new facilities required by the cumulative effects of this project and surrounding projects would have to meet all applicable environmental standards. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**46. Utilities**

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact:

a-h) Implementation of the project will result in an incremental system capacity demand for energy systems, communication systems, storm water drainage systems, street lighting systems, maintenance of public facilities, including roads and potentially other governmental services. Each of the utility systems, including collection of solid waste, are available at the project site and lines will have to be extended onto the site, which will already be disturbed by grading and other construction activities. These impacts are considered less than significant based on the availability of existing public facilities that support local systems. The project will not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

Compliance with the requirements of Southern California Edison, Eastern Municipal Water District, Verizon, Riverside County Flood Control and Riverside County Transportation Department will ensure that potential impacts to utility systems are reduced to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Based on data available at this time, no offsite utility improvements will be required to support this project, other than improvement of local roadways. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

47. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare, or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

48. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of other current projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

49. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Staff review, project application

Findings of Fact: The proposed project would not result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**VI. EARLIER ANALYSES**

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration as per California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

Riverside County General Plan

Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS)

PDB05386 – Focused Assessment for Burrowing Owl, prepared by Jeff Kidd, dated 5/10/08

Oak Tree Survey, prepared by Jeff Kidd, dated 8/22/08

PD-A-4536 Phase I Archaeological Assessment, prepared by CRM Tech, dated July 7, 2008

PD-P-1334 Paleontological Resources Assessment, prepared by CRM Tech, dated July 7, 2008

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review:

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department  
 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor  
 Riverside, CA 92505

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 USE - PROJECT DESCRIPTION RECOMMND

This condition will require an update. There are discrepancies between the LDC approved exhibit and the site plan revisions the applicant discussed at Planning Commission on 5/05/10.

The use hereby permitted is for a winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. In addition, the project proposes a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,861 square foot gathering room, a 1-bedroom 4,659 square foot Bed & Breakfast facility, a 7,450 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 192 square foot guard office, a 400 square foot enclosed dance facility, and to permit an existing garage/storage building. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 108 parking spaces and an area for overflow parking.

AMENDED AT PLANNING COMMISSION ON 5/05/10 (This condition was amended to reflect the revised project description.)

10. EVERY. 2 USE - HOLD HARMLESS RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Riverside (COUNTY) its agents, officers, or employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY, its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning Plot Plan No. 23376. The COUNTY will promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY and will cooperate fully in the defense. If the COUNTY fails to promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant/permittee shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the COUNTY.

10. EVERY. 3 USE - DEFINITIONS RECOMMND

The words identified in the following list that appear in all capitals in the attached conditions of Plot Plan No.

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 2

PLOT PLAN: TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 3 USE - DEFINITIONS (cont.) RECOMMND

23376 shall be henceforth defined as follows:

APPROVED EXHIBIT A = Site Plan for Plot Plan No. 23376,  
Amended No. 2, dated June 19, 2009.

APPROVED EXHIBIT B = Elevations and Floor Plans for Plot  
Plan No. 23376, Amended No. 2, dated June 4, 2009.

APPROVED EXHIBIT L = Landscaping Plans for Plot Plan No.  
23376, Amended No. 2, dated June 4, 2009.

APPROVED EXHIBIT M = Material Board for Plot Plan No.  
23376, Amended No. 2, dated June 4, 2009.

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

10.BS GRADE. 1 USE -GIN INTRODUCTION RECOMMND

Improvements such as grading, filling, over excavation and  
recompaction, and base or paving which require a grading  
permit are subject to the included Building and Safety  
Department Grading Division conditions of approval.

10.BS GRADE. 3 USE-G1.2 OBEY ALL GDG REGS RECOMMND

All grading shall conform to the California Building Code,  
Ordinance 457, and all other relevant laws, rules, and  
regulations governing grading in Riverside County and prior  
to commencing any grading which includes 50 or more cubic  
yards, the applicant shall obtain a grading permit from the  
Building and Safety Department.

10.BS GRADE. 4 USE-G1.3 DISTURBS NEED G/PMT RECOMMND

Ordinance 457 requires a grading permit prior to clearing,  
grubbing, or any top soil disturbances related to  
construction grading.

10.BS GRADE. 5 USE-G1.6 DUST CONTROL RECOMMND

All necessary measures to control dust shall be implemented  
by the developer during grading. PM10 plan may be required  
at the time a grading permit is issued.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 6 USE-G2.3SLOPE EROS CL PLAN RECOMMND

Erosion control - landscape plans, required for manufactured slopes greater than 3 feet in vertical height, are to be signed by a registered landscape architect and bonded per the requirements of Ordinance 457 (refer to dept. form 284-47).

10.BS GRADE. 7 USE-G2.5 2:1 MAX SLOPE RATIO RECOMMND

Graded slopes shall be limited to a maximum steepness ratio of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) unless otherwise approved.

10.BS GRADE. 8 USE-G2.6SLOPE STABL'TY ANLYS RECOMMND

A slope stability report shall be submitted and approved by the County Geologist for all proposed cut or fill slopes steeper than 2:1 (horiz. to vert.) or over 30' in vertical height - unless addressed in a previous report.

10.BS GRADE. 9 USE-G2.7DRNAGE DESIGN Q100 RECOMMND

All grading and drainage shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's conditions of approval regarding this application. If not specifically addressed in their conditions, drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100 year storm flows.

Additionally, the Building and Safety Department's conditional approval of this application includes an expectation that the conceptual grading plan reviewed and approved for it complies or can comply with any WQMP (water Quality Management Plan) required by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

10.BS GRADE. 10 USE-G2.8MINIMUM DRNAGE GRADE RECOMMND

Minimum drainage grade shall be 1% except on portland cement concrete where .35% shall be the minimum.

10.BS GRADE. 11 USE-G2.9DRNAGE & TERRACING RECOMMND

Provide drainage facilities and terracing in conformance with the California Building Code's chapter on "GRADING".

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 12 USE-G2.10 SLOPE SETBACKS RECOMMND

Observe slope setbacks from buildings & property lines per the California Building Code as amended by Ordinance 457.

10.BS GRADE. 13 USE-G2.23 OFFST. PAVED PKG RECOMMND

All offstreet parking areas which are conditioned to be paved shall conform to Ordinance 457 base and paving design and inspection requirements.

10.BS GRADE. 14 USE-G.3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the property owner shall obtain a grading permit and/or approval to construct from the Grading Division of the Building and Safety Department.

10.BS GRADE. 15 USE-G3.3RETAINING WALLS RECOMMND

Lots which propose retaining walls will require separate permits. They shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any other building permits - unless otherwise approved by the Building and Safety Director. The walls shall be designed by a Registered Civil Engineer - unless they conform to the County Standard Retaining Wall designs shown on the Building and Safety Department form 284-197.

10.BS GRADE. 16 USE-G3.4CRIB/RETAIN'G WALLS RECOMMND

Cribwall (retaining) walls shall be designed by a qualified professional who shall provide the following information for review and approval - this shall be in addition to standard retaining wall data normally required. The plans shall clearly show: soil preparation and compaction requirements to be accomplished prior to footing-first course installation, method/requirement of footing-first course installation, properties of materials to be used (i.e. Fc=2500 p.s.i.). Additionally special inspection by the manufacturer/dealer and a registered special inspector will be required.

10.BS GRADE. 17 USE-G4.1E-CL 4:1 OR STEEPER RECOMMND

Plant & irrigate all manufactured slopes steeper than a 4:1 (horizontal to vertical) ratio and 3 feet or greater in vertical height with grass or ground cover; slopes 15 feet or greater in vertical height shall be planted with

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 17 USE-G4.1E-CL 4:1 OR STEEPER (cont.) RECOMMND

additional shrubs or trees or as approved by the Building & Safety Department's Erosion Control Specialist.

10.BS GRADE. 18 USE-G4.3PAVING INSPECTIONS RECOMMND

The developer/applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the paving inspections required by Ordinance 457.

10.BS GRADE. 19 USE-G2.17LOT TO LOT DRN ESMT RECOMMND

A recorded easement is required for lot to lot drainage.

10.BS GRADE. 20 USE-G1.4 NPDES/SWPPP RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits - whichever comes first - the applicant shall provide the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the following: "Effective March 10, 2003 owner operators of grading or construction projects are required to comply with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner operator can comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

For additional information and to obtain a copy of the NPDES State Construction Permit contact the SWRCB at (916) 657-1146.

Additionally, at the time the county adopts, as part of any ordinance, regulations specific to the N.P.D.E.S., this project (or subdivision) shall comply with them.

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

10.E HEALTH. 1 SDRWQCB GENERAL COMMENTS RECOMMND

Based on the information provided to the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) during the planning review process, no action on behalf of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) was required at the time. However, DEH reserves the right to request a

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 6

PLOT PLAN: TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.E HEALTH. 1                   SDRWQCB GENERAL COMMENTS (cont.)                   RECOMMND

clearance letter from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board should further information indicate the requirements.

10.E HEALTH. 2                   EST. DAILY WASTEWATER FLOWS                   RECOMMND

Per letter c/o Lawrence Phelps, RCE dated March 9, 2009, the estimated aggregate total daily wastewater flow discharged onsite does not exceed 1200 gallons. Should further information indicate total daily wastewater flow discharges greater than 2000 gallons, the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) reserves the right to regulate in accordance with County Ordinances and policies including but not limited to requiring further engineering and/or testing, the proposal of an advanced treatment unit or sanitary sewer, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board clearance, etc.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

10.FIRE. 1                   USE-#50-BLUE DOT REFLECTOR                   RECOMMND

Blue retroreflective pavement markers shall be mounted on private street, public streets and driveways to indicate location of fire hydrants. Prior to installation, placement of markers must be approved by the Riverside County Fire Department.

10.FIRE. 2                   USE -WINE CAVE                   RECOMMND

WINERY CAVE SHALL COMPLY WITH 2007 CBC, SECTION 436.

10.FIRE. 3                   USE-#23-MIN REQ FIRE FLOW                   RECOMMND

Minimum required fire flow shall be 1500 GPM for a 2 hour duration at 20 PSI residual operating pressure, which must be available before any combustible material is placed on the job site. Fire flow is based on type V-B construction per the 2007 CBC and Building(s) having a fire sprinkler system.

10.FIRE. 4                   USE-#31-ON/OFF NOT LOOPED HYD                   RECOMMND

A combination of on-site and off-site super fire hydrant(s) (6"x4"x 2-2-1/2"), will be located not less than 25 feet or more than 165 feet from any portion of the building as

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FIRE. 4 USE-#31-ON/OFF NOT LOOPED HYD (cont.) RECOMMND

measured along approved vehicular travel ways. The required fire flow shall be available from any adjacent hydrants(s) in the system.

10.FIRE. 5 USE-#84-TANK PERMITS RECOMMND

Applicant or Developer shall be responsible for obtaining under/aboveground fuel, chemical and mixed liquid storage tank permits, from the Riverside County Fire Department and Environmental Health Departments. Plans must be submitted for approval prior to installation. Aboveground fuel/mixed liquid tanks(s) shall meet the following standard: Tank must be tested and labeled to UL2085 Protected Tank Standard or SwRI 93-01. The test must include the Projectile Penetration Test and the Heavy Vehicle Impact Test. A sample copy of the tank's label from an independent test laboratory must be included with your plans.

10.FIRE. 6 USE-#89-RAPID HAZMAT BOX RECOMMND

Rapid entry Hazardous Material data and key storage cabinet shall be installed on the outside of the building. Plans shall be submitted to the Riverside County Fire Department for approval prior to installation.

10.FIRE. 7 USE-#25-GATE ENTRANCES RECOMMND

Any gate providing access from a road to a driveway shall be located at least 35 feet from the roadway and shall open to allow a vehicle to stop without obstructing traffic on the road. Where a one-way road with a single traffic lane provides access to a gate entrance, a 38 foot turning radius shall be used.

10.FIRE. 8 USE-#88A-AUTO GATES RECOMMND

Gate(s) shall be automatic operated, minimum 20 feet in width, with a setback of 35 feet from face of curb/flow line. Gate access shall be equipped with a rapid entry system. Plans shall be submitted to the Fire Department for approval prior to installation. Automatic/manual gate pins shall be rated with shear pin force, not to exceed 30 foot pounds. Automatic gates shall be equipped with emergency backup power. Gates activated by the rapid entry system shall remain open until closed by the rapid entry system.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

## 10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

### FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

#### 10.FLOOD RI. 1 . USE FLOOD HAZARD REPORT

RECOMMND

PP 23376 is a proposal to legalize an existing wedding facility with addition of bed and breakfast place and a restaurant in the Temecula area. The 10.25 acre site is located on the south side of Glenoaks Road approximately 660 feet west of Camino Del Vino.

The site is subject to local offsite runoff from a tributary drainage area of approximately 10 acres from the east. Most of these flows are tributary to an existing pond on the proposed site.

The development of this site would adversely impact water quality. The impervious area due to the proposed development in the northern half area is not considered large enough to initiate an increased runoff mitigation measure. However, mitigation shall be required to offset water quality impacts. The hydrology study and the preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) dated June 18, 2009 was submitted with the previous amended 2 exhibit which was approved by the District and is still applicable to this amended 3 exhibit. The developer is proposing a grassy swale to treat the parking lot which then drains to an existing low. Although no backup calculations or cross section for the grassy swale is submitted, it appears there is sufficient area to accommodate additional length for the grassy swale if needed. An infiltration basin is proposed along the southern boundary to mitigate both increased runoff and water quality. The developer is also proposing "porous" cobblestone for the driveways as a BMP. No section or detail of these cobblestones is provided and therefore the cobblestone would be considered impervious and shall have water quality mitigation. The detail cross section and the back up calculations for these BMP's shall be submitted at the improvement plan check.

#### 10.FLOOD RI. 5 USE PERP DRAINAGE PATTERNS

RECOMMND

The property's grading shall be designed in a manner that perpetuates the existing natural drainage patterns with respect to tributary drainage area, outlet points and outlet conditions; otherwise, a drainage easement shall be obtained from the affected property owners for the release of concentrated or diverted storm flows. A copy of the recorded drainage easement shall be submitted to the District for review.

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 9

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 10 USE INCREASED RUNOFF

RECOMMND

The development of this site will adversely impact downstream property owners by increasing the rate and volume of flood flows. To mitigate this impact, the developer has proposed a detention basin. Although final design of the basin will not be required until the improvement plan stage of this development, the applicant's engineer has submitted a preliminary hydrology and hydraulics study that indicates that the general size, shape, and location of the proposed basin is sufficient to mitigate the impacts of the development.

10.FLOOD RI. 11 USE INCREASED RUNOFF CRITERIA

RECOMMND

The development of this site would increase peak flow rates on downstream properties. Mitigation shall be required to offset such impacts. An increased runoff basin shall be shown on the exhibit and calculations supporting the size of the basin shall be submitted to the District for review. The entire area of proposed development will be routed through a detention facility(s) to mitigate increased runoff. All basins must have positive drainage; dead storage basins shall not be acceptable.

A complete drainage study including, but not limited to, hydrologic and hydraulic calculations for the proposed detention basin shall be submitted to the District for review and approval.

Storms to be studied will include the 1-hour, 3-hour, 6-hour and 24-hour duration events for the 2-year, 5-year and 10-year return frequencies. Detention basin(s) and outlet(s) sizing will ensure that none of these storm events has a higher peak discharge in the post-development condition than in the pre-development condition. For the 2-year and 5-year events the loss rate will be determined using an AMC I condition. For the 10-year event AMC II will be used. Constant loss rates shall be used for the 1-hour, 3-hour and 6-hour events. A variable loss rate shall be used for the 24-hour events.

Low Loss rates will be determined using the following:

1. Undeveloped Condition --> LOW LOSS = 90%
2. Developed Condition --> LOW LOSS = .9 - (.8x%IMPERVIOUS)
3. Basin Site --> LOW LOSS = 10%

Where possible and feasible the on-site flows should be

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 11

USE INCREASED RUNOFF CRITERIA (cont.)

RECOMMND

mitigated before combining with off-site flows to minimize the size of the detention facility required. If it is necessary to combine off-site and on-site flows into a detention facility two separate conditions should be evaluated for each duration/return period/before-after development combination studied; the first for the total tributary area (off-site plus on-site), and the second for the area to be developed alone (on-site). It must be clearly demonstrated that there is no increase in peak flow rates under either condition (total tributary area or on-site alone), for each of the return period/duration combinations required to be evaluated. A single plot showing the pre-developed, post-developed and routed hydrographs for each storm considered, shall be included with the submittal of the hydrology study.

No outlet pipe(s) will be less than 18" in diameter. Where necessary an orifice plate may be used to restrict outflow rates. Appropriate trash racks shall be provided for all outlets less than 48" in diameter.

The basin(s) and outlet structure(s) must be capable of passing the 100-year storm without damage to the facility. Embankment shall be avoided in all cases unless site constraints or topography make embankment unavoidable in the judgment of the General Manager-Chief Engineer.

Mitigation basins should be designed for joint use and be incorporated into open space or park areas. Sideslopes should be no steeper than 4:1 and depths should be minimized where public access is uncontrolled.

A viable maintenance mechanism, acceptable to both the County and the District, should be provided for detention facilities. Generally, this would mean a CSA, landscape district, parks agency or commercial property owners association.

10.FLOOD RI. 13

USE WQMP ESTABL MAINT ENTITY

RECOMMND

This project proposes BMP facilities that will require maintenance by public agency or commercial property owner association. To ensure that the public is not unduly burdened with future costs, prior to final approval or recordation of this case, the District will require an acceptable financial mechanism be implemented to provide

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 11

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 13 USE WQMP ESTABL MAINT ENTITY (cont.) RECOMMND

for maintenance of treatment control BMPs in perpetuity. This may consist of a mechanism to assess individual benefiting property owners, or other means approved by the District. The site's treatment control BMPs must be shown on the project's improvement plans - either the street plans, grading plans, or landscaping plans. The type of improvement plans that will show the BMPs will depend on the selected maintenance entity.

10.FLOOD RI. 14 USE SUBMIT FINAL WQMP>PRELIM RECOMMND

In compliance with Santa Ana Region and San Diego Region Regional Water Quality Control Board Orders, and Beginning January 1, 2005, projects submitted within the western region of the unincorporated area of Riverside County for discretionary approval will be required to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan for Urban Runoff (WQMP). The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and redevelopment projects. The WQMP requirements will vary depending on the project's geographic location (Santa Ana, Santa Margarita or Whitewater River watersheds). The WQMP provides detailed guidelines and templates to assist the developer in completing the necessary studies. These documents are available on-line at:  
[www.rcflood.org/NPDES](http://www.rcflood.org/NPDES).

To comply with the WQMP a developer must submit a "Project Specific" WQMP. This report is intended to a) identify potential post-project pollutants and hydrologic impacts associated with the development; b) identify proposed mitigation measures (BMPs) for identified impacts including site design, source control and treatment control post-development BMPs; and c) identify sustainable funding and maintenance mechanisms for the aforementioned BMPs. A template for this report is indicated as 'exhibit A' on the website above. A final Project Specific WQMP must be approved by the District prior to issuance of building or grading permits.

Projects that require a Project Specific WQMPs were required to submit a PRELIMINARY Project Specific WQMP along with the land-use application package in the tentative phase of development in order to obtain recommended conditions of approval. The developer has submitted a report that minimally meets the criteria for a

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 14 USE SUBMIT FINAL WQMP>PRELIM (cont.) RECOMMND

preliminary project specific WQMP of addressing points a, b, and c above. It shall be noted that while the preliminary project specific WQMP was adequate at that stage, the preliminary WQMP report will need significant revisions at the improvement plan check phase of the development in order to meet the requirements of a final project specific WQMP - including detailed drawings for the BMPs along with all supporting calculations. It should also be noted that if 401 certification is necessary for the project, the Water Quality Control Board may require additional water quality measures.

10.FLOOD RI. 16 USE BMP MAINTENANCE & INSPECT RECOMMND

The BMP maintenance plan shall contain provisions for all treatment controlled BMPs to be inspected, and if required, cleaned no later than October 15 each year. Required documentation shall identify the entity that will inspect and maintain all structural BMPs within the project boundaries. A copy of all necessary documentation shall be submitted to the District for review and approval prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 3 USE - PDP01334 RECOMMND

County Paleontological Report (PDP) No. 1334, submitted for this project (PP23376), was prepared by CRM Tech and is entitled: "Paleontological Resources Assessment Report, Assessors Parcel No. 942-050-004, Plot Plan No. 23376, Oak Meadows, 36101 Glen Oaks Road, Rancho California Area, Riverside County, California", CRM Tech Contract No. 2245P, July 7, 2008.

PDP01334 concluded:

1.The project area lies within the highly fossiliferous Pleistocene-age Pauba Formation. The Temecula Arkose and an unnamed sandstone formation may lie beneath the Pauba Formation.

2.The proposed project's potential to impact paleontological resources is determined to be high for Pleistocene-age fossil remains.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 3 USE - PDP01334 (cont.)

RECOMMND

PDP01334 recommended:

1.Paleontological monitoring for all earth-moving operations in the project area that will directly impact sediments of the Pauba Formation, the Temecula Arkose Formation, or the unnamed sandstone formation.

2.A program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources unearthed during the project should be developed in accordance with the provisions of CEQA as well as regulations of the County of Riverside and the proposed guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. This program is described, in part, in the July 7, 2008 report referenced above and includes monitoring, collection of vertebrate fossils, sediment sampling & washing for small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils, preparation, identification and curation of recovered specimens and reporting.

PDP01334 satisfies the requirement for a Paleontological Study for Planning/CEQA purposes. PDP01334 is hereby accepted for PP23376. A Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) shall be prepared prior to issuance of any grading permit on this site as described elsewhere in this conditions set.

10.PLANNING. 4 USE - COMPLY WITH ORD./CODES

RECOMMND

The development of these premises shall comply with the standards of Ordinance No. 348 and all other applicable Riverside County ordinances and State and Federal codes.

The development of the premises shall conform substantially with that as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A, unless otherwise amended by these conditions of approval.

10.PLANNING. 5 USE - FEES FOR REVIEW

RECOMMND

Any subsequent submittals required by these conditions of approval, including but not limited to grading plan, building plan or mitigation monitoring review, shall be reviewed on an hourly basis (research fee), or other such review fee as may be in effect at the time of submittal, as required by Ordinance No. 671. Each submittal shall be accompanied with a letter clearly indicating which condition or conditions the submittal is intended to comply

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 5 USE - FEES FOR REVIEW (cont.) RECOMMND

with.

10.PLANNING. 6 USE - LIGHTING HOODED/DIRECTED RECOMMND

Any outside lighting shall be hooded and directed so as not to shine directly upon adjoining property or public rights-of-way.

10.PLANNING. 7 USE- COLORS & MATERIALS RECOMMND

Building colors and materials shall be in substantial conformance with those shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT M.

10.PLANNING. 9 USE- HOURS OF OPERATION RECOMMND

Use of the facilities approved under this plot plan shall be limited to the hours of operation listed below in order to reduce the conflict with adjacent residential zones and/or land uses.

-Weddings can be held:

Monday through Thursday: 4:00 pm to 9:00 pm

Friday through Sunday: 4:00pm to 10:00 pm

-The small group gatherings shall occur Monday through Thursday between the hours of 11:00 AM - 2:00 PM and 4:00 PM - 9:00 PM.

-The family movie nights will occur on Wednesday nights between 6:00 PM - 9:00 PM.

-Jazz concerts will be on Saturday night between 5:00 PM - 10:00 PM.

-Wine tasting is allowed between the hours of 10:00 AM and 4:00 PM Monday through Sunday.

AMENDED AT PLANNING COMMISSION ON 5/05/10. (Special event hours of operation on Friday, Saturday and Sunday were extended to 10 PM.)

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 10 USE- BASIS FOR PARKING RECOMMND

Parking for this project was determined primarily on the basis of County Ordinance No. 348, Section 18.12. a.(2).b)

Tasting Room - 1 space per 45 square feet of serving area

Gift Shop - 1 space per 200 square feet

Banquet Hall - 1 space for every 2 guests

300 Maximum Guests for whole facility = 150 parking spaces required

AMENDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

10.PLANNING. 11 USE- LIMIT ON SIGNAGE RECOMMND

Signage for this project shall be limited to the two (2) signs shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT L. Any additional signage shall be approved by the Planning Department pursuant to the requirements of Section 18.30 (Planning Department review only) of Ordinance No. 348.

10.PLANNING. 22 USE - NO RESIDENT OCCUPANCY RECOMMND

No permanent occupancy shall be permitted within the property approved under this plot plan as a principal place of residence except the existing residence and caretaker's dwelling as shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT A. No person, except the occupant of the existing residence, caretaker and members of the caretaker's family, shall use the premises as a permanent mailing address nor be entitled to vote using an address within the premises as a place of residence.

10.PLANNING. 23 USE - MAINTAIN LICENSING RECOMMND

At all times during the conduct of the permitted use the permittee shall maintain and keep in effect valid licensing approval from the Department of Alcohol and Beverage Control (ABC), or equivalent agency as provided by law. Should such licensing be denied, expire or lapse at any time in the future, this permit shall become null and void.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 25

USE - NOISE MONITORING REPORTS

RECOMMND

The permit holder may be required to submit periodic noise monitoring reports as determined by the Department of Code Enforcement as part of a code enforcement action relating to noise issues. Upon written notice from the Department of Code Enforcement requiring such a report, the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall prepare and submit an approved report within thirty (30) calendar days to the Department of Code Enforcement, unless more time is allowed through the written agreement by the Department of Code Enforcement. The noise monitoring report shall be approved by the Office of the Industrial Hygiene of the Health Service Agency (the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall be required to place a deposit sufficient funds to cover the costs of this approval prior to commencing the required report.)

The permit holder shall comply with the applicable standards of Ordinance No. 847. Sound amplifying equipment or live music is prohibited between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. Sound emanating from sound amplifying equipment or live music at any other time shall not be audible to the human ear at a distance greater than five hundred (500) feet from the equipment or music. In the event noise exceeds this standard, the permit holder or the permit holder's successor-in-interest shall take the necessary steps to remedy the situation, which may include discontinued operation of the facilities.

REVISED AT PC ON 10/28/09.

10.PLANNING. 33

USE - MT PALOMAR LIGHTING AREA

RECOMMND

Within the Mt. Palomar Special Lighting Area, as defined in Ordinance No. 655, low pressure sodium vapor lighting or overhead high pressure sodium vapor lighting with shields or cutoff luminaires, shall be utilized.

10.PLANNING. 39

USE - C/V DESIGN GUIDELINES

RECOMMND

The project shall conform to the Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area Design Standards and Guidelines.

10.PLANNING. 40

USE - BUSINESS LICENSING

RECOMMND

Every person conducting a business within the unincorporated area of Riverside County, as defined

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 40 USE - BUSINESS LICENSING (cont.) RECOMMND

in Riverside County Ordinance No. 857, shall obtain a business license. For more information regarding business registration, contact the Business Registration and License Program Office of the Building and Safety Department at [www.rctlma.org.buslic](http://www.rctlma.org.buslic).

10.PLANNING. 44 USE - VINEYARD PLANTING RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of building permits, 75% of the net project area shall be planted in vineyards.

10.PLANNING. 45 USE - SPECIAL EVENTS RECOMMND

The following special events shall be allowed:

-134 special events per year comprised of 99 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts.

-Weddings shall have a maximum of 150 guests.

-With the exception of the jazz concerts and movie nights, the special events shall be held indoors.

Note: If the winery production room/caretaker's unit and banquet hall have not been constructed within 1 year of project approval, the special events must cease. The allowance for special events is dependent on the remodel of the winery production room. Per the Citrus Vineyard zone, incidental commercial uses (special events) shall be secondary to the agricultural use of the site.

AMENDED AT DH ON 5/05/10

(Amended to reflect the allowed number of special events.)

10.PLANNING. 46 USE- PRODUCTION CAPACITY RECOMMND

The winery facility shall have a capacity to produce a minimum of 3,500 gallons of wine annually.

10.PLANNING. 47 USE- AMPLIFIED MUSIC RECOMMND

No amplified music shall be played outdoors with the exception of the two jazz concerts.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 48

USE- INDUSTRIAL HYG. RECOMMND

RECOMMND

The project shall comply with the following recommendations provided by the Department of Industrial Hygiene stated in their letter dated December 9, 2008:

1. Facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home" must not exceed the following worst case noise levels 45 dB(A) - 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am and 65 dB(A) - 10 minute leq between 7:00 am and 10:00pm.

2. Whenever a construction site is within one-quarter (1/4) of a mile of an occupied residence or residences, no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 6:00 pm and 6:00 am during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 pm and 7:00 am during the months of October through May. Exceptions to these standards shall be allowed only with the written consent of the building official.

3. The Lake Oak Meadows Wedding Facility shall adhere to the requirements set forth by the Riverside County Noise Ordinance, Section 9.52.060 D.

4. Our department (Office of Industrial Hygiene) must receive, review and approve an acoustical report (as listed above) addressing the noise that might be produced from speaker phones and air conditioning unit location and specification from the proposed wedding banquet hall. Building design must be shown to reduce interior noise to at or below 50 Ldn for those buildings along Glen Oaks Road.

5. The applicant shall pay review fees to the Department of Public Health for all time spent in review of this project. Fees will be assessed at the Department's hourly rate for Industrial Hygienists.

10.PLANNING. 49

USE - LC LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENT

RECOMMND

The developer/ permit holder shall:

1)Ensure all landscape and irrigation plans are in conformance with the APPROVED EXHIBITS;

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 49 USE - LC LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENT (cont.) RECOMMND

2)Ensure all landscaping is provided with California Friendly landscaping and a weather based irrigation controller(s) as defined by County Ordinance No. 859;

3)Ensure that irrigation plans which may use reclaimed water conform with the requirements of the local water purveyor; and,

4)Be responsible for maintenance, viability and upkeep of all slopes, landscaped areas, and irrigation systems until the successful completion of the twelve (12) month inspection or those operations become the responsibility of the individual property owner(s), a property owner's association, or any other successor-in-interest, whichever occurs later.

To ensure ongoing maintenance, the developer/ permit holder or any successor in interest shall:

1)Connect to a reclaimed water supply for landscape irrigation purposes when reclaimed water is made available.

2)Ensure that landscaping, irrigation and maintenance systems comply with the Riverside County Guide to California Friendly Landscaping, and Ordinance No. 859.

3)Ensure that all landscaping is healthy, free of weeds, disease and pests.

10.PLANNING. 50 USE- NO OUTDOOR RECEPTIONS RECOMMND

No outdoor receptions will be allowed after the construction of the 400 square foot building that will be used for events.

AMENDED AT PC 5/05/10.

10.PLANNING. 51 USE- NO OUTDOOR EVENTS NOV-FEB RECOMMND

No outdoor special events are allowed during the months of November, December, January and February.

CONDITION ADDED AT DIRECTOR'S HEARING ON JULY 27, 2009.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 52

GEN - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND

RECOMMND

The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following codes for the life of this project:

If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 (b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and their disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within the period specified by law. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the "Most Likely Descendant." The Most Likely Descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultation with the County and the property owner concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Human remains from other ethnic/cultural groups with recognized historical associations to the project area shall also be subject to consultation between appropriate representatives from that group and the County Planning /Director.

10.PLANNING. 53

GEN - INADVERTANT ARCHAEO FIND

RECOMMND

The developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with the following for the life of this project:

If during ground disturbance activities, cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological reports and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. A cultural resources site is defined, for this condition, as being three or more artifacts in close association with each other, but may include fewer artifacts if the area of the find is determined to be of significance due to it sacred or cultural importance.

1.All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resource shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative (or other appropriate ethic/cultural group representative),

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 53                    GEN - INADVERTANT ARCHAEO FIND (cont.)                    RECOMMND

and the Planning Director to discuss the significance of the find.

2.At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed and after consultation with the Native American tribal (or other appropriate ethnic/cultural group representative) and the archaeologist, a decision is made, with the concurrence of the Planning Director, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc) for the cultural resource.

3.Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures.

10.PLANNING. 54                    USE - CAUSES FOR REVOCATION                    RECOMMND

In the event the use hereby permitted under this permit, a) is found to be in violation of the terms and conditions of this permit, b) is found to have been obtained by fraud or perjured testimony, or c) is found to be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare, or is a public nuisance, this permit shall be subject to the revocation procedures.

10.PLANNING. 55                    USE - EXTERIOR NOISE LEVEL                    RECOMMND

Exterior noise levels produced by any use allowed under this permit, are not to exceed 45 db(A), 10-minute LEQ, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., and 65 db(A), 10-minute LEQ, at all other times as measured at any residential, hospital, school, library, nursing home or other similar noise sensitive land use. In the event noise exceeds this standard, the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall take the necessary steps to remedy the situation, which may include discontinued operation of the facilities.

ADDED AT PC ON 10/28/09.

10.PLANNING. 56                    USE - MAXIMUM CAPACITY                    RECOMMND

At no time shall the number of people at the facility exceed 300. This number includes guests and employees.

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 22

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 56 USE - MAXIMUM CAPACITY (cont.) RECOMMND

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

10.PLANNING. 57 USE - NUMBER OF WEDDINGS RECOMMND

One year after the approval of the plot plan, the Planning Director shall review any noise complaints about the facility and determine if the number of weddings per year shall be increased from 99 to 130 weddings. The determination shall be placed in the Land Management System used for permits or other subsequently used permit tracking system.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

10.PLANNING. 58 USE - TEMP. RESTRAINING ORDER RECOMMND

In the event the applicant has uncured code or conditions of approval violations after a ten (10) day notice period, the applicant agrees that the County may go to court ex parte to obtain a temporary restraining order that would prohibit special events at the property, but allow the winery to continue operating, until the violations are cured.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

10.TRANS. 1 USE - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN RECOMMND

The following Traffic Management Plan was prepared by the applicant/engineer.

PP 23376

Project Description:

The purpose of this Traffic Management Plan is to describe the proposed project details for Plot Plan 23376 located at 36101 Glen Oaks Rd. Temecula.

This project is on 10 gross acres and is currently an existing wedding facility holding weddings in an outdoors setting. Several phases of Plot Plan 23376 will improve the facility with a banquet hall, barrel room, tasting room, gift shop, and appurtenances. Following are several event scenarios describing hours and number of guest. Seventy

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

## 10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 1

USE - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN (cont.)

RECOMMND

five percent of the 10 acres will remain vineyard.

### Ingress/Egress:

The project takes access from Glen Oaks Rd at 2 points. The existing street is paved to a width of 28 feet on a ROW of 88'.

Access to this site is provided by two 24 ft. wide driveways connecting directly to Glen Oaks Rd.

The driveway connections to Glen Oaks Rd. will include left turn pockets and A.C pavement transitions to taper between the existing road, and the proposed driveways. Driveways will be design in accordance with the following design parameters:

1. Edge of pavement returns shall be a 35 foot radius.
2. Left turn pockets shall be 12 foot wide and 100 feet long, with a 120 foot transition.
3. Provide 330 feet A.C. pavement transitions on each side of the left turn pockets (deceleration transition).

### Parking:

Onsite parking is in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 348, Section 18.12. Ordinance requires 108 parking spaces. A total of 112 parking spaces are provided, with an additional 42 spaces for overflow. Seven spaces have been designated as handicap accessible. The overflow spaces are located between the rows of grapes west of the primary parking area. When parking requires the use of overflow spaces Lake Oak Meadows staff will "valet park" vehicles to avoid damage to vines and vehicles.

### Hours of Operation/Employees:

The winery will be open for wine tasting 7 days a week from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

The winery is operated by The Aglio Family. In addition to family members, there will be 2 -4 employees working at the winery.

### Special Events:

Please see Planning Department conditions of approval regarding special events.

### Signage:

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 1 USE - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN (cont.) (cont.)RECOMMND

A winery sign exist at the entrance to the site. Signage has been noted on the Plot Plan as well as a proposed/existing signage report. All signage will conform to Riverside County Ord. 348 Sec 19.4.

Stop signs will be placed on the driveways where the driveways meet Glen Oaks Rd. They will be located 55 feet south of the centerline of Glen Oaks Rd. and 6 feet east of the edge of the pavement for the driveway.

No Parking signs will be posted along Glen Oaks Rd. along the length of the subject property unless directed otherwise by County Transportation.

\*Per Planning Commission public hearing held on May 5, 2010, the Special Events section was revised\*

10.TRANS. 2 USE - TS/EXEMPT RECOMMND

The Transportation Department has not required a traffic study for the subject project. The Transportation Department has determined that the project is exempt from traffic study requirements.

10.TRANS. 3 USE - STD INTRO 3(ORD 460/461) RECOMMND

With respect to the conditions of approval for the referenced tentative exhibit, the landowner shall provide all street improvements, street improvement plans and/or road dedications set forth herein in accordance with Ordinance 460 and Riverside County Road Improvement tandards (Ordinance 461). It is understood that the exhibit correctly shows acceptable centerline elevations, all existing easements, traveled ways, and drainage courses with appropriate Q's, and that their omission or unacceptability may require the exhibit to be resubmitted for further consideration. These Ordinances and all conditions of approval are essential parts and a requirement occurring in ONE is as binding as though occurring in all. All questions regarding the true meaning of the conditions shall be referred to the Transportation Department.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 4 USE - COUNTY WEB SITE RECOMMND

Additional information, standards, ordinances, policies, and design guidelines can be obtained from the Transportation Department Web site: <http://rctlma.org/trans/>. If you have questions, please call the Plan Check Section at (951) 955-6527.

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

20.PLANNING. 1 USE - EXPIRATION DATE-PP RECOMMND

This approval shall be used within two (2) years of approval date; otherwise, it shall become null and void and of no effect whatsoever. By use is meant the beginning of substantial construction contemplated by this approval within a two (2) year period which is thereafter diligently pursued to completion or of the actual occupancy of existing buildings or land under the terms of the authorized use.

Prior to the expiration of the two year period, the permittee may request a one (1) year extension of time request in which to use this plot plan. A maximum of three one-year extension of time requests shall be permitted. Should the time period established by any of the extension of time requests lapse, or should all three one-year extensions be obtained and no substantial construction or use of this plot plan be initiated within five (5) years of the effective date of the issuance of this plot plan, this plot plan shall become null and void.

20.PLANNING. 3 USE - REVIEW OPERATION HOURS RECOMMND

One year after issuance of occupancy permit the Planning Director and the Director of Building and Safety shall review this permit to consider the hours of operation. If significant complaints have been received regarding noise and nuisance, the hours of operation of the special events may be further restricted.

20.PLANNING. 5 USE- EXPIRATION CODE ENFORCE RECOMMND

WITHIN SIXTY (60) DAYS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS PERMIT, the permit holder shall apply to the Building and Safety Department for all necessary permits, including the

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 5 USE- EXPIRATION CODE ENFORCE (cont.) RECOMMND

submission of all required document fees for any plan check review as determined by the Director of Building and Safety, to ensure all buildings, structures and uses are in compliance with the applicable requirements of Ordinance Nos. 457 (Building Code) and 348 (Land Use) and the conditions of approval of this permit. No building permits shall be issued until AFTER the permit holder has met the 75% planting requirements of Condition Nos. 10.PLANNING.44 and 80.PLANNING.29 herein. THE PERMIT HOLDER SHALL PURSUE DILIGENTLY TO COMPLETION ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND OBTAIN FINAL INSPECTION APPROVAL THEREOF WITHIN ONE (1) YEAR OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS PERMIT. Additional time may be requested pursuant to Section 18.43 of Ordinance No. 348.

AMENDED AT PC 10/28/09.

20.PLANNING. 6 USE - EXISTING STRUCTURE CHECK RECOMMND

WITHIN SIXTY (60) DAYS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS PERMIT, the permittee or the permittee's successors-in-interest shall apply to the Building and Safety Department for all necessary permits, including the submission of all required documents and fees for any plan check review as determined by the Director of the Department of Building and Safety, to ensure that all existing buildings, structures and uses are in compliance with Ordinance No. 348 and Ordinance No. 457 and the conditions of approval of this permit.

20.PLANNING. 9 USE - REMVE TRLRS & OUTSD STRG RECOMMND

The existing trailers and outside storage shall be removed from the site within 30 days of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

20.PLANNING. 10 USE - PORTABLE RESTROOM RECOMMND

The portable restroom facility shall be removed within 1 year of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 11 USE - DANCE FACILITY RECOMMND

The applicant shall submit dance facility plans to the Building and Safety Department in enough time for plan check to occur and allow the enclosed dance facility permit to be issued within 60 days of project approval and finalized within 120 days of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

20.PLANNING. 12 USE - VINEYARD PLANTING RECOMMND

75% vineyard planting shall be completed within 60 days of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

20.PLANNING. 13 USE - GARAGE/STORAGE BLDG RECOMMND

The applicant/permit-holder shall cause the garage/storage building plans to be submitted to the Building & Safety Department with enough time to allow plan check to occur. The existing garage/storage building near the western property line shall be permitted and finalized within 90 days of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

20.PLANNING. 14 USE - WINE PRODUCTION BLDG RECOMMND

The applicant/permit-holder shall cause the wine production building plans to be submitted to the Building & Safety Department with enough time to allow plan check to occur. The wine production building permit shall be finalized within 300 days of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

20.PLANNING. 15 USE - GATHERING ROOM RECOMMND

The applicant/permit-holder shall cause the gathering room building plans to be submitted to the Building & Safety Department with enough time to allow plan check to occur. The gathering room building permit shall be issued within 180 days and shall be finalized within 1 year of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 28

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 16 USE - POOL FENCING

RECOMMND

The applicant/permit-holder shall cause permanent pool fencing plans to be submitted to the Building & Safety Department with enough time to allow plan check to occur. The pool fence permit shall be issued within 60 days and finalized within 90 days of project approval.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

20.PLANNING. 17 USE - AMENDED PER FINAL

RECOMMND

Within 10 days of approval by the Planning Commission six (6) copies of an Amended Per Final Conditions site plan, elevations, and floor plans shall be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Department. A lock shall take effect at the end of the 10 days on the PLOT PLAN and on any implementing permits (including building permits) and shall not be removed unless and until the Amended Per Final Conditions exhibits have been approved by the County Planning Department.

ADDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

20.TRANS. 1 USE - IMPROVEMENT

RECOMMND

Glenoaks Road is a paved County maintained road and shall be improved along the outside project boundary with AC pavement, protected shoulders, and transitions per PP23376 Amended No. 3 exhibit dated 6/19/2009 within the 94' (50' on project side and 44' on the opposite side of the centerline) dedicated right-of-way as follows:

PRIOR TO ONE (1) YEAR AFTER APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT, the driveways connection to Glenoaks Road will include left-turn pockets and AC pavement transitions to taper between the existing road, and the proposed driveways, in accordance with the following design parameters and/or as approved by the Director of Transportation.

1. Edge of pavement returns shall be a 35 foot radius.
2. The left-turn pockets shall be 12 foot wide and 100 feet long with a 120 foot transition.
3. Provide 330' AC pavement transitions on each side

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.TRANS. 1 USE - IMPROVEMENT (cont.) RECOMMND

of the left-turn pockets (deceleration transition).

4. Provide 14 foot AC pavement transitions on each side of the left-turn pocket for a design speed of 50 mph.
5. Provide acceleration/deceleration lanes per County Standard 803.
6. If existing pavement is found in poor condition, it is the responsibility of the applicant to re-construct the section adjacent to required improvement including 12' minimum on the north side of Glenoaks Road.

\*Per Planning Commission public hearing held on May 5, 2010, the reference to the amended exhibit and timing of improvements was revised\*

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

60.BS GRADE. 1 USE-G2.1 GRADING BONDS RECOMMND

Grading in excess of 199 cubic yards will require performance security to be posted with the Building and Safety Department. Single Family Dwelling units graded one lot per permit and proposing to grade less than 5,000 cubic yards are exempt.

60.BS GRADE. 3 USE-G2.4GEOTECH/SOILS RPTS RECOMMND

Geotechnical soils reports, required in order to obtain a grading permit, shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Department's Grading Division for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit.

All grading shall be in conformance with the recommendations of the geotechnical/soils reports as approved by Riverside County.\*

\*The geotechnical/soils, compaction and inspection reports will be reviewed in accordance with the RIVERSIDE COUNTY GEOTECHNICAL GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF GEOTECHNICAL AND GEOLOGIC REPORTS.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 4 USE-G2.7DRNAGE DESIGN Q100

RECOMMND

All grading and drainage shall be designed in accordance with Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District's conditions of approval regarding this application. If not specifically addressed in their conditions, drainage shall be designed to accommodate 100 year storm flows.

Additionally, the Building and Safety Department's conditional approval of this application includes an expectation that the conceptual grading plan reviewed and approved for it complies or can comply with any WQMP (water Quality Management Plan) required by Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

60.BS GRADE. 7 USE-G2.15NOTRD OFFSITE LTR

RECOMMND

A notarized letter of permission, from the affected property owners or easement holders, is required for any proposed off site grading.

60.BS GRADE. 9 USE-G1.4 NPDES/SWPPP

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits - whichever comes first - the applicant shall provide the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the following: "Effective March 10, 2003 owner operators of grading or construction projects are required to comply with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner operator can comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. For additional information and to obtain a copy of the NPDES State Construction Permit contact the SWRCB at (916) 657-1146.

Additionally, at the time the county adopts, as part of any ordinance, regulations specific to the N.P.D.E.S., this project (or subdivision) shall comply with them.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 10                   USE IMPORT/EXPORT                   RECOMMND

In instances where a grading plan involves import or export, prior to obtaining a grading permit, the applicant shall have obtained approval for the import/export location from the Building and Safety department. If an Environmental Assessment, prior to issuing a grading permit, did not previously approve either location, a Grading Environmental Assessment shall be submitted to the Planning Director and the Environmental Programs Director for review and comment and to the Building and Safety Department Director for approval. Additionally, if the movement of import/export occurs using county roads, review and approval of the haul routes by the Transportation Department will be required.

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

60.FLOOD RI. 2                   USE SUBMIT PLANS                   RECOMMND

A copy of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. The plans must receive District approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. All submittals shall be date stamped by the engineer and include a completed Flood Control Deposit Based Fee Worksheet and the appropriate plan check fee deposit.

60.FLOOD RI. 3                   USE EROS CNTRL AFTER RGH GRAD                   RECOMMND

Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent deposition of debris onto downstream properties or drainage facilities. Plans showing these measures shall be submitted to the District for review.

60.FLOOD RI. 4                   USE OFFSITE EASE OR REDESIGN                   RECOMMND

Offsite drainage facilities shall be located within dedicated drainage easements obtained from the affected property owner(s). Document(s) shall be recorded and a copy submitted to the District prior to issuance of permits. If the developer cannot obtain such rights, the project shall be redesigned to eliminate the need for the easement.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.FLOOD RI. 5 USE WRITTEN PERM FOR GRADING RECOMMND

Written permission shall be obtained from the affected property owner(s) allowing the proposed grading and/or facilities to be installed outside of the project boundaries. A copy of the written authorization shall be submitted to the District for review and approval.

60.FLOOD RI. 8 USE MITCHARGE RECOMMND

The County Board of Supervisors has adopted the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for the purpose of collecting drainage fees. This project may require earlier construction of downstream ADP facilities. To mitigate this effect, the District recommends that this project be required to pay a flood mitigation fee. The mitigation fee should be based upon the fee structures set for land divisions having comparable anticipated impermeable surface areas.

Plot Plan 23376 is located within the limits of the Santa Gertrudis Valley sub-watershed of the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan for which drainage fees have been adopted to help mitigate the impacts of this development. The mitigation charge for this proposal shall equal the prevailing Area Drainage Plan fee rate multiplied by the area of the new development. This new development has a total of 1.86-acres subject to the fee. The charge is payable to the Flood Control District by cashier's check or money order only, and shall be paid after final approval of the staff report/conditions of approval by the Board of Supervisors and prior to issuance of permits.

60.FLOOD RI. 9 USE SUBMIT FINAL WQMP RECOMMND

A copy of the project specific WQMP shall be submitted to the District for review and approval.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

60.PLANNING. 1 USE - PALEO PRIMP & MONITOR RECOMMND

PDP01334, prepared by CRM Tech July 7, 2008, determined the proposed project's potential to impact paleontological resources is high for Pleistocene-age fossil remains. Hence,

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF ANY GRADING PERMIT, THE FOLLOWING

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 1 USE - PALEO PRIMP & MONITOR (cont.)

RECOMMND

SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE COUNTY GEOLOGIST:

A Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) report that includes, at a minimum, the following:

- 1.Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations.
- 2.Description of the level of monitoring required for all earth-moving activities in the project area.
- 3.Identification and qualifications of the qualified paleontological monitor to be employed for grading operations monitoring.
- 4.Identification of personnel with authority and responsibility to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for recovery of large specimens.
- 5.Means and methods to be employed by the paleontological monitor to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays.
- 6.Sampling of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.
- 7.Procedures and protocol for collecting and processing of samples and specimens.
- 8.Fossil identification and curation procedures to be employed.
- 9.Identification of the permanent repository to receive any recovered fossil material.
- 10.All pertinent exhibits, maps and references.
- 11.Procedures for reporting of findings.

12.Identification and acknowledgement of the developer for the content of the PRIMP as well as acceptance of financial responsibility for monitoring, reporting and curation fees.

All reports shall be signed by the qualified paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content, as appropriate. Two wet-signed original copies of

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 1 USE - PALEO PRIMP & MONITOR (cont.) (cont.) RECOMMND

the report shall be submitted to the office of the County Geologist along with a copy of this condition and the grading plan for appropriate case processing and tracking. These documents should not be submitted to the project Planner, the Plan Check staff, the Land Use Counter or any other County office.

60.PLANNING. 2 USE - GEOTECHNICAL REPORT RECOMMND

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF ANY GRADING PERMITS, THE FOLLOWING SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY GEOLOGIST FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL:

A report that addresses the excavation for and general construction of the proposed underground facilities (wine storage/tasting room).

60.PLANNING. 10 USE - SKR FEE CONDITION RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance No. 663, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance. Said fee shall be calculated on the approved development project which is anticipated to be 10.25 acres (gross) in accordance with APPROVED EXHIBIT NO. A. If the development is subsequently revised, this acreage amount may be modified in order to reflect the revised development project acreage amount.

AMENDED AT PC ON 10/28/09.

60.PLANNING. 14 USE - FEE STATUS RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Plot Plan No. 23376, the Planning Department shall determine the status of the deposit based fees. If the fees are in a negative status, the permit holder shall pay the outstanding balance.

60.PLANNING. 19 USE - OAK TREE PRESERVATION RECOMMND

The following tree preservation guidelines shall be incorporated in the project's approved grading, building, and landscaping plans:

1. No construction activities or placement of

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 19

USE - OAK TREE PRESERVATION (cont.)

RECOMMND

structures shall occur within the protected zone of any oak tree or oak woodland, except as provided herein. The protected zone is defined as a circle whose center is within the base of an oak tree, the radius of which is equal to an oak tree's height or ten (10) feet, whichever is greater. Where the outermost edge of an oak tree's drip line (the outermost edge of a tree's canopy) extends beyond this radius, that portion of the drip line shall also be included as part of that tree's protected zone. Protected zones do not apply to dead or dying oak trees, unless the tree's condition appears to be the result of human activity that indicates an intent to kill the tree.

2. Landscaping, trenching, or irrigation systems shall not be installed within the existing protected zone of any oak tree or oak woodlands, unless recommended by a qualified biologist.

3. Land uses that would cause excessive soil compaction within the protected zone of any individual oak tree shall be avoided. No recreational trails are permitted within the drip line of any individual oak tree.

4. Manufactured cut slopes shall not begin their downward cut within the protected zone of any individual oak tree, except as provided in these guidelines.

5. Manufactured fill slopes shall not extend within the protected zone, except as provided in these guidelines.

6. On-site retaining walls, if required, shall be designed to protect the root system of any individual oak tree by preserving the natural grade within the protected zone.

7. Redirection of surface runoff which results in increased soil moisture for an extended period of time within the drip line area of any individual oak tree shall be avoided. If unavoidable, a drainage system shall be designed to maintain the previous amount of soil moisture.

8. Sedimentation and siltation shall be controlled to avoid filling around the base of oak trees.

9. Redirection of surface runoff which results in decreased soil moisture for an extended period of time

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 19 USE - OAK TREE PRESERVATION (cont.) (cont.) RECOMMND

within the drip line area shall be avoided. If unavoidable, an irrigation system shall be designed to maintain the previous amount of soil moisture.

10. A construction zone at the interface with a protected zone shall be clearly delineated on the site in order to avoid impacts from construction operations and also to prevent the storage or parking of equipment outside the construction zone.

11. Dead or dying oak trees are necessary for the excavation of nest cavities by woodpeckers. Twelve species of birds use nest cavities. It is important to the health of the habitat to retain dead and dying oak trees that are not a hazard to humans. Such oak trees shall be retained in place unless determined to pose a health or safety hazard in which case they shall be discarded at an approved on-site location identified by the consulting biologist for habitat enhancement.

12. On-site to on-site, or on-site to off-site relocation of oak trees will not constitute mitigation and is considered the same as removal for the purposes of these guidelines.

13. Replacement of oak trees with plantings of saplings or acorns is not required by these guidelines; however, replacement plantings may be used in addition to these guidelines when they are required by another agency or when it is determined to be biologically sound and appropriate to do so.

60.PLANNING. 23 GEN - CULTURAL RESOURCES PROFE RECOMMND

As a result of information contained in the archaeology report prepared for this project, (PD-A-4536), archaeological monitoring of all grading shall be required. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit holder shall retain and enter into a monitoring and mitigation service contract with a qualified Archaeologist for services. This professional shall be known as the "Project Monitor." The Project Monitor shall be included in the pre-grade meetings to provide cultural/historical sensitivity training including the establishment of set guidelines for ground disturbance in sensitive areas with the grading contractors and special

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 23 GEN - CULTURAL RESOURCES PROFE (cont.) RECOMMND

interest monitors. The Project Monitor shall manage and oversee monitoring for all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of materials, rock crushing, structure demolition and etc. The Project Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with the special interest monitors.

The developer/permit holder shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract to the Riverside County Planning Department to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

NOTE:

1)The Project Monitor is responsible for implementing mitigation using standard professional practices for cultural resources. The Professional shall consult with the County, developer/permit holder and special interest group monitor throughout the process.

2)This agreement shall not modify any condition of approval or mitigation measure.

60.PLANNING. 24 GEN - TRIBAL MONITORS RECOMMND

As a result of information submitted by the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, Native American monitoring of the grading shall be required.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit holder shall enter into contract and retain a monitor(s) designated by the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians. This group shall be known as the Tribal Monitor for this project. The contract shall address the treatment and ultimate disposition of cultural resources which may include repatriation and/or curation in a Riverside County approved curation facility.

The Tribal Monitors shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, stockpiling of

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 24

GEN - TRIBAL MONITORS (cont.)

RECOMMND

materials, rock crushing, structure demolition and etc. .  
The Tribal Monitors shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources in coordination with the appropriate Cultural Resources Professional such as an Archaeologist, Historic Archaeologist, Architectural Historian and/or Historian.

The developer/permit holder shall submit a fully executed copy of the contract to the Riverside County Planning Department to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

NOTE:

- 1)The Cultural Resources Professional is responsible for implementing mitigation and standard professional practices for cultural resources. The Professional shall consult with the County, developer/permit holder and tribal monitors throughout the process.
- 2)Tribal monitoring does not replace any required Cultural Resources monitoring, but rather serves as a supplement for consultation and advisory purposes for all groups interests only.
- 3)This agreement shall not modify any condition of approval or mitigation measure.
- 4)The developer/permit holder shall contact the Planning Director for consideration of this condition after forty-five (45) days, if an agreement with the tribal groups has not been met.
- 5)Should repatriation be preferred, it shall not occur until after the Phase IV monitoring report has been submitted to the Riverside County Planning Department. Should curation be preferred, the developer/permit holder is responsible for all costs.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

TRANS DEPARTMENT

60.TRANS. 1 USE - TRANSPORTATION CLEARANCE RECOMMND.

A clearance from the Transportation Department is required prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

80.BS GRADE. 1 USE\* -G3.1NO B/PMT W/O G/PMT RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of any building permit, the property owner shall obtain a grading permit and/or approval to construct from the Grading Division of the Building and Safety Department.

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

80.E HEALTH. 1 USE - FOOD PLANS REQD RECOMMND

\*\*\* No Text Exists For This Condition \*\*\*

80.E HEALTH. 3 USE - PERC TEST REQD RECOMMND

A satisfactory detailed soils percolation test in accordance with the procedures outlined in the County of Riverside, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) Technical Guidance Manual.

80.E HEALTH. 4 USE - SEPTIC PLANS RECOMMND

The applicant must provide to the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) for review at least three copies of detailed contoured plot plans wet stamped and signed by the Professional of Record (individual or firm who is responsible for the soils percolation report), drawn to an appropriate scale, showing all required detail as specified in the DEH Technical Guidance Manual.

80.E HEALTH. 5 DEH SITE EVALUATION REQUIRED RECOMMND

The Department of Environmental Health (DEH) site evaluation is required. The applicant must ensure that the groundwater detection boring (4" perforated pipe installed at a depth that extends at least 10 feet below the proposed

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.E HEALTH. 5 DEH SITE EVALUATION REQUIRED (cont.) RECOMMND

leach line trench bottom) is installed for DEH staff to evaluate.

In addition, the applicant must ensure that the job property is clearly identified with a durable placard delineating the site address or APN# as well as ensure that all property corners are clearly staked or marked.

\*\*Please note that if groundwater encroachment is observed, further engineering as well as Regional Water Quality Control Board Clearance may be required.\*\*

FIRE DEPARTMENT

80.FIRE. 1 USE-#17A-BLDG PLAN CHECK \$ RECOMMND

Building Plan check deposit base fee of \$1,056.00, shall be paid in a check or money order to the Riverside County Fire Department after plans have been approved by our office.

80.FIRE. 2 USE-#4-WATER PLANS RECOMMND

The applicant or developer shall separately submit two copies of the water system plans to the Fire Department for review and approval. Calculated velocities shall not exceed 10 feet per second. Plans shall conform to the fire hydrant types, location and spacing, and the system shall meet the fire flow requirements.

Plans shall be signed and approved by a registered civil engineer and the local water company with the following certification: "I certify that the design of the water system is in accordance with the requirements prescribed by the Riverside County Fire Department."

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

80.FLOOD RI. 2 USE SUBMIT PLANS RECOMMND

A copy of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. The plans must receive District approval prior to the issuance of building permits. All submittals shall be date stamped by the engineer and include a completed Flood Control Deposit Based Fee Worksheet and the appropriate plan check fee deposit.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.FLOOD RI. 4 USE MITCHARGE RECOMMND

The County Board of Supervisors has adopted the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan (ADP) for the purpose of collecting drainage fees. This project may require earlier construction of downstream ADP facilities. to mitigate this effect, the District recommends that this project be required to pay a flood mitigation fee. The mitigation fee should be based upon the fee structures set for land divisions having comparable anticipated impermeable surface areas.

Plot Plan 23376 is located within the limits of the Santa Gertrudis Valley sub-watershed of the Murrieta Creek Area Drainage Plan for which drainage fees have been adopted to help mitigate the impacts of this development. The mitigation charge for this proposal shall equal the prevailing Area Drainage Plan fee rate multiplied by the area of the new development. This new development has a total of 1.86-acres subject to the fee. The charge is payable to the Flood Control District by cashier's check or money order only, and shall be paid after final approval of the staff report/conditions of approval by the Board of Supervisors and prior to issuance of permits.

80.FLOOD RI. 5 USE SUBMIT FINAL WQMP RECOMMND

A copy of the project specific WQMP shall be submitted to the District for review and approval.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

80.PLANNING. 3 USE- CONFORM TO ELEVATIONS RECOMMND

Elevations of all buildings and structures submitted for building plan check approval shall be in substantial conformance with the elevations shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT B.

80.PLANNING. 4 USE- CONFORM TO FLOOR PLANS RECOMMND

Floor plans shall be in substantial conformance with that shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT B.

80.PLANNING. 5 USE - ROOF EQUIPMENT SHIELDING RECOMMND

Roof mounted equipment shall be shielded from ground view. Screening material shall be subject to Planning Department

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 5                   USE - ROOF EQUIPMENT SHIELDING (cont.)                   RECOMMND  
approval.

80.PLANNING. 7                   USE- MAXIMUM DWELLING UNITS                   RECOMMND  
A maximum of two (2) dwelling units are allowed under this permit. This includes the existing residence and the proposed caretaker's unit only.

80.PLANNING. 10                  USE - REC & PARK DIST MITIG.                   RECOMMND  
The applicant or the successor-in-interest shall provide a clearance letter from the Riverside County Economic Development Agency providing proof that the project has been annexed into CSA 149A. Contact EDA at 951-955-3212.  
AMENDED AT PC ON 10/28/09.

80.PLANNING. 11                  USE - PLANS SHOWING BIKE RACKS                   RECOMMND  
Bike rack spaces or bike lockers shall be shown on the project's parking and landscaping plan submitted to the Planning Department for approval.

80.PLANNING. 16                  USE- WASTE MGMT. CLEARANCE                   RECOMMND  
A clearance letter from Riverside County Waste Management District shall be provided to the Riverside County Planning Department verifying compliance with the conditions contained in their letter dated June 2, 2008, summarized as follows: The developer shall provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials such as paper products, glass and green waste in commercial, industrial, public facilities and residential development projects.

80.PLANNING. 17                  USE - SCHOOL MITIGATION                   RECOMMND  
Impacts to the Temecula Valley Unified School District shall be mitigated in accordance with California State law.

80.PLANNING. 20                  USE - LIGHTING PLANS                   RECOMMND  
All parking lot lights and other outdoor lighting shall be shown on electrical plans submitted to the Department of Building and Safety for plan check approval and shall comply with the requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 and the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 21 USE - FEE STATUS RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of building permits for Plot Plan No. 23376, the Planning Department shall determine the status of the deposit based fees for project. If the case fees are in a negative state, the permit holder shall pay the outstanding balance.

80.PLANNING. 28 USE- LNDSCPNG PROJ SPECIFIC RECOMMND

In addition to the requirements of the Landscape and Irrigation Plan submittal, the following project specific conditions shall be imposed:

a.If over 75% vineyard planting is achieved, additional plants are to be used for the landscape around new and existing buildings

80.PLANNING. 29 USE - VINEYARD PLANTING RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of building permits, 75% of the net project area shall be planted in vineyards.

80.PLANNING. 32 USE - LC LANDSCAPE PLOT PLAN RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of building permits, the developer/permit holder shall file a Landscaping Minor Plot Plan Application to the Riverside County Planning Department for review and approval along with the current fee. The landscaping plans shall be in conformance with the APPROVED EXHIBITS; in compliance with Ordinance No. 348, Section 18.12; Ordinance No. 859; and, be prepared consistent with the County of Riverside Guide to California Friendly Landscaping.

At minimum, plans shall include the following components:  
1)Landscape and irrigation working drawings "stamped" by a California certified landscape architect;

2)Weather based controllers and necessary components to eliminate water waste;

3)A copy of the "stamped" approved grading plans; and,

4)Emphasis on native and drought tolerant species.

When applicable, plans shall include the following components:

1)Identification of all common/open space areas;

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.PLANNING. 32

USE - LC LANDSCAPE PLOT PLAN (cont.)

RECOMMND

2)Natural open space areas and those regulated/conserved by the prevailing MSHCP;

3)Shading plans for projects that include parking lots/areas;

4)The use of canopy trees (24" box or greater) within the parking areas;

5)Landscaping plans for slopes exceeding 3 feet in height;

6)Landscaping and irrigation plans associated with entry monuments. All monument locations and dimensions shall be provided on the plan; and/or,

7)If this is a phased development, then a copy of the approved phasing plan shall be submitted for reference.

NOTE:

1)Landscaping plans for areas within the road right-of-way shall be submitted for review and approval by the Transportation Department only. The Planning Department shall not approve landscape plans within the Road Right-of-Way.

2)When the Landscaping Plot Plan is located within a special district such as Valley-Wide Recreation and Park District, Jurupa Community Services District, Coachella Valley Water District, a County Service Area (CSA) or other maintenance district, the developer/permit holder shall submit plans for review to the appropriate special district for simultaneous review. The permit holder shall show evidence to the Planning Department that the subject District has approved said plans.

As part of the plan check review process and request for condition clearance, the developer/permit holder shall show proof of the approved landscaping plot plan by providing the Plot Plan number. The planning department shall verify the landscape route is approved and the Plot Plan is in TENTAPPR status. Upon verification of compliance with this condition and the APPROVED EXHIBITS, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

TRANS DEPARTMENT

80.TRANS. 1 USE - R-O-W DEDICATION 1 RECOMMND

Sufficient public street right-of-way along Glenoaks Road shall be conveyed for public use to provide for a 50 foot half-width right-of-way.

80.TRANS. 2 USE - TUMF CREDIT AGREEMENT RECOMMND

If the applicant/developer is constructing a "TUMF" facility as a condition of approval for this project and will be seeking "TUMF" credits and/or reimbursements for the "TUMF" improvements built with this project, the applicant shall enter into a "TUMF Improvement and Credit Agreement" with the Transportation Department prior to the first building permit issuance as directed by the Director of Transportation. Please contact (951) 955-6800 for additional information.

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

90.BS GRADE. 1 USE\*G4.3PAVING INSPECTIONS RECOMMND

The developer/applicant shall be responsible for obtaining the paving inspections required by Ordinance 457.

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

90.E HEALTH. 1 USE - HAZMAT CONTACT RECOMMND

Contact the Hazardous Materials Management Division, (951) 358-5055 for any additional requirements.

90.E HEALTH. 2 USE- E.HEALTH CLEARANCE REQ RECOMMND

Environmental Health Clearance prior to final inspection.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

90.FIRE. 1 USE-#45-FIRE LANES RECOMMND

The applicant shall prepare and submit to the Fire Department for approval, a site plan designating required fire lanes with appropriate lane painting and/or signs.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.FIRE. 2                      USE-#66-DISPLAY BOARDS                      RECOMMND

Display Boards will be as follows: Each complex shall have an illuminated diagrammatic representation of the actual layout which shows name of complex, all streets, building designators, unit members, and fire hydrant locations within dimension and located next to roadway access. The minimum size shall be no less than 4 feet x 4 feet.

90.FIRE. 3                      USE-#12A-SPRINKLER SYSTEM                      RECOMMND

Install a complete fire sprinkler system per NFPA 13 2002 edition in all buildings requiring a fire flow of 1500 GPM or greater. Sprinkler system(s) with pipe sizes in excess of 4" in diameter will require the project structural engineer to certify (wet signature) the stability of the building system for seismic and gravity loads to support the sprinkler system. All fire sprinkler risers shall be protected from any physical damage. The post indicator valve and fire department connection shall be located to the front, within 50 feet of a hydrant, and a minimum of 25 feet from the building(s). A statement that the building(s) will be automatically fire sprinkled must be included on the title page of the building plans.

Applicant or developer shall be responsible to install a U.L. Central Station Monitored Fire Alarm System. Monitoring system shall monitor the fire sprinkler system(s) water flow, P.I.V.'s and all control valves. Plans must be submitted to the Fire Department for approval prior to installation. Contact fire department for guideline handout

90.FIRE. 4                      USE-#83-AUTO/MAN FIRE ALARM                      RECOMMND

Applicant or developer shall be responsible to install a manual and automatic Fire Alarm System. Plans must be submitted to the Fire Department for approval prior to installation.

90.FIRE. 5                      USE-#27-EXTINGUISHERS                      RECOMMND

Install portable fire extinguishers with a minimum rating of 2A-10BC and signage. Fire Extinguishers located in public areas shall be in recessed cabinets mounted 48"

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.FIRE. 5 USE-#27-EXTINGUISHERS (cont.) RECOMMND

(inches) to center above floor level with maximum 4" projection from the wall. Contact Fire Department for proper placement of equipment prior to installation.

90.FIRE. 6 USE-#36-HOOD DUCTS RECOMMND

A U.L. 300 hood duct fire extinguishing system must be installed over the cooking equipment. Wet chemical extinguishing system must provide automatic shutdown of all electrical componets and outlets under the hood upon activation. System must be installed by a licensed C-16 contractor. Plans must be submitted with current fee to the Fire Department for review and approval prior to installation.

NOTE: A dedicated alarm system is not required to be installed for the exclusive purpose of monitoring this suppression system. However, a new or pre-existing alarm system must be connected to the extinguishing system. (\* separate fire alarm plans must be submitted for connection)

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

90.FLOOD RI. 2 USE BMP - EDUCATION RECOMMND

The developer shall distribute environmental awareness education materials on general good housekeeping practices that contribute to protection of stormwater quality to all initial users. The developer may obtain NPDES Public Educational Program materials from the District's NPDES Section by either the District's website [www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us](http://www.floodcontrol.co.riverside.ca.us), e-mail [fcnpdes@co.riverside.ca.us](mailto:fcnpdes@co.riverside.ca.us), or the toll free number 1-800-506-2555. Please provide Project number, number of units and location of development. Note that there is a five-day minimum processing period requested for all orders.

The developer must provide to the District's PLAN CHECK Department a notarized affidavit stating that the distribution of educational materials to the tenants is assured prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.FLOOD RI. 3 USE IMPLEMENT WQMP RECOMMND

All structural BMPs described in the project-specific WQMP shall be constructed and installed in conformance with approved plans and specifications. It shall be demonstrated that the applicant is prepared to implement all non-structural BMPs described in the approved project specific WQMP and that copies of the approved project-specific WQMP are available for the future owners/occupants. The District will not release occupancy permits for any portion of the project exceeding 80% of the project area prior to the completion of these tasks.

90.FLOOD RI. 5 USE BMP MAINTENANCE & INSPECT RECOMMND

The BMP maintenance plan shall contain provisions for all treatment controlled BMPs to be inspected, and if required, cleaned no later than October 15 each year. Required documentation shall identify the entity that will inspect and maintain all structural BMPs within the project boundaries. A copy of all necessary documentation shall be submitted to the District for review and approval prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

90.PLANNING. 3 USE- PARKING PAVING MATERIAL RECOMMND

A minimum of 108 parking spaces shall be provided as shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT A, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Department. Parking spaces shall be surfaced with asphaltic concrete, or concrete, or porous paving to current standards as approved by the Department of Building and Safety. The additional 42 spaces are to be provided within the overflow area shown on EXHIBIT A. Overflow parking shall be provided by valets only in order to protect the vineyard planting.

AMENDED AT PC ON 5/05/10.

90.PLANNING. 4 USE- ACCESSIBLE PARKING RECOMMND

A minimum of seven (7) accessible parking spaces for persons with disabilities shall be provided as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A. Each parking space reserved for persons with disabilities shall be identified by a permanently affixed reflectorized sign constructed of porcelain on steel, beaded text or equal, displaying the

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 4 USE- ACCESSIBLE PARKING (cont.) RECOMMND

International Symbol of Accessibility. The sign shall not be smaller than 70 square inches in area and shall be centered at the interior end of the parking space at a minimum height of 80 inches from the bottom of the sign to the parking space finished grade, or centered at a minimum height of 36 inches from the parking space finished grade, ground, or sidewalk. A sign shall also be posted in a conspicuous place, at each entrance to the off-street parking facility, not less than 17 inches by 22 inches, clearly and conspicuously stating the following:

"Unauthorized vehicles not displaying distinguishing placards or license plates issued for physically handicapped persons may be towed away at owner's expense. Towed vehicles may be reclaimed at \_\_\_ or by telephoning \_\_\_."

In addition to the above requirements, the surface of each parking space shall have a surface identification sign duplicating the symbol of accessibility in blue paint of at least 3 square feet in size.

90.PLANNING. 5 USE- COVERED PARKING SPACES RECOMMND

A minimum of six (6) parking spaces shall be covered by a carport or enclosed garage as shown on EXHIBIT A.

90.PLANNING. 8 USE - ROOF EQUIPMENT SHIELDING RECOMMND

Roof-mounted equipment shall be shielded from ground view. Screening material shall be subject to Planning Department approval.

90.PLANNING. 10 USE- INSTALL BIKE RACKS RECOMMND

A bicycle rack with a minimum of four spaces shall be provided in convenient locations to facilitate bicycle access to the project area as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT L. The bicycle racks shall be shown on project landscaping and improvement plans submitted for Planning Department approval, and shall be installed in accordance with those plans.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 11 USE - UTILITIES UNDERGROUND RECOMMND

All utilities, except electrical lines rated 33 kV or greater, shall be installed underground. If the permittee provides to the Department of Building and Safety and the Planning Department a definitive statement from the utility provider refusing to allow underground installation of the utilities they provide, this condition shall be null and void with respect to that utility.

90.PLANNING. 16 USE- TRASH ENCLOSURES RECOMMND

Two (2) trash enclosures which are adequate to enclose a minimum of two (2) bins shall be located as shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT A, and shall be constructed prior to the issuance of occupancy permits. The enclosure(s) shall be a minimum of six (6) feet in height and shall be architecturally enhanced and made with masonry block, landscaping screening and a solid gate which screens the bins from external view. Additional enclosed area for collection of recyclable materials shall be located within, near or adjacent to each trash and rubbish disposal area. The recycling collection area shall be a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the area provided for the trash/rubbish enclosure(s) or as approved by the Riverside County Waste Management Department. All recycling bins shall be labeled with the universal recycling symbol and with signage indicating to the users the type of material to be deposited in each bin.

90.PLANNING. 17 USE - EXISTING STRUCTURES RECOMMND

All existing buildings, structures and uses on the entire property shall conform to all the applicable requirements of Ordinance No. 348 and Ordinance No. 457, and the conditions of this permit.

90.PLANNING. 18 USE- CSA 149 FEE RECOMMND

The permit holder shall present certification to the Director of the Department of Building and Safety that payment of development impact fees in accordance with Section 10.35 of Ordinance No. 460 has taken place. Said certification shall be obtained from County Service Area No. 149.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 19 USE - REMOVE OUTDOOR ADVERTISE RECOMMND

All existing outdoor advertising displays, signs or billboards shall be removed.

90.PLANNING. 20 USE- WALL & FENCE LOCATIONS RECOMMND

Wall and/or fence locations shall be in conformance with APPROVED EXHIBIT L.

90.PLANNING. 25 USE - CONDITION COMPLIANCE RECOMMND

The Department of Building and Safety shall verify that the Development Standards of this approval and all other preceding conditions have been complied with prior to any use allowed by this permit.

90.PLANNING. 28 USE- ORD 810 O S FEE (2) RECOMMND

Prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance No. 810, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. The amount of the fee will be based on the "Project Area" as defined in the Ordinance.

AMENDED AT PC ON 10/28/09.

90.PLANNING. 29 USE - ORD NO. 659 (DIF) RECOMMND

Prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Ordinance No. 659 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development projects. Additionally, it establishes the authorized uses of the fees collected. The amount of the fee for commercial or industrial development shall be calculated on the basis of the "Project Area", as defined in the Ordinance.

AMENDED AT PC ON 10/28/09.

90.PLANNING. 32 USE - LC LNDS CP INSPECT DEPOST RECOMMND

Prior to building permit final inspection, the developer/permit holder shall file an Inspection Request

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 32 USE - LC LNDSKP INSPECT DEPOST (cont.) RECOMMND

Form and deposit sufficient funds to cover the costs of Installation, Six Month Establishment, and One Year Post-Establishment inspections. In the event that an open landscape case is not available, then the applicant shall open a FEE ONLY case to conduct inspections. The deposit required for landscape inspections shall be determined by the Riverside County Landscape Division. The Planning Department shall clear this condition upon determination of compliance.

90.PLANNING. 33 USE - LC COMPLY W/ LNDSKP/ IRR RECOMMND

The developer/permit holder shall coordinate with their designated landscape representative and the Riverside County Planning Department's landscape inspector to ensure all landscape planting and irrigation systems have been installed in accordance with APPROVED EXHIBITS, landscaping, irrigation, and shading plans. The Planning Department will ensure that all landscaping is healthy, free of weeds, disease and pests; and, irrigation systems are properly constructed and determined to be in good working order. The developer/permit holder's designated landscape representative and the Riverside County Planning Department's landscape inspector shall determine compliance with this condition and execute a Landscape Certificate of Completion. Upon determination of compliance, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

90.PLANNING. 36 GEN - CULTURAL RESOURCES RPT RECOMMND

Prior to final inspection of the first building permit, the developer/permit holder shall prompt the Cultural Resources Professional to submit two (2) copies of a Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report that complies with the Riverside County Planning Department's requirements for such reports. The report shall include evidence of the required cultural/historical sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the pre-grade meeting. The Planning Department shall review the report to determine adequate mitigation compliance. Provided the report is adequate, the Planning Department shall clear this condition.

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 37 USE - PALEO MONITORING REPORT

RECOMMND

PRIOR TO BUILDING FINAL INSPECTION:

The applicant shall submit to the County Geologist one wet-signed copy of the Paleontological Monitoring Report prepared for site grading operations at this site. The report shall be certified by the professionally-qualified Paleontologist responsible for the content of the report. This Paleontologist must be on the County's Paleontology Consultant List. The report shall contain a report of findings made during all site grading activities and an appended itemized list of fossil specimens recovered during grading (if any) and proof of accession of fossil materials into the pre-approved museum repository. In addition, all appropriate fossil location information shall be submitted to the Western Center, the San Bernardino County Museum and Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, at a minimum, for incorporation into their Regional Locality Inventories.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

90.TRANS. 1 USE - IMP PLANS

RECOMMND

Improvement plans for the required improvements must be prepared and shall be based upon a design profile extending a minimum of 300 feet beyond the project boundaries at a grade and alignment as approved by the Riverside County Transportation Department. Completion of road improvements does not imply acceptance for maintenance by County.

NOTE: 1. Before you prepare the street improvement plan(s), please review the Street Improvement Plan Policies and Guidelines from the Transportation Department Web site: [http://www.rctlma.org/trans/land\\_dev\\_plan\\_check\\_guidelines.html](http://www.rctlma.org/trans/land_dev_plan_check_guidelines.html).

90.TRANS. 2 USE - SIGNING & STRIPING

RECOMMND

A signing and striping plan is required for this project. The project proponent shall be responsible for any additional paving and/or striping removal caused by the striping plan. Traffic signing and striping shall be performed by County forces with all incurred costs borne by the applicant, unless otherwise approved by the County Traffic Engineer.

NOTE: Signing and striping shall be performed per

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.TRANS. 2 USE - SIGNING & STRIPING (cont.) RECOMMND

10.TRANS.1 condition (Traffic Management Plan).

90.TRANS. 3 USE - WRCOG TUMF RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the project proponent shall pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of issuance, pursuant to Ordinance No. 824.

90.TRANS. 4 USE - UTILITY PLAN RECOMMND

Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be designed to be placed underground in accordance with Ordinance 460 and 461, or as approved by the Transportation Department. The applicant is responsible for coordinating the work with the serving utility company. This also applies to existing overhead lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site. A disposition note describing the above shall be reflected on design improvement plans whenever those plans are required. A written proof for initiating the design and/or application of the relocation issued by the utility company shall be submitted to the Transportation Department for verification purposes.

90.TRANS. 5 USE - UTILITY INSTALL RECOMMND

Electrical power, telephone, communication, street lighting, and cable television lines shall be placed underground in accordance with Ordinance 460 and 461, or as approved by the Transportation Department. This also applies to existing overhead lines which are 33.6 kilovolts or below along the project frontage and between the nearest poles offsite in each direction of the project site.

A certificate should be obtained from the pertinent utility company and submitted to the Department of Transportation as proof of completion.

05/17/10  
13:56

Riverside County LMS  
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 55

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP23376

Parcel: 942-050-004

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.TRANS. 6 USE - IMPROVEMENT

RECOMMND

Glenoaks Road is a paved County maintained road and shall be improved along the outside project boundary with AC pavement, protected shoulders, and transitions per PP23376 Amended No. 3 exhibit dated 6/19/2009 within the 94' (50' on project side and 44' on the opposite side of the centerline) dedicated right-of-way as follows:

PRIOR TO ONE (1) YEAR AFTER APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT, the driveways connection to Glenoaks Road will include left-turn pockets and AC pavement transitions to taper between the existing road, and the proposed driveways, in accordance with the following design parameters and/or as approved by the Director of Transportation.

1. Edge of pavement returns shall be a 35 foot radius.
2. The left-turn pockets shall be 12 foot wide and 100 feet long with a 120 foot transition.
3. Provide 330' AC pavement transitions on each side of the left-turn pockets (deceleration transition).
4. Provide 14 foot AC pavement transitions on each side of the left-turn pocket for a design speed of 50 mph.
5. Provide acceleration/deceleration lanes per County Standard 803.
6. If existing pavement is found in poor condition, it is the responsibility of the applicant to re-construct the section adjacent to required improvement including 12' minimum on the north side of Glenoaks Road.

\*Per Planning Commission public hearing held on May 5, 2010 the reference to the amended exhibit and timing of improvements was revised\*

**LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**INITIAL CASE TRANSMITTAL**  
**RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE**  
**P.O. Box 1409**  
**Riverside, CA 92502-1409**

DATE: May 8, 2008

**TO:**

Transportation Dept.-Jim Knutson  
Environmental Health Dept.  
Flood Control Dist.  
Fire Department  
Dept. of Bldg. & Safety (Grading)  
Regional Parks & Open Space Dist.  
Co. Geologist  
Environmental Programs Dept.  
P.D. Trails Coordinator-J. Jolliffe  
Riv. Sheriffs Dept.  
Riv. Waste Management Dept.

CSA 149 c/o EDA  
Supervisor Stone  
Commissioner Petty  
Temecula Unified School Dist. ✓  
RCWD ✓  
SCE ✓  
Southern California Gas ✓  
EIC "Attachment A" ✓  
Temecula Valley Winegrowers Assoc. ✓  
Archeology

**PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** – EA41927 – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG:AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, Westerly of Camino Del Vino, and Easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes to legalize an existing wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn that will be remodeled and used for a caretakers residence. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,190 square foot underground winery with a tasting room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 7,460 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 4,440 square foot restaurant, and a 4,170 square foot banquet hall with a flower gift shop. Note: The existing trailers will be removed. - APN(s): 942-050-004 - Related Cases: PAR01094, CV06-5352, CV07-10259

Please review the attached exhibit(s) for the above-described project. This case is scheduled for a **LDC Meeting on May 29, 2008.** All County Agencies and Departments, please have draft conditions in the Land Management System by the above date. If you cannot clear the exhibit, please have corrections in the system and DENY the routing. Once the route is complete, and the approval screen is approved with or without corrections, the case can be scheduled for a public hearing. All other agencies, please have your comments/conditions to the Planning Department as soon as possible. Your comments/recommendations/conditions are requested so that they may be incorporated in the staff report for this particular case.

Should you have any questions regarding this item, please do not hesitate to contact **Alisa Krizek**, Project Planner, at **(951) 955-9075** or email at [akrizek@RCTLMA.org](mailto:akrizek@RCTLMA.org) / **MAILSTOP# 1070**.

**COMMENTS:**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE PRINT NAME AND TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

*If you do not include this transmittal in your response, please include a reference to the case number and project planner's name. Thank you.*



**Rancho  
Water**

June 6, 2008

Alisa Krizek, Case Planner  
**County of Riverside**  
Planning Department  
Post Office Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**SUBJECT: WATER AVAILABILITY  
PLOT PLAN 23376  
PORTION OF PARCEL F-19 OF MAP BOOK 50/68-75  
APN 942-050-004  
[KELLY SMITH]**

Board of Directors

**William E. Plummer**  
President

**Ralph H. Daily**  
Sr. Vice President

**Stephen J. Corona**

**Ben R. Drake**

**Lisa D. Herman**

**John E. Hoagland**

**Lawrence M. Libeu**

Dear Ms. Krizek:

Please be advised that the above-referenced project/property is located within the boundaries of Rancho California Water District (RCWD) and fronts an existing 24-inch diameter water pipeline (1790 Pressure Zone) within Glenoaks Road.

Officers:

**Phillip L. Forbes**  
Interim General Manager

**Jeffrey D. Armstrong**  
Acting Assistant General Manager /  
Chief Financial Officer

**Perry R. Louck**  
Director of Planning

**Andrew L. Webster, P.E.**  
Acting District Engineer

**Kelli E. Garcia**  
District Secretary

**C. Michael Cowett**  
Best Best & Krieger LLP  
General Counsel

Water service to the property exists, and modifications to existing service arrangements would be available upon the completion of financial arrangements between RCWD and the property owner. If new water facilities are required for fire protection or other purposes, the project proponent should contact RCWD for fees and requirements.

Water availability is contingent upon the property owner(s) destroying all on-site wells and signing an Agency Agreement that assigns water management rights, if any, to RCWD.

Sewer service to the subject project, if available, would be provided by Eastern Municipal Water District. If you should have any questions or need additional information, please contact an Engineering Services Representative at this office at (951) 296-6900.

Sincerely,

**RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT**

**Corey F. Wallace, P.E.**  
Engineering Manager

cc: Laurie Williams, Engineering Services Supervisor

08\CW:lm042\FEG



Riverside County  
**Waste Management Department**

Hans W. Kernkamp, General Manager-Chief Engineer

June 2, 2008

Alisa Krizek, Project Planner  
Riverside County Planning Department  
P.O. Box No. 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**RE: Plot Plan No. 23376**

**Proposal: Legalize an existing wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn that will be remodeled and used for a caretakers residence.**

**APN: 942-050-004**

Dear Ms. Krizek:

The Riverside County Waste Management Department (RCWMD) has reviewed the proposed project located south of Glen Oaks Road, west of Camino Del Vino, and east of Milkweed Way, in the Rancho California Zoning Area. The project is subject to the State Model Ordinance, implemented 9/1/94 in accordance with AB 1327, Chapter 18, California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, which requires that all commercial, industrial and multi-family residential development projects provide adequate area(s) for collection and loading of recyclable materials (i.e., paper products, glass and other recyclables). Based on this State Law the RCWMD recommends that the following conditions be made a part of any Conditions of Approval for the proposed development project:


1. **Prior to issuance of a building permit for EACH building**, the applicant shall submit three (3) copies of a Recyclables Collection and Loading Area plot plan to the Riverside County Waste Management Department for review and approval. The plot plan shall conform to ***Design Guidelines for Recyclables Collection and Loading Areas***, provided by the Waste Management Department, and shall show the location of and access to the collection area for recyclable materials, along with its dimensions and construction detail, including elevation/façade, construction materials and signage. The plot plan shall clearly indicate how the trash and recycling enclosures shall be accessed by the hauler.
2. **Prior to final building inspection for EACH building**, the applicant shall construct the recyclables collection and loading area in compliance with the Recyclables Collection and Loading Area plot plan, as approved and stamped by the Riverside County Waste Management Department and as verified by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department through site inspection.
3. a) **Prior to the issuance of a building permit**, a *Waste Recycling Plan* (WRP) shall be submitted to the Waste Management Department for approval. At a

minimum, the WRP must identify the materials (i.e., concrete, asphalt, wood, etc.) that will be generated by construction and development, the projected amounts, the measures/methods that will be taken to recycle, reuse, and/or reduce the amount of materials, the facilities and/or haulers that will be utilized, and the targeted recycling or reduction rate. Materials can be taken directly to recycling facilities (Riverside County Waste Management Department, Recycling Section, can be contacted directly at 951.486.3200 for a list of facilities), or arrangements can be made through the franchise hauler and/or a construction clean-up business.

- b) **Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit**, evidence (i.e., receipts or other type of verification) to demonstrate project compliance with the approved WRP shall be presented by the project proponent to the Planning/Recycling Division of the Riverside County Waste Management Department in order to clear the project for occupancy permits.
4. Since hazardous materials are not accepted at Riverside County landfills, the project proponent shall take any hazardous wastes, including paint used during construction, to facilities that are permitted to receive them, in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program at 1-800-304-2226.
  5. Use mulch and/or compost in the development and maintenance of landscaped areas within the project boundaries. Recycle green waste through either onsite composting of grass, i.e., leaving the grass clippings on the lawn, or sending separated green waste to a composting facility.
  6. Consider xeriscaping and using drought tolerant/low maintenance vegetation in all landscaped areas of the project.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions, please call me at (951) 486-3284.

Sincerely,



Mirtha Liedl, Planner

Enclosure: Initial Case Transmittal

PD 67231v3



Dedicated to delivering state-of-the-art occupational and environmental consultation to businesses, governmental agencies and communities of Riverside County

**Date:** December 9, 2008

**To:** Alisa Krizek  
Riverside County Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, California 92502  
Fax: (951) 955-3157

**From:** Steven D. Hinde, REHS, CIH  
Senior Industrial Hygienist  
Department of Public Health  
Office of Industrial Hygiene  
P.O. BOX 7600  
Riverside, California 92513-7600  
Phone: (951) 358-5050

**Report Written by:** Leah McNamara  
Industrial Hygienist I *LM*

**Report Reviewed by:** Steven D. Hinde, REHS, CIH *SDH*  
Senior Industrial Hygienist


**Project Reviewed:** Plot Plan No. 23376

**Reference Number:** 96561

**Applicant:** Ms. Kelly Smith  
21579 Coral Rock Lane  
Wildomar, CA 92595

**Noise Consultant:** URBAN CROSSROADS  
41 Corporate Park, Ste. 300  
Irvine, CA 92606

**Review Stage:** First Review



**Information  
Provided:**

"Lake Oak Meadows Noise Study, County of Riverside, California JN: 06177-02, dated September 18, 2008."

**Noise Standards:****For Stationary Noise Sources:****A. Standards:**

Facility-related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home", must not exceed the following worst-case noise levels:

- a) 45 dB (A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (nighttime standard).
- b) 65 dB (A) – 10 minute leq, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. (daytime standard).

**B. Requirement for Determination of Community Noise Impact:**

- a) Noise originating from operations within the facility grounds shall be treated as "stationary" noise sources for which this standard will apply.
- b) Noise Modeling Methodology: Noise predictions are to be made by an engineer, acoustical consultant or other similar professional with experience in predicting community noise exposure using standard methods and practices of the noise consulting industry.
- c) Required Modeling Parameters for Stationary Sources:
  - i. Stationary sources are to be modeled as "point" sources.
  - ii. Mobile point sources are to be modeled as emanating from the acoustical centroid of the activity, or at its closest approach to potentially impacted residential property lines, which ever yields the worst-case results.
  - iii. Noise modeling for each piece of acoustical equipment, process or activity must be based on Reference Noise Levels (RNL). RNL may be obtained directly from the manufacturer (in case of equipment) or generated from field studies. Regardless, the data must be representative of worst-case conditions. Directionality of the noise source must be taken into consideration if applicable.
  - iv. Predicted noise levels are to be expressed in terms of worst-case "equivalent continuous sound levels" [or, Leq] averaged over a ten minute

period.

- v. For modeling purposes, receivers are assumed to be positioned at the property line boundary at an elevation of five feet off the ground.
- vi. Terrain conditions for modeling noise propagation: Assumptions regarding ground effects, atmospheric absorption and other forms of noise attenuation must be fully justified.

#### Findings:

The consultant's report is adequate. Based on our calculations the recommendations listed below should provide sufficient attenuation to reduce the exterior noise levels to below 65 dB (A) during the day and 45 dB (A) at night.

#### Recommendations:

The following conditions shall be applied to the project based on the information provided by the acoustical consultant:


1. Facility-related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home", must not exceed the following worst-case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (nighttime standard) and 65 dB (A) – 10 minute leq, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p. m. (daytime standard).
2. Whenever a construction site is within one-quarter (1/4) of a mile of an occupied residence or residences, no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May. Exceptions to these standards shall be allowed only with the written consent of the building official.
3. The Lake Oak Meadows Wedding Facility shall adhere to the requirements set forth by the Riverside County Noise Ordinance, Section 9.52.060 D.
4. Our department (Office of Industrial Hygiene) must receive, review and approve an acoustical report (as listed above) addressing the noise that might be produced from speaker phones and air conditioning unit location and specifications from the proposed wedding banquet hall. Building design must be shown to reduce interior noise to at or below 50 Ldn for those buildings along Glen Oaks Road.

5. The applicant shall pay review fees to the Department of Public Health for all time spent in review of this project. Fees will be assessed at the Department's hourly rate for Industrial Hygienists.

Supervisor Stone  
District 3  
Date Drawn: 12/11/08

PP23376  
VICINITY MAP

Planner: Alisa Krizek  
Date: 01/12/09  
Vicinity Map



DISCLAIMER: On October 7, 2003, the County of Riverside adopted a new General Plan providing new land use designations for unincorporated Riverside County parcels. The new General Plan may contain different types of land use than is provided for under existing zoning. For further information, please contact the Riverside County Planning Department offices in Riverside at (951) 955-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.ltrpg.org>.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Area: Rancho California  
Township/Range: T7SR1W  
Section: 19

Assessors  
Blk. Pg. 942-05  
Thomas  
Bros. Pg. 930 D7



Dear Supervisor Stone,

Planning Commissioner Petty, and

Planning Director Ron Goldman

RE: Lake Oak Meadows – Letter of support pending CV Policy Area requirement compliance

Following are comments and concerns over the Lake Oak Meadows Project from the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association and in keeping with the current CV Policy Area Requirements. Mr. Aglio committed to building a winery and has given assurances to all parties that his first order of priority in regards to his project would be to meet the CV Policies vineyards and winery requirements.

The Winery related infrastructure and vineyard development would, as Mr. Aglio described it, be substantial enough to undoubtedly be considered a winery. Members of the TVWA Board and Land Use Committee would only support such a project if Mr. Aglio put forth considerable effort to meet the CV Policy Requirements and become a “Winery First”.

Mr. Aglio must appreciate that tolerances have been given and that his project stands to benefit a great deal from being included as a winery. Riverside County and the TVWA have diligently worked to define a course that would sustain and benefit Wine Country and is trying to take every measure to ensure that proper course. Mr. Aglio’s project does not currently meet Riverside Counties or Wine Countries standards. We insist that Mr. Aglio meet the CV Policy Requirements immediately.

Pending Mr. Aglio’s compliance with the CV Policy Area Requirements as mentioned before, we would whole heartedly support such a project.

Consequently it would be required, and Mr. Aglio Agreed, that he would do the following as the first phase of his project. Work is to commence as soon as permits are approved and all items below are to be completed soonest after having pulled said permits.

- Plant 75% of acreage (Acreage calculation to be approved by Riverside County.)
- Enclose “Dance Floor” – As Proposed
- Build a Production Facility – As Proposed  
Approved Plans are for a 3,182 Sq Facility with a 21’ high ceiling and a 1,014 Sq. dry case goods storage area as part of the total square footage. This facility will be used for red wine production only. Balance of production will be made at Temecula Valley Winery Management located in the city of Temecula.

- Build a Tasting Room Facility – As Proposed

Members of the TVWA have expressed concerns over noise, traffic, and parking requirements but recognize that the Riverside County Planning Commission will consider, Public Safety, Transportation and Noise related issues will be resolved during the planning approval process.

It is our intention to support the positive growth of Wine Country in accordance with the current and future CV Policy requirements. We hope that Mr. Aglio will be a responsible partner with a first class operation and that he will be committed to the future quality of the Temecula Valley AVA and not just a special event and wedding production facility.

As Always,

Cheers

Bill Wilson

Wilson Creek Winery

President TVWA

Ed Meyers Oak Meadows.txt  
From: Ed Meyers [ensmeyers@aerosurf.net]  
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2010 8:27 PM  
To: Hesterly, Kinika  
Cc: Rebaux Steyn  
Subject: Oak Meadows  
Attachments: Oak Meadows 2.pdf

I wanted to inform you that I have agreed to the terms of the attached letter and will not oppose this project as long as the terms are being met. Additionally they have assured me that the jazz concerts that they are requesting will not exceed 4 per year which I will also not oppose as long as the agreement is met.

Ed Meyers  
39621 Avenida Ascension  
Temecula, CA 92592

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5051 (20100422) \_\_\_\_\_

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5051 (20100422) \_\_\_\_\_

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5083 (20100503) \_\_\_\_\_

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>



TEMECULA VALLEY  
WINERY MANAGEMENT

Ed Meyers  
39621 Avenida Ascencion  
Temecula, CA 92592  
Tel: (951) 695.0594

April 19, 2010

Mr. Ed Meyers,

RE: Lake Oak Meadows Project

Ed, thank you for being such a gracious host and for allowing such candid discussion in regards the Lake Oak Meadows Project. I respect and understand the concerns that you have raised and hope to remedy those by proposing that Mr. Aglio take action on the following items as recommended below.

As mentioned in our discussion, the only real remedy to the noise issue is to have the "dance area" enclosed as being proposed to Riverside County. A set of plans has been submitted and is awaiting approval by the planning department, after which the "dance floor" along with the building plans for winery facilities will be submitted to the building department to be permitted. I anticipate that the process would take a while as I had mentioned, but would like to offer a minute of my time weekly, to briefly discuss the status of the project with you.

We will have the "Dance Floor" enclosed immediately upon permit issuance.

In addition to remedying the noise concerns more permanently we would also like to offer improving the landscaping immediately surrounding the "dance floor" area in the interim. It is recommended that we plant trees and or shrubbery that have more height so as to try and mitigate any sound from traveling onto your property. Landscaping improvements will be made when we have your approval.

It is also recommended that we institute a procedure on property to better monitor sound levels. We will supply you, upon request with a written account of sound level measurements taken at the time of an event and will share with you a copy of our DJ Agreement. The agreement with the DJ will limit the volume used when making announcements and will discourage the use of amplified music outside of the enclosed "dance floor" area. If amplified music were to be used outside the "dance floor" area it would be monitored and would have to fall within the agreements requirements.

Ed, I appreciated the offer you made to write a letter of support, pending some form of an agreement on how we were going to remedy your concerns. If you would be as kind to write the letter, we would greatly appreciate it. I also want to ask that this letter be signed if you feel it addresses your concerns fully.

I sincerely appreciated your concerns as a resident in Wine Country and trust that the working relationship we've established will result in a better project and another beautiful addition to Wine Country as well as an elevated standard of living for you and your family.

Sincerely,

---

Frank Aglio  
Lake Oak Meadows

Date: 04/19/10



---

Ed Meyers

Date: 04/19/10

In Witness hereof:

---



Reboux Steyn  
Temecula Valley Winery Management, LLC

Date: 04/19/10

Jan. 19, 2009

Dear Sirs:

My husband and I received a letter about the project at plot #23376. We live at 39650 Camino Del Vino and are very concerned about the noise factor and about the traffic that would be created due to the people coming and going from the parties. Looking at the established and new businesses being built in the area we feel that 10 acres is not nearly enough to fit with the plan wine country is looking for. Also, the proposed property is on a turn in the road and visibility is poor and dangerous for oncoming traffic.

Sincerely,  
 Mr. and Mrs. Robert King  
  


951-699-4303

January 20, 2009

Riverside County Director's Hearing  
Plot Plan number 23376  
RE: Public Hearing scheduled for January 26, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:


I received information regarding the current wedding venue at the above plot number requesting to expand the current set up. As a neighbor of this venue I am respectfully requesting that you **do not approve** their request for the following reasons.


Currently, the wedding venue has weddings on occasion and we (along with other neighbors) can constantly hear music from these events. It is very distracting and disrupts the neighborhood around it. I do not just hear the music when I am outside my house, but when I am also inside my house. With the increase in size and people will only come an increase in noise and disruption.

This venue is tucked between houses and would make homes by this venue difficult to sell. Due to real estate regulations, home owners have to disclose loud nuisances in the neighborhood, which I would consider this venue. If the venue is expanded, I only anticipate the issue to get worse.

The street the venue is on is a two lane road which is constantly busy and this venue would only make traffic to the neighborhood worse. With the new wineries going in on Rancho California, traffic will be poorer than it already is. On weekends, wine goers, along with limo's and buses take over the area and cause traffic to slow dramatically.

I hope you consider my thoughts in your deliberations and understand the neighborhood's situation. We are surrounded by wineries (Wilson Creek, Palumbo, Foote Print Winery, Wiens, Ponte, and the soon to be Monte De Oro Winery) and would like to keep Wine County on a somewhat small level. Knowing that is asking a lot, we implore you to keep this venue as is, due to the close proximity to homes and what this will do to our already dwindling home values. Thank you for your time.

 Bobbi & Charlie Dall  
39885 Camino Del Vino  
Temecula, CA 92592



12.19.09

TO: Alison Krizan  
Riverside County Planning Dept. PLOT PLAN NO.  
23376

The enclosed notice arrived in the mail yesterday (12.18.09) and I am responding to it.

I think the request of Kelly Smith is ridiculous. Already the noise on weekends at this property is intolerable. This was a very quiet neighborhood and I truly resent having to listen to "D5"s, recorded music in the evening. Twice I have called the police well after 11:00 P.M. when the noise was still quite loud.

I want you to know as a home owner and resident I am completely AGAINST Plot Plan No. 23376

Also - how could they be operating the existing facility without a permit ????

Sandra Vandenberg

Riverside County Planning Department  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, California 92502-1409

January 26, 2009

Re: OBJECTION to Plot Plan No. 23376

Dear Planning Director:

I object to the proposed project.

I live at the end of Fox Hollow Road. At this location, I live across the road from the current unpermitted facility, "Oak Meadows." The "vacant land to the North," which consists of a single parcel of some 8 acres and is the only vacant land between my home, the road, and the entrance to this venue, is situated so that the width rather than the length is between, thus 8 acres is not the true value of the distance.

As you know, the Wilson Creek Winery is located at 35960 Rancho California Road, pretty much just around the corner. This winery has increased in size and magnitude so that they impose a considerable amount of noise and light pollution on the neighborhood. You can hear this winery at my location. The amount of cars parking at that location has steadily increased, along with tour buses and hot air balloon launches.

The unpermitted wedding venue alone, without the added activities proposed, has already brought noise and traffic congestion. When a wedding is held there, you can clearly hear the announcer and the music. You can hear the crowd roar. Traffic is heavy and can easily be seen. At times, there are car headlights shining across into my yard and window.

I ask you to consider the following in your decision:

- 1. Glen Oaks Road is too narrow to permit large volumes of additional traffic.

West of Anza Road, Rancho California Road has a middle turn lane. East of Anza Road, there are right turn lanes but no

middle turn lane. Cars traveling west on Rancho California Road frequently have to stop to wait for left turns to be made by cars entering South Coast Winery. Wilson Creek Winery has a middle turn lane in front of it, which tapers and disappears.

Glen Oaks Road has a right turn lane for entering Rancho California Road going east. To enter Glen Oaks Road from Rancho California Road, there is a right turn lane. And that is all. There is no room on Glen Oaks Road for a third lane of any kind. It is a narrow, twisting road with many dips and hollows. It is conceivable that cars seeking to enter this proposed venue could back up traffic all the way to Rancho California Road, leaving no access for residents to pass through, or escape from the lane of traffic. This would be a nightmare for residents. If you think that this cannot happen, observe the volume of cars at any of the venues along Rancho California Road.

2. I was asked by the venue owner to allow them to use the vacant lot next to me for overflow parking. I don't own that acreage, so I did not speak for the owners. Now I live in fear that one day I will be living next to a noisy parking lot.

3. Customers who miss the entrance or who cannot park in a filled parking lot will be making U-turns and turn-arounds further down the road, before or at Camino del Vino. The owners will not be able to control this behavior. This will bring congestion further down the road, where people will park wherever they can.

4. Putting some of the activity inside a building will not completely eliminate the music noise, will not eliminate the people noise, and certainly not the traffic.

No one is pretending that the building will achieve complete abatement of the noise. The owners themselves state "...while considerably reducing the noise level." This is an admission that they know there will be continued noise. And there is no guarantee that during the summer months they will not hold outdoor concerts. (Wilson Creek Winery holds outdoor concerts, and we can hear them.) If it is a successful venue, it will destroy the neighborhood and create unsafe conditions.

For the above reasons, I object to the Plot Plan No. 23376 and the proposed venue. This is a residential neighborhood. This 10.25 acre plot is in a preexisting residential neighborhood. It fronts directly onto a narrow residential street. The increased activity will have significantly more impact on the neighborhood, NOT LESS! And the buildings will only enable the owners to have activities disturbing the peace and quiet on a continuous basis.

Please say no.

*Sharon Adams*

Sharon Adams  
36123 Fox Hollow Road  
Temecula, California 92592

Ed & Sheree Meyers  
39621 Avenida Ascencion  
Temecula, CA 92592

June 28, 2008

Alisa Krizek  
Riverside County Planning

Subject: Oak Meadows

Dear Alisa:


Per our phone conversation, we are writing this letter to express our concerns over Oak Meadows located at 36101 Glen Oaks Rd, Temecula, CA. In our conversation you had mentioned that a hearing is to be held pursuant to them applying for a permit to operate and at that hearing discussions will be held regarding the frequency that events be allowed to be held.

Our property sits adjacent to Oak Meadows on the South East Corner of their property. They began having events over a year ago and at that time they were held at random and infrequent intervals. At that time it was a minor annoyance, but we did not want to be bad neighbors and complain about it. As time passed however the "events" which are almost exclusively weddings began to increase with frequency, until it has become unbearable. At this time and over the last several months they have held events every Friday, Saturday and Sunday afternoon and evening. With the loud music, DJs over a PA system and people yelling it has been like having a teenager living next door throwing parties every weekend.

We originally built our home in 1994 in order to have some serenity and spent considerably more than we would have on a tract home in order to have it. Now we have to listen to this every single weekend and are completely unable to enjoy our patio on the weekends because of this. At this point I would like to sell my home and move away from this place, but I am very distressed over what is happening to my home's resale value. In a down market, I can't even imagine who would want to buy a home that sits next to Oak Meadows. And given that it is located in such a populated area with homes all around it I can't imagine any of the neighbors are happy about it. With that in mind I would like to request that their application for a permit to operate be denied. While I understand that they have spent a considerable amount of money fixing up the property, I would submit that maybe they should have done all of us the courtesy of letting us know exactly what they were planning and asking us for permission before they went ahead with their plans. Furthermore they should have asked you the county, gone through proper channels and gotten permits before proceeding. Maybe they felt it would be easier to ask for forgiveness than permission, but I believe they should not be rewarded for ignoring the law.

Thank you for your time,

Ed Meyers



3.25.09

TO: County of Riverside Planning Dept.  
regarding: Plot plan 22217, Lake Oaks  
meadows

We have a second letter  
regarding Lake Oaks Meadows and  
have some issues as well as  
questions.


1. only six parking spaces ???
2. No more special events. i.e. Weddings
3. What about traffic increase?

Lake Oaks rd. has already had  
two deaths from automobiles

4. Why does the county continue  
to allow an unpermitted project to  
hold events every weekend ???

5. We would prefer the hours  
of operations weekends only from  
noon to 3pm.

I feel the people who  
own & operate the Oak Meadows




- 2 -

property law really taken  
advantage of both the county  
(by disobeying the law) and  
their neighbors by the very  
loud noise, traffic and  
people. Perhaps a property on  
Rancho California Road would  
be better suited to their needs.

Sincerely,

Dandra VanderLens  
(a neighbor)



April 6, 2009

To: Riverside County Planning Dept  
about: Plat Plan No. 22217

To whom it may concern -

I was mistaken and thought the letter with this information referred to Lake Oak Meadows (Plat plan 23376) and not to the Foster winery. Their project is quiet and does not interfere with us in any way. Oak Meadows does.

The Foster winery should be allowed to proceed with their project and I am very sorry about my error.

Sincerely,

Sandra VanderLans



*Rick & Mimi Beter*

41885 Chaparral Drive  
Temecula, CA 92592  
(951) 302-9978

April 13, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commissioner  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, California 92501

Fax # 951-955-1891

Re: Oak Meadows Wedding Facility

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We have been long time residents of Riverside County and have taken pride in being a part of the Temecula Wine region.

During our time in Temecula we have seen many changes, and with recent damage to the grape crops, a water shortage, and a suffering national and local economy we would surely consider these trying times in our community.

We are concerned about our local wineries and local event facilities, and can only hope they are able to keep themselves afloat during these tough times. It seems that one way to get things back on the upturn would be to find other ways to keep the communities successful.

With the spring and summer months ahead of us, the beauty and tranquility of the wine region cannot be ignored when considering wedding destinations. Many of the larger wineries take advantage of the wonderful weather and surreal settings to provide interested couples with a memorable setting for one of the most important days of their lives.

This privilege and opportunity should not be denied to Oak Meadows. Anyone who steps foot in this facility is immediately taken by its majestic beauty, and welcoming atmosphere, so we ask that you please support Oak Meadows in its pursuit of expansion.

Sincerely,

Rick and Mimi Beter

BoCakes Bakery  
43053 Margarita Rd. Suite B-104  
Temecula, CA 92592  
951-676-6500

April 14, 2009

Dear Riverside County Planning Commission,

I am writing this letter to express my support of Lake Oak Meadows as a Temecula Valley Wedding Venue.

As a Temecula bakery, I deliver wedding cakes to nearly all the local venues. It is my opinion that Lake Oak Meadows is one of the most beautiful, well-run venues. I have always had exemplary feedback from couples, complimenting the professional staff and impeccable grounds. Lake Oak Meadows is such a wonderful alternative to the mainstream wineries, showcasing the rural beauty of Temecula.

From a business perspective, I am most likely to refer couples to Lake Oak Meadows, not only for the beauty, but also because of the professional staff and rave reviews I receive from the newlyweds. Often, couples borrow cake stands from my bakery. It is their responsibility to return the stand after the wedding. Because of this, I am in the unique position of seeing the couple and/or family after the event. My first question is always... "so how did it go?" I can't repeat this often enough. Couples ALWAYS phrase the staff at Lake Oak Meadows for their professionalism and efficiency. I can honestly say, I have never heard even one negative response. "Perfect" is the word I hear most from these couples.

From a personal perspective, I am acquainted with the family and I know they work hard to promote the wedding industry in all of Temecula. They understand that there are many alternatives for venues and all must work together to bring business and revenue to our community.

A final note to consider, my Menifee home is located approximately 200 yards from a neighborhood wedding venue. Most weekend evenings, my husband and I can hear the festivities. Often, we enjoy sitting outside on a warm evening, listening to the music and fun. On the occasion that we're not in the mood to listen, we simply close our doors. It's not a life-changing event either way.


In closing, I am appealing to the Planning Commission to issue the necessary permits to allow this beautiful venue to continue promoting the wedding industry in the Temecula Valley.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,



Kathy Stringer  
Owner  
BoCakes Bakery



Sept. 14, 2009

Regarding Plat Plan 23376 -

We are completely against  
this project -

I'm not sure I understand  
why an unpermitted winery can  
operate - The noise from this "winery"  
is loud - especially in the summer  
when our windows are open. Sixty-  
five special events is insane.


Traffic will increase. Already  
at least two people have been killed  
on Glen Oaks road.

This is very unfair  
of the county to  
allow this facility  
to operate as it has.

We are also curious how they expect  
to have 3/4 of the land in grapes -

Sincerely,

Dorinda VanderLans  
Cultiv' Edge Ranch



**To the County Planning Commission of Riverside,**

**I am writing on behalf of Oak Meadows, Lake of Dreams, I am Owner and Chief Operator of "Celebrations by Diana", Wedding Coordinating Services. I humbly request your consideration as I inform those concerned of my deep distress over the possible closure of the wedding facility known as Oak Meadows, Lake of Dreams (located at 36101 Glen Oaks Road, Temecula, California, 92592).**

**I have worked as an independent Coordinator at this property for over two years. This account provides approximately 70% of my income for each calendar year; I also support three other subcontractors with this revenue, its closure would be a financial hardship to both their and my livelihood. In addition to my personal welfare, I have come to admire and respect this family very much for their hard work and commitment to the wedding industry.**

**I believe it is also very important to realize the impact that our wedding facilities have on our cities economy. With 75-100 events a year, these locations bring in guests from San Diego, Orange County and Los Angeles for lodging, dining and entertainment. The time and energy, in addition to the financial investment the owners of Lake Oak Meadows have devoted to this property is extensive and has proven worthwhile to our small (but growing) community.**

**I am only one of many vendors who are dedicated to and benefitting from the business provided by Oak Meadows Lake of Dreams, and I humbly request that you reflect on this when making your decision about this location's interest and welfare. I greatly appreciate your consideration in this matter.**

**Respectfully,**



**Diana M. Ross  
Owner/Celebrations...by Diana  
[srossca@mindspring.com](mailto:srossca@mindspring.com)  
[www.celebartionsbydi.com](http://www.celebartionsbydi.com)  
951 491 0552**

Gary J. Boeldt II  
43263 Brookway Dr.  
Temecula, Ca 92592  
April 9, 2009

Ron Goldman  
Planning Director  
Riverside Planning Department  
4080 Lemon St  
Riverside Ca 92502-1629

Dear Mr. Goldman:

I am a long-time resident of our city, and I am writing to express my concern about recent discussion and the pending decision regarding Lake Oak Meadows Event and Wedding Resource Center. I understand that a decision is being considered and as a resident, business man within our community I would like to share my insights, and thoughts.

First and foremost, I do not believe there is any benefit for our community in making any decision that would obstruct Lake Oak Meadows, from operating in our wonderful community. I have personally come to know the entire Aglio Family, and I can tell you that they are a respectable, upright, hard working Family. They are an undeniable asset to our community and I see nothing but positive influence in their operations. They provide jobs and opportunity in a time of unequalled economic challenges for our country as a whole, and if for no other reason than that, they should be allowed to operate in whatever capacity that they are requesting. They have become an incredibly beautiful compliment to our valley, and I have seen no less than the best intentions, and 110% commitment to make the changes and improvements necessary to grow their business in our community. I would strongly encourage you to help clear and obstacle or obstruction that slows or impedes any progression for this place of business.


I know there may be those that oppose what Lake Oak Meadows is doing, but that sight is short, and self serving, in the long run, I think it is clear that Lake Oak Meadow's strives for the very thing that this community is built on, hard work, opportunity, and progress. I have seen, and been apart of hundreds of Weddings as a DJ in Southern California, I have done Weddings at many Elite locations all across Southern California, Arizona, Hawaii, and New York, I have even flown to England, and I can tell you that "Lake Oak Meadows" has become a big part of our ever increasing draw to Temecula Valley as a "Destination Location" for Weddings, we have been seen in all of the eminent Bridal magazines such as "The Knot", "The Bride", "Contemporary Bride" etc.. Lake Oak Meadows has been no small part of this, and I have letter upon letter from Happy Brides that can resonate that sentiment. Please consider this position, and look at the value this business brings to so many.

Please help Lake Oak Meadows and the many that rely on its revenue to prosper and continue as a permanent fixture in Temecula Valley.

Sincerely,

Gary J. Boeldt II

Elite Music Works  
Event Audio and Lighting, DJ ~ Services




**Vineyard Gourmet Catering  
28545 Felix Valdez A-3  
Temecula, Ca. 92562  
951-694-6355**

*The Temecula Valley has become a destination for Weddings and other events. Our valley was host to over 1100 Weddings in 2008. Lake Oak Meadows was and is a thriving part of this market. While every venue has its own charm, Lake Oak Meadows is unique. From their Lush grounds, Romantic outdoor fireplace, to the beautiful lake with Fountains, Lake Oak Meadows offers an enchanting atmosphere for any event. This Venue is truly majestic and an asset to our valley.*

*Relying on outside vendors and resources for every event, Oak Meadows provides a revenue source for many local small businesses. We are proud to be one of the many vendors that represent Lake Oak Meadows. We look forward to the continued growth of our valley and the future success of Lake Oak Meadows.*

**Kind Regards,**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Debra Lutz". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above the printed name and company information.

**Volker & Debra Lutz  
Vineyard Gourmet Catering**

5-4-09

Mr. Ron Goldman , Planning Director  
Planning Commission and Planning Department  
4080 Lemon Street, 9<sup>th</sup> floor, Riverside CA, 92502

Subject : Oak Meadows proposing a winery, tasting room, bed and breakfast (10 rooms), special occasion facility and special occasion facility.

Reference - Proposed Oak Meadows - 36101 Glen Oaks Road, Temecula, CA 92592.

Parcel Number - 942-050-004, Case #PP23379 AMD #1, Planner - Lisa Sheldon.

Dear Mr. Goldman,

Recent General Plan Amendment No.1056, and Change of Zone NO. 7666 states that planning and County Counsel staff were asked to bring back recommendations to the Board on proposed changes for Special Occasion Facilities due to the growing concerns with incompatible land uses in Wine Country. A number of residents have testified that noise, traffic, trespass and lewd behavior from Special Occasion Facilities have resulted in diminishing the "quality of life" for the area. Although I was not notified about your meeting in September, 2008, 100 residents, vintners and other stakeholders attended and community members voiced concerns and support of stricter requirements for Special Occasion Facilities.

Enclosed is a petition signed by 32 local residents near the proposed illegal Oak Meadows Wedding facility. Additional signatures could be obtained over time but due to property security limitations many residents could not be contacted to sign this petition. Of the people contacted only two people did not want to get involved and two people had signed Mr. Aglio's petition based on his personal promise that the reception facility would be in an underground basement and completely inaudible. I do not think that this is what is being proposed.

The local residents have many objectionable issues relating to this residential property and would like this project denied based on issues which include but are not limited to unlawful extended hours of illegal operation, excessive noise levels, litter, additional drunk drivers on the roads, lewd behavior and a precedence for a residential area. Currently, no stand alone wedding facilities exist in the wine country.

Citations, violations and code case files showing incompatibility with the surrounding neighborhood are as follows:

CV065352 - Business Zoning Violation  
CV0710259 - Construction without permits  
CV0809319 - Zoning Noise violation  
CV003816 - Construction without permits  
CV077925 - Storage and rubbish violations  
CE45722 - Civil Citation with code case CV0808319

What is Oak Meadows? A winery? No. A vineyard? No. An agricultural operation? No. A residence surrounded by higher density wine country homes? **Yes. Surrounded by 8 residences.**

#### **Ville de Amore**

A case file example of a similar property denied is Ville de Amore. Why was this proposed wedding facility denied? It was concluded that Ville de Amore is not consistent with the C/V

zoning classification of Ordinance NO. 348 and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance NO. 348. It was also found that the public's health, safety and general welfare are not protected through project design. It was also found that the project is not compatible with the present and future logical development of the area. It was also found that per Ordinance 348, Article 14.71, limited incidental commercial uses such as bed and breakfast inns be permitted only when they are **secondary and directly related to the agricultural operations as defined in Section 14.72**. Primary agricultural operations defined in 14.72 fall under "production lot", "vineyard" and "winery". The other definitional categories contained in Section 14.72 ( bed and breakfast, special occasion facility, etc) fall into the secondary category. Since the proposed project is primarily a special occasion facility, the proposed project is not consistent with the C/V rural policy area. A noise study was also conducted at Ville de Amore and was found to exceed the maximum allowable decibel level of 45 for that area. It was found that Ville de Amore did not attenuate noise and therefore creates a nuisance for the surrounding residences. **Project denied.**

Two other case studies where owners proceeded with the county in the correct manner but received limitations on hours and secondary privileges are listed below.

#### **Doffo Winery**

The winery will be open for wine tasting Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays, and Holidays. **Special Events - There will be no special events.**

#### **Briar Rose Winery**

**Special events shall be permitted to be held year up to four times per year, at a minimum interval of two months apart.** Weekends shall be the only permissible days of the week for special events. The private on-site residence shall not be accessible by patrons.

Exterior noise levels produced by any use allowed under this permit, including, but not limited to, any outdoor public address system, shall not exceed 5 db(A), 10-minute LEQ, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to :00 a.m., and 65 db(A), 10-minute LEQ, at all other times as measured at any residential, hospital, school, library, nursing home or other similar noise sensitive land use. In the event noise exceeds this standard, the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall take the necessary steps to remedy the situation, which may include discontinued operation of the facilities. he permit holder shall comply with the applicable standards of Ordinance No. 847.

#### **Noise Standards**

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside Ordains as Follows:

Section 1. **INTENT.** At certain levels, sound becomes noise and may jeopardize the health, safety or general welfare of Riverside County residents and degrade their quality of life. Pursuant to its police power, the Board of Supervisors hereby declares that noise shall be regulated in the manner described herein. This ordinance is intended to establish countywide standards regulating noise. This ordinance is not intended to establish thresholds of significance for the purpose of any analysis required by the California Environmental Quality Act and no such thresholds are hereby established.

Section 4. **GENERAL SOUND LEVEL STANDARDS.** No person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1.

TABLE 1 - SOUND LEVEL STANDARDS

## GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION NAME

DENSITY MAXIMUM DECIBEL LEVEL - 7am/10pm Community Development

RR Rural Residential 5 ac 45db/45db  
Agriculture AG Agriculture 10 AC 45db/45db

c. Audio Equipment. No person shall operate any audio equipment, whether portable or not, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. such that the equipment is audible to the human ear inside an inhabited dwelling other than a dwelling in which the equipment may be located. No person shall operate any audio equipment, whether portable or not, at any other time such that the equipment is audible to the human ear at a distance greater than one hundred **(100)** feet from the equipment.

d. Sound Amplifying Equipment and Live Music. No person shall install, use or operate sound amplifying equipment, or perform, or allow to be performed, live music unless such activities comply with the following requirements. To the extent that these requirements conflict with any conditions of approval attached to an underlying land use permit, these requirements shall control.

1. Sound amplifying equipment or live music is prohibited between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

2. Sound emanating from sound amplifying equipment or live music at any other time shall not be audible to the human ear at a distance greater than two hundred **(200)** feet from the equipment or music.

Section 9. **DUTY TO COOPERATE**. No person shall refuse to cooperate with, or obstruct, the enforcement officials identified in Section 8. of this ordinance when they are engaged in the process of enforcing the provisions of this ordinance. This duty to cooperate may require a person to extinguish a sound source so that it can be determined whether sound emanating from the source violates the provisions of this ordinance.

### **Conclusions**

As you know, the C/V Rural Policy Area encompasses one of the most important agricultural land areas in the county. In addition to vineyards and other agricultural uses, the project area is comprised of wineries, single-family residential units, bed and breakfast inns, restaurants and Special Occasion Facilities only as a secondary and incidental use operation to a production vineyard or winery. There are no stand alone Special Occasion Facilities in this area. The existing and planned land uses commonly found in the area are intended to encourage agricultural cultivation, vineyards and wineries that would preserve the rural lifestyle and wine making atmosphere of the areas where such activities are occurring **and protect areas from incompatible uses, which could result in reduced agricultural productivity and increased urbanization within the policy area.**

Many conclusions can be made and there are many undesirable answers when it comes to the proposed Oak Meadows project. Here are 31 questions which come to mind.

1. Is the vintners association against this project? According to President Bill Wilson and his assistant Peggy, yes. Why? Oak Meadows takes business away from the larger facilities and hurts their viability.

2. Is Oak Meadows a vineyard, winery or agricultural operation? No.

3. Has Oak Meadows ever wanted to be anything but a wedding facility? **No.**
4. Is Oak Meadows trying to put on a show by planting grapes to meet a technical requirement to get around the current code? **Probably.**
5. Does Oak Meadows have 75% of their land planted in grapes in harvest? **No.**
6. Can Oak Meadows meet the requirement of 5 above and still have room for what they are proposing? **No.**
7. Does Oak Meadows produce 3,500 gallons of wine annually? **No.**
8. Does the Oak Meadows project enhance and preserve the rural lifestyle and wine making atmosphere of the area? **No.**
9. Does the Oak Meadows project add to the urbanization of the area? **Yes.**
10. Is the Oak Meadows project incompatible with the neighborhood? **Yes.**
11. Does Mr. Aglio feel that citations are part of doing business? **It seems so.**
12. Does Mr. Aglio feel that it is cheaper to receive a citation than comply with code? **It seems so.**
13. Has Mr. Aglio received multiple complaints about his illegal facility? **Yes.**
14. Has Mr. Aglio complied with complaints? **The law states that Mr. Aglio has a duty to comply.**
15. Are existing wineries in residential areas heavily restricted? **Yes.**
16. Due to design and topography, ingress and egress, does the Oak Meadows project have the potential for public endangerment? **It seems so.**
17. Is this facility a public nuisance to the surrounding neighbors? **By petition, it seems so. It has also been found by code enforcement that Oak Meadows does not attenuate noise and therefore creates a nuisance for the surrounding residences.**
18. Is Mr. Aglio's pond approved by fish and game? **Probably not.**
19. Is Mr. Aglio's pond and swimming pool a public nuisance and security risk? **Yes.**
20. If people were wandering around the steep topography and happened to have an accident, could a First Response Unit get to them in time? **Probably not.**
21. Can Mr. Aglio serve food from the portable kitchen on the back wall of the his and her port-a-potty? **Probably not.**
22. Is it legal for Mr. Aglio to allow open container hard liquor to be consumed during his party festivals? **Probably not.**
23. Does Mr. Aglio have structural permits for any improvements? **No.**
24. Has Mr. Aglio ever pulled a permit for the tent he erects for his parties?

25. Where do all of the people living in the multiple use illegal buildings defecate? Illegal septic systems?

26. There are neighbors that may testify to uncontrolled lewd behavior if asked. Is sex in public against the law? **I think so.**

27. Some neighbors may testify that they have to leave their home once a party starts at Oak Meadows due to the noise. Is that what the General Plan intends? **No.**

28. Some neighbors may testify about personal threats made to them by Mr. Aglio suggesting that the whole neighborhood does not know who they are dealing with and implies some sort of mafia connection with violence, power and money. **What kind of neighbor makes threats?**

29. Is this out of area property owner allowed to ruin a neighborhood for personal gain? **Hopefully not.**

30. Why would Mr. Aglio not want to complete his entire project in a timely manner rather than 4 phases? Money problems?

31. Does Mr. Aglio have the financing to even complete his proposed project or does he plan to continue hosting weddings illegally, multiple times a week, to cash flow his project over time?

I spoke with neighbors when obtaining signatures. A neighborhood overtone to the conversation included why is the County allowing this to happen? Isn't the County going to do anything? What is the County going to do about this? Only you can answer these questions.

Mr. Goldman, you stated to several neighbors at a jobsite meeting in February, 2009 that this facility has had the most complaints and opposition. This is because it is incompatible with the neighborhood and diminishes the residents "quality of life" guaranteed by the County General Plan?

**The neighborhood is begging you to deny this project and have them cease and desist.**

Regards,



Wendell Wright  
39626 De Marquez Court  
Temecula, CA 92592

CC:

Damian Meins, Assistant Planning Director  
Derek Hull, Principal Planner (South County)  
Lisa Sheldon, Case File Planner  
Supervisor Jeff Stone  
John Boyd Director of Code Enforcement  
Mark Slocum Code Enforcement Officer, Murrieta

Site address - 36101 Glen Oaks Road, Temecula, CA 92592.

Parcel Number - 942-050-004, Case #PP23379 AMD #1, Planner - A. Krizek

This petition is a statement and request to stop Oak Meadows entertainment/wedding facility from further activities. Multiple complaints, improvement citations and noise citations are on file with Mark Slocum, Riverside County Code Enforcement Officer. Due to the facts that the property is less than a net 10 acre minimum and not a winery, we find that the property does not meet general zoning requirements for this type of activity. Property history shows that no legal permits exist for any structural ground improvements for this public facility nor special permits allowing any past activities.

The northwest area of the property has been converted to "shanty town" housing for rent in trade for services. An examination may reveal illegal aliens hired for services. This would be in violation of California employer laws as well as a conviction from the Internal Revenue Service if income tax evasion was found. Citrus and vineyard CC&R's allow limited approved housing for agricultural farmers to house their temporary workers, which does not include, by definition, the "Oak Meadows", residential lot. These types of violations lower the property values of surrounding properties and erodes the Riverside County tax base. This also puts Riverside County at risk for a class action lawsuit if laws are not enforced.

We do not feel that this project can be mitigated to the surrounding neighborhood in any way, shape, form or fashion. As this is primarily an outdoor facility by layout and design. Violations of curfew ordinances, drunken patrons, intrusive lighting and excessive noise from this facility have drastically lowered the quality of life for all tax paying citizens in the general area. A reception could be held inside a sound proof building but it is generally felt that due to the facilities available at the property as well as past behavior, this property would continue to violate all curfew, light and noise ordinances.

Name	Address	Phone Number
<del>W. Wright</del>	39525 DeMarquez Ct, Temecula, CA	951-676-4948
W. Wright	39525 DeMarquez Ct, Temecula, CA	951-676-4948
J. O'Connell	39621 AVENIDA ASCENSION, TEMECULA, CA	951-675-0594
LEE MEYERS	39621 Avenida Ascension, Temecula, CA	(951) 675-0555
ANDREW CARSON	39575 Avenida Ascension, Temecula, CA	(951) 506-4622
MICHAEL CARSON	"	"
LEE & HOLLY WILSON	39155 Calle Anita, Temecula, CA	(951) 587-9946
KATHY WISKI	39377 Calle Anita, Temecula, CA	(951) 308-2338
LEE BURKE	39377 Calle Anita, Temecula, CA	925 92 308-
LEE BURKE	39455 Calle Anita, Temecula, CA	925 92 2338
LEE BURKE	39455 Calle Anita, Temecula, CA	925 92 951-506-564

Name	Address	Phone Number
<del>Arthur L. Ethel</del>	39350 Calle Anita	951-205-6545
Queen Ayers	39350 Calle Anita	(951) 326-4324
Sharon Adams	36123 Fox Hollow Rd	951-699-4500
<del>39525 De Marquez Ct, Temecula, CA</del>	39525 De Marquez Ct, Temecula, CA	951-676-4941
<del>39525 De Marquez Ct, Temecula, CA</del>	39525 De Marquez Ct, Temecula, CA	951-676-4948
<del>39035 De Mesa Ct, Temecula, CA</del>	39035 De Mesa Ct, Temecula, CA	951-775-6596
Sara Hamilton	39375 Camino del Viento Temecula, CA	951-676-5354
Sandy Vandekam	36400 Glen Oaks Temecula, CA	951-676-5646
Chris Vandekam	Jane	
* [Signature]	35767 Via Las Pambas Temecula, CA	92592
* Mike Jones	35767 VIA LAS PAMBUAS TEMECULA, CA	92592
Ron Man	39555 de Marquez Ct Temecula, CA	694-5950
* Lorenz E. Blackl	40295 Aranda St. Temecula, CA	92592
* Diana Blackl	40295 Aranda St. Temecula, CA	
* Tony PAPA	36628 MONTEDORO Temecula	92592
* David Papa	36628 Monte d Oro rd -	
* Consuelo Duzco	40910 Aranda St. Temecula	
* Jay Jay	36628 Monte D Oro Road	

my PAPA



CUTTIN' EDGE RANCH

36400 GLEN OAKES ROAD  
TEMECULA, CA 92592

To: Ron Swanson  
regarding Lake Oak  
Meadows  
Plot plan: 23376

We are completely  
against the noise  
and traffic  
created by this  
facility. Our evenings  
on the weekends are  
(completely) disrupted  
by noise & deer yard  
Voices.

Vandn Lars  
Family

Phone 951.676.5646  
Fax 951.676.5646

seahorsesandy@aol.com



**From:** Howard, Roy V [mailto:rhoward@mwdh2o.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 18, 2009 8:49 AM  
**To:** Sheldon, Lisa  
**Subject:** Oak Meadows

Lisa Sheldon,


Good morning. My name is Roy Howard. My wife (Kathleen) and I have lived at 39600 Milkweed Way for the past 22 years. I am sending this email to show our full support for the development of the subject property. We have not experience any negative impacts resulting from activities held at Oak Meadows. We feel that the intent of the Oak Meadows Development is consistent with the other wineries in the area and we are exited to see the full extent of the proposed improvements. We have no personal or professional affiliation with Oak Meadows or anyone involved with the development of the facility.

Sincerely,  
Roy and Kathleen Howard  
(951) 676-1310

49?

RIVERSIDE COUNTY GIS

Linck H.



Selected parcel(s):  
942-050-004

LEGEND

SELECTED PARCEL

PARCELS

Mark them today & I will  
review the list and  
check for comments tomorrow

IMPORTANT

This information is made available through the Riverside County Geographic Information System. The information is for reference purposes only. It is intended to be used as base level information only and is not intended to replace any recorded documents or other public records. Contact appropriate County Department or Agency if necessary. Reference to recorded documents and public records may be necessary and is advisable.

REPORT PRINTED ON...Thu Dec 18 14:48:28 2008

# OAK MEADOWS

## LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. <u>Print Name</u>	CHERYL MARSHALL	Signature	Cheryl Marshall
Address	37380 GLENOAKS RD TEMECULA	Phone	951 303-9697
		Email	cheriemarshall@gnm
2. <u>Print Name</u>	Ray Mizell	Signature	[Signature]
Address	38910 Avenida Arriba	Phone	951 303 1267
		Email	
3. <u>Print Name</u>	Judy Mizell	Signature	Judy Mizell
Address	38950 Avenida Arriba	Phone	951 303-1267
		Email	
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Aurie Weimann	Signature	Aurie Weimann
Address	39010 Avenida Arriba	Phone	302-3804
		Email	
5. <u>Print Name</u>	Mike Weimann	Signature	Mike Weimann
Address	39010 Avenida Arriba	Phone	302-3804
		Email	
6. <u>Print Name</u>	Lisa Duty	Signature	[Signature]
Address	37410 Glenoaks Rd	Phone	302-9222
		Email	
7. <u>Print Name</u>	MIKE DUTY	Signature	[Signature]
Address		Phone	302-9222
		Email	
8. <u>Print Name</u>		Signature	
Address		Phone	
		Email	
9. <u>Print Name</u>		Signature	
Address		Phone	
		Email	
10. <u>Print Name</u>		Signature	
Address		Phone	
		Email	

April 23, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commissioner  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street, 9<sup>th</sup> floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

Dear Planning Commissioner:


I have lived in Riverside County for twenty years with the past ten as a resident of Temecula in Wine Country.

Wine Country is such a great place to live not only for it's beauty but also the attractions it has to offer. The wineries, restaurants and event venues are a great attraction for visitors as well as to those of us who live here.

I know that many of the wineries also offer wedding services. Oak Meadows is one of these. The setting there is breathtaking and allows couples to share in the beauty and tranquility of wine country. The weddings not only attract business for Oak Meadows but for every business associated with a wedding: photographers, cake decorators, caterers, florists, etc.

The economy has already effected so many local businesses in a negative way. I hope that you will allow Oak Meadows to continue to expand therefore bringing much needed business and opportunity to wine country.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lisa Duty". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Lisa Duty











Wine Country Resident

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

NEIGHBORS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. <u>Print Name</u>	THOMAS WOODWARD	Signature	
Address	36015 GLEN OAKS RD.	Phone	951-694-0163
		Email	
2. <u>Print Name</u>	Izwan Martin	Signature	
Address	35905 Monte De Oro Rd.	Phone	
		Email	951-551-2751
3. <u>Print Name</u>	Dan Zita, Sherry	Signature	
Address	39575 De Marquez ch.	Phone	
		Email	951-831-5473, Dan @ Azchevine.com
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Sherry A. Zita	Signature	
Address	39575 De Marquez	Phone	
		Email	branchzita.com @YAHOO
5. <u>Print Name</u>	GARY WARREN	Signature	
Address	39505 DE MARQUEZ CT	Phone	
		Email	(951) 775-5976 cece
6. <u>Print Name</u>	Bill Moyer	Signature	
Address	39555 De Marquez CT	Phone	(951) 694-5954
		Email	AMoyer@AOC.com
7. <u>Print Name</u>	Cindy Yost	Signature	
Address	35615 Monte de Oro Rd.	Phone	
		Email	(951) 551-5449
8. <u>Print Name</u>	RANDY FARRAR	Signature	
Address	35615 MONTE DE ORO RD.	Phone	
		Email	(951) 951-5449
9. <u>Print Name</u>	JAIME RIVERA	Signature	
Address	36298 GLEN OAKS RD	Phone	
		Email	(951) 694-9426
10. <u>Print Name</u>	ROGER MILTON	Signature	
Address	36055 GLEN OAKS RD.	Phone	
		Email	951-676-3310

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

NEIGHBORS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.











1. <u>Print Name</u>	PAT SIVERT		<u>Signature</u>	Pat Sivert	
<u>Address</u>	35770 MONTE DE ORO TEMECULA, CA 92592		<u>Phone</u>	676-1743	
			<u>Email</u>	thesiverts@hotmail.com	
2. <u>Print Name</u>	Mark Sivert		<u>Signature</u>	Mark Sivert	
<u>Address</u>	35770 Monte De Oro Rd. Temecula CA 92592		<u>Phone</u>	764-7150	
			<u>Email</u>	trevis-kram@hotmail.com	
3. <u>Print Name</u>	PAUL E. BENEVIDES		<u>Signature</u>	Paul E. Benvides	
<u>Address</u>	35770 Vlt Las Pintas		<u>Phone</u>	(951) 587-0133	
			<u>Email</u>		
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Bardelio Sandoval		<u>Signature</u>	Bardelio Sandoval	
<u>Address</u>	36298 Glen Oak Rd		<u>Phone</u>	(951) 694-9426	
			<u>Email</u>		
5. <u>Print Name</u>			<u>Signature</u>		
<u>Address</u>			<u>Phone</u>		
			<u>Email</u>		
6. <u>Print Name</u>			<u>Signature</u>		
<u>Address</u>			<u>Phone</u>		
			<u>Email</u>		
7. <u>Print Name</u>			<u>Signature</u>		
<u>Address</u>			<u>Phone</u>		
			<u>Email</u>		
8. <u>Print Name</u>			<u>Signature</u>		
<u>Address</u>			<u>Phone</u>		
			<u>Email</u>		
9. <u>Print Name</u>			<u>Signature</u>		
<u>Address</u>			<u>Phone</u>		
			<u>Email</u>		
10. <u>Print Name</u>			<u>Signature</u>		
<u>Address</u>			<u>Phone</u>		
			<u>Email</u>		

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

NEIGHBORS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. <u>Print Name</u>	Mimi Beter	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	951-302-2978	<u>Email</u>	—
<u>Address</u>	41885 Cheparral Drive, Temecula CA 92592						
2. <u>Print Name</u>	JERRY J DOTSON	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	951 699-1777	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	39695 CAMINO DEL VINO						
3. <u>Print Name</u>	GREGG ENGLISH	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	(951) 694-1532	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	39875 CAMINO DEL VINO						
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Cheryl English	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	951 694-1532	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	39875 Camino Del Vino						
5. <u>Print Name</u>	CHERI HUDSON	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	951-676-8461	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	39725 CAMINO DEL VINO TEMECULA						
6. <u>Print Name</u>	EDDIE HUDSON	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>		<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	39725 CAMINO DEL VINO						
7. <u>Print Name</u>	Lauren Sivert	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	(951) 676-1743	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	35770 Monte De Oro Rd						
8. <u>Print Name</u>	Colby Coppock	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	(951) 231-4642	<u>Email</u>	ColbyC@mac.com
<u>Address</u>	37410 Glen Oaks rd Temecula						
9. <u>Print Name</u>	Chad Duty	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	(951) 832-1942	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	37410 Glen Oaks Rd.						
10. <u>Print Name</u>	Angelika de Armas	<u>Signature</u>		<u>Phone</u>	949-378-3906	<u>Email</u>	
<u>Address</u>	39340 Jessie Cr Temecula, CA 92591						

April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009

My name is Dan Torning and I am writing this letter on behalf of Oak Meadows, in Temecula. I was recently notified by Anthony that he has received several complaints from neighbors and the county about the loud music during wedding events.

My wife and I were married at Oak Meadows July 18<sup>th</sup>, and it was by far the best wedding I have been involved with or attended. The staff at Oak Meadows is extremely attentive to your needs and has a first class facility. The music was by no means loud. In fact we had the level turned down, and off by 9 pm. I would think anyone who moves into the wine country would know there are wedding sites in the area. It is part of the appeal of wine country.

The issue I see now though is that the other locations are not a problem; however, Oak Meadows is, and they are allegedly disturbing the neighborhood. That's interesting to me since Oak Meadows has been trying to get permits to build a reception hall, and have hit road blocks every step of the way. My wife and I had looked into several wedding sites in the Temecula wine country for our wedding. Oak Meadows was our first choice.


In regards to the music/noise issue, I believe this is an attempt to single out one wedding site. There are several wineries in the area and they also have weddings and outdoor events with music and concerts. It is my understanding that the noise ordinance allows for the music to go until 10 pm. I can honestly say if we did not have our wedding at Oak Meadows, we would not have gotten married in Temecula. Oak Meadows is more affordable and accommodating, unlike the majority of wedding sites in that area. Oak Meadows is a beautiful and pleasant experience for all who attend a wedding. I have recommended Oak Meadows to many of my co workers and friends.

It would be a sad day if Oak Meadows was unable to have weddings. This is an experience most brides would love to have and share with friends and family. I hope you seriously consider keeping this fine, beautiful outdoor wedding site in our county.

Sincerely,

Dan Torning

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DT', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.



The Arrangement Gallery Florist

725 E. Florida Avenue  
Hemet, CA 92543  
(951) 652-9234 • Fax (951) 652-0694


April 15, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:



I, Rick Crimeni, want to support and affirm that Oak Meadows is a much needed facility in the Temecula Valley. After 44 years in the floral business, there are very few facilities that can compare to Oak Meadows. I do approximately 275 weddings a year all over Southern California and there are numerous reasons I prefer Oak Meadows to other venues, but privacy and ambiance are priority. It is a winery atmosphere that is private to accomodate any corporate event. So many brides I have worked with prefer a private setting as opposed to a winery were there is very little privacy. However, with the location of Oak Meadows, brides can receive the privacy as well as take advantage of the hotels and winerys nearby. In addition, brides coming from San Diego and Los Angeles bring much needed tax dollars to the county.

Oak Meadows, I believe, provides an invaluable service and is a much needed venue in the Temecula Valley. Should you have any questions or concerns I would be happy to discuss further via telephone.

Sincerely,



Rick Crimeni





**Vineyard Gourmet Catering  
28545 Felix Valdez A-3  
Temecula, Ca. 92562  
951-694-6355**

*The Temecula Valley has become a destination for Weddings and other events. Our valley was host to over 1100 Weddings in 2008. Lake Oak Meadows was and is a thriving part of this market. While every venue has its own charm, Lake Oak Meadows is unique. From their Lush grounds, Romantic outdoor fireplace, to the beautiful lake with Fountains, Lake Oak Meadows offers an enchanting atmosphere for any event. This Venue is truly majestic and an asset to our valley.*

*Relying on outside vendors and resources for every event, Oak Meadows provides a revenue source for many local small businesses. We are proud to be one of the many vendors that represent Lake Oak Meadows. We look forward to the continued growth of our valley and the future success of Lake Oak Meadows.*

**Kind Regards,**

  
**Volker & Debra Lutz  
Vineyard Gourmet Catering**



To the County Planning Commission of Riverside,

I am writing on behalf of Oak Meadows, Lake of Dreams, I am Owner and Chief Operator of "Celebrations by Diana", Wedding Coordinating Services. I humbly request your consideration as I inform those concerned of my deep distress over the possible closure of the wedding facility known as Oak Meadows, Lake of Dreams (located at 36101 Glen Oaks Road, Temecula, California, 92592).

I have worked as an independent Coordinator at this property for over two years. This account provides approximately 70% of my income for each calendar year; I also support three other subcontractors with this revenue, its closure would be a financial hardship to both their and my livelihood. In addition to my personal welfare, I have come to admire and respect this family very much for their hard work and commitment to the wedding industry.

I believe it is also very important to realize the impact that our wedding facilities have on our cities economy. With 75-100 events a year, these locations bring in guests from San Diego, Orange County and Los Angeles for lodging, dining and entertainment. The time and energy, in addition to the financial investment the owners of Lake Oak Meadows have devoted to this property is extensive and has proven worthwhile to our small (but growing) community.

I am only one of many vendors who are dedicated to and benefitting from the business provided by Oak Meadows Lake of Dreams, and I humbly request that you reflect on this when making your decision about this location's interest and welfare. I greatly appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Diana M. Ross'.

Diana M. Ross  
Owner/Celebrations...by Diana  
[rossca@mindspring.com](mailto:rossca@mindspring.com)  
[www.celebrationsbydi.com](http://www.celebrationsbydi.com)  
951 491 0552

BoCakes Bakery  
43053 Margarita Rd. Suite B-104  
Temecula, CA 92592  
951-676-6500

April 14, 2009

Dear Riverside County Planning Commission,

I am writing this letter to express my support of Lake Oak Meadows as a Temecula Valley Wedding Venue.

As a Temecula bakery, I deliver wedding cakes to nearly all the local venues. It is my opinion that Lake Oak Meadows is one of the most beautiful, well-run venues. I have always had exemplary feedback from couples, complimenting the professional staff and impeccable grounds. Lake Oak Meadows is such a wonderful alternative to the mainstream wineries, showcasing the rural beauty of Temecula.

From a business perspective, I am most likely to refer couples to Lake Oak Meadows, not only for the beauty, but also because of the professional staff and rave reviews I receive from the newlyweds. Often, couples borrow cake stands from my bakery. It is their responsibility to return the stand after the wedding. Because of this, I am in the unique position of seeing the couple and/or family after the event. My first question is always..."so how did it go?" I can't repeat this often enough. Couples ALWAYS phrase the staff at Lake Oak Meadows for their professionalism and efficiency. I can honestly say, I have never heard even one negative response. "Perfect" is the word I hear most from these couples.

From a personal perspective, I am acquainted with the family and I know they work hard to promote the wedding industry in all of Temecula. They understand that there are many alternatives for venues and all must work together to bring business and revenue to our community.

A final note to consider, my Menifee home is located approximately 200 yards from a neighborhood wedding venue. Most weekend evenings, my husband and I can hear the festivities. Often, we enjoy sitting outside on a warm evening, listening to the music and fun. On the occasion that we're not in the mood to listen, we simply close our doors. It's not a life-changing event either way.

In closing, I am appealing to the Planning Commission to issue the necessary permits to allow this beautiful venue to continue promoting the wedding industry in the Temecula Valley.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,



Kathy Stringer

Owner

BoCakes Bakery

# R O M E B E A U T Y P H O T O G R A P H Y

104 Parrot Lane  
Fountain Valley CA 92708

T 714-376-4662

[john@romebeautyphotography.com](mailto:john@romebeautyphotography.com)

<http://www.romebeautyphotography.com>

Riverside County Planning Commission  
3900 Main Street  
Riverside CA 92522

Date 4/16/2009

Re: Frank Aglio/Oak Meadows

Dear: Riverside County Planning Commission:

As a small business owner in the special events industry, I am writing to support Frank Aglio, owner of Oak Meadows.

I first came to experience Oak Meadows in the summer of 2007 for the wedding of Corinne Flower & Andrew Taube who both confided in me their love and appreciation for such a beautiful facility that addressed all of the qualities in a venue they were looking for. "John, this place has a lake, a beautiful green area for the ceremony, a good size bridal room, open air grounds that are so beautiful, and most of all a family that operates the business which is so great to work with. I'm very happy with my venue."

As a Wedding Photojournalist, my career requires me to network in circles in which I am entrusted to recommend venues of all kinds to couples, wedding planners and friends, and I can honestly say I highly recommend Oak Meadows all the time. I point out it's great location in the wine country, the advantages of holding an event away from city locations, and also for it's great beauty.

I urge The Riverside County Planning Commission to reconsider Frank Aglio/Oak Meadows as a valuable business member of the community.

Sincerely,  
John Prado  
Owner of Rome Beauty Photography Fountain Valley CA

April 11, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

Dear Planning Commissioners:

As a local business owner in the City of Temecula, I urge you to approve the permits for the owners of Oaks Meadows.

Other local business owners, such as myself, have become dependent on the weddings and other celebrations that take place at Oak Meadows.

Times are tough. Please don't things more difficult for us. I ask that you approve their permits.

Thank you for your time and consideration..

Cordially,

*John M. Moore* Moore-Heat (Outdoor Heater Rentals)

---

# Moore-Heat

**Outdoor Heating  
Sales and Rentals**

**John Moore**

0077 Parado Del Sol  
Temecula, CA 92592

Office: (951) 302-3702  
Mobile: (951) 837-0065

April 14, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the team at Lake Oak Meadows, I am writing in support of this facility, the ownership and team that are employed there. My name is Karolin DiCristina, and I am a Co-Owner of Belle Mariée Bridal & Tuxedo in Murrieta.

Every day I am fortunate to work with many brides who have chosen to have their wedding at this amazing facility. My conversations with them always support what I have seen myself – that the team and ownership at Lake Oak Meadows pride themselves on integrity and providing a valuable service to their clientele. Furthermore, I have seen the team from Lake Oak Meadows out in the community, fully supporting the local vendors, and the city, working to serve and assist both in an economy that is facing some of the greatest challenges we have seen in decades. To hinder a team in this community as valuable as this, is to only create larger problems.

I realize that the City and County are faced with challenges, and it is not my goal to diminish that. However, it is important that we also find the most constructive and supportive paths to meet that end. I hope that you will consider the integrity and hard work of the team at Lake Oak Meadows.

Sincerely,

Karolin DiCristina  
Belle Mariee Bridal & Tuxedo  
41421 Date Street, Suite 105  
Murrieta, CA 92562

## Once Upon A Wedding And American Classic Catering

April 17, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission


We own and operate Once Upon A Wedding and American Classic Catering an off-premise food catering company and headquartered in Temecula. During the course of the year we generate a large portion of our revenue from our services provided to venues in the Temecula Wine County, more specifically The Lake Oak Meadows.

This letter is to show our support for Lake Oak Meadows and continued operation of this venue to benefit of the Aglio family, all the vendors who make a living from locations like Lake Oak Meadow. The county of Riverside should take the time to meet the Aglio family there great to work with. Frank Aglio is a man of his word and today you don't find many people like that.

This location brings in customers from all over southern California to financial benefit of Temecula, County of Riverside and the state of California in the form of taxes, lodging, food, gas entertainment etc.

We ask that the Riverside County Planning commission allow the The Aglio family and Lake Oak Meadows to proceed with their plans and build their complex with the support of the county.

Respectfully,



Rich and Marie Fowler  
Once Upon A Wedding and American Classic Catering

27645 Commerce Center Drive Temecula CA, 92590  
(951) 308-1300




To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter on behalf of Oak Meadows. They have become one of top customers in a very short time. If it would not have been for their business this year already payroll would have been much harder to make than it already was. They have done seven jobs with us this year. All my other top customers have done one or two at the most. Some have not even done one job with me. The customers that are doing jobs pay slowly. I am lucky to get paid in 45 days for net 30. I have two customers that pay on time every time. One of them is Oak Meadows. I would hate to see anything happen to Oak Meadows that they could no longer do business. It would be another hit to my business in these already tough times.

Jeff Leichty  
Owner

*Rick & Mimi Beter*



---

41885 Chaparral Drive  
Temecula, CA 92592  
(951) 302-9978

April 13, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commissioner  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, California 92501

Fax # 951-955-3157

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We have been long time residents of Riverside County and have taken pride in being a part of the Temecula Wine region.

During our time in Temecula we have seen many changes, and with recent damage to the grape crops, a water shortage, and a suffering national and local economy we would surely consider these trying times in our community.

We are concerned about our local wineries and local event facilities, and can only hope they are able to keep themselves afloat during these tough times. It seems that one way to get things back on the upturn would be to find other ways to keep the communities successful.

With the spring and summer months ahead of us, the beauty and tranquility of the wine region cannot be ignored when considering wedding destinations. Many of the larger wineries take advantage of the wonderful weather and surreal settings to provide interested couples with a memorable setting for one of the most important days of their lives.

This privilege and opportunity should not be denied to Oak Meadows. Anyone who steps foot in this facility is immediately taken by its majestic beauty, and welcoming atmosphere, so we ask that you please support Oak Meadows in its pursuit of expansion.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rick Beter'.

Rick and Mimi Beter

# Sweet Flowers

To Whom it may Concern,

My Name is Mark Jackson, My wife Jenelle and I own and operate Sweet Flowers Weddings & Events Inc. We do Flowers, Linens, Chair Covers and other rental items. We moved out to the Temecula surrounding area about 4 years ago, to give our kids a better living environment, and a safer place for them to grow up. Since being out here, we have met Frank Aglio (owner of Oak Meadows) and have become very close to him and his family. We have been doing weddings out there since they have opened their doors. They provide the most beautiful facility for a wedding, not to mention the service to go along with it. We get very close to our clients and they have had, and I quote "Fairytale Weddings" there. They have made it possible for me to run this business with my wife, full time, and spend so much time with my kids to keep them on the straighten arrow and watch them grow. There are so many other things that come out of Oak Meadows, than just great weddings, memories, etc. There is tons of other business brought into Wine Country due to this facility being there. We have so many brides/grooms that get married their as a "Destination Wedding" (coming from Orange County, L.A. San Diego, Etc.) This in turn brings more business, money and revenue into Temecula Wine Country. When these people are planning their wedding, they come out to visit the wineries, they have dinner, some stay over night in our hotels, get gas at our local gas stations, shop at our malls, the lists are endless. When people come to attend these weddings, this chain starts all over again. There are a lot of people coming to wine country for the first time, to these weddings, and I guarantee it will not be the last time they come and visit. I can honestly tell you that if this facility was to be shut down, we and a lot of other companies, would probably not survive in this economy. Look at the hard times we are in now. The wedding industry is almost foolproof. People are not going to stop getting married, why stop the revenue coming into Temecula Wine country. In my eyes, they have just as much right to be in business, doing weddings, as the wineries out here do. There is more than enough business to go around. Let's just keep it all coming into Wine Country. Thanks for you time.

*Mark G. Jackson*



*Vice President / C.O.O. / C.F.O.*

*Sweet Flowers Weddings & Events Inc.*

*Office . 951.723.8904*

*Cell. 714.293.3016*

April 9, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Have you ever visited Oak Meadows? If so, then you know how beautiful and magical the place is. You will also understand why hundreds of couples choose this location for their weddings and other special occasions.


The owners of Oak Meadows have spent the last decade turning the vineyard into a gorgeous oasis. It is no surprise why people come from all over the southland to celebrate the most important day of their lives.

It would be a shame if the County did not approve their permit. The owners of Oak Meadows have gone out of their ways to be considerate of their neighbors and to respect County's conditions.

I ask that you please approve their application for permits.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

  
FRANCISCO ROMERO  
SUN CITY CA. 92580

April 9, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

Dear Planning Commissioners:


Have you ever visited Oak Meadows? If so, then you know how beautiful and magical the place is. You will also understand why hundreds of couples choose this location for their weddings and other special occasions.

The owners of Oak Meadows have spent the last decade turning the vineyard into a gorgeous oasis. It is no surprise why people come from all over the southland to celebrate the most important day of their lives.

It would be a shame if the County did not approve their permit. The owners of Oak Meadows have gone out of their ways to be considerate of their neighbors and to respect County's conditions.

I ask that you please approve their application for permits.

Thank you.

Best Regards,  Robert Gonzalez  
San Jacinto, Ca

April 13, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501


Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to ask that you please approve the owner's, Frank Aglio's, application for permit in regards to his Oak Meadow Estate.

For more than a decade, Frank has been dedicated to the magical oasis that is Oak Meadows. People from all over Southern California and the business community of Temecula have come to rely on Oak Meadows.

Please allow Oak Meadows to continue their special events services.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Brittany Pelters".

Brittany Pelters

4/11/2009

April 10, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

Dear Planning Commissioners:

As part of the Temecula business community, I ask that you please approve the applicants request for permitting in regards to the Oak Meadows property.

Frank Aglio, owner of Oak Meadows has been a tremendous help to us local business owners. Whenever there is an event, he calls upon the local caterers, party planners, limousine services and other wineries for service.

In addition, he has helped bring people to the Temecula wine country that would not have normally come out here.

Oak Meadows has been a wonderful community partner. Please allow them to continue their good services.

Sincerely,

*Mike Leichitz*  
Mike Leichitz

April 9, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Have you ever visited Oak Meadows? If so, then you know how beautiful and magical the place is. You will also understand why hundreds of couples choose this location for their weddings and other special occasions.

The owners of Oak Meadows have spent the last decade turning the vineyard into a gorgeous oasis. It is no surprise why people come from all over the southland to celebrate the most important day of their lives.

It would be a shame if the County did not approve their permit. The owners of Oak Meadows have gone out of their ways to be considerate of their neighbors and to respect County's conditions.

I ask that you please approve their application for permits.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Ken Kopecky  
Ken Kopecky  
Oceanside

April 9, 2009

Riverside County Planning Commission  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, California 92501

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Have you ever visited Oak Meadows? If so, then you know how beautiful and magical the place is. You will also understand why hundreds of couples choose this location for their weddings and other special occasions.

The owners of Oak Meadows have spent the last decade turning the vineyard into a gorgeous oasis. It is no surprise why people come from all over the southland to celebrate the most important day of their lives.

It would be a shame if the County did not approve their permit. The owners of Oak Meadows have gone out of their ways to be considerate of their neighbors and to respect County's conditions.

I ask that you please approve their application for permits.

Thank you.

*ROSE AIKEN*

Best regards,

*Rose Aiken*

4/11/09

APRIL 7, 2009

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER  
4080 LEMON STREET  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

DEAR PLANNING COMMISSIONER,


AS A LOCAL BUSINESS OWNER, I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY SUPPORT OF OAK MEADOWS WINERY'S REQUEST FOR A PERMIT.

THE OWNER OF OAK MEADOWS, FRANK AGLIO, PURCHASED THE WINERY IN 1996 AND HAS MADE IT AN EXCELLENT ADDITION TO THE TEMECULA WINE COUNTRY. PERFORMING CEREMONIES HAS BECOME A COMMON OCCURRENCE AT OAK MEADOWS, AND MR. AGLIO SEEMS TO TAKE GREAT PRIDE IN HOSTING THESE UNIONS.

AS A BUSINESS OWNER MYSELF, I COMMEND MR. AGLIO ON THE EXPANSION OF HIS BUSINESS, AND HIS PASSION FOR HIS CUSTOMERS.

I HAVE ALSO ENJOYED THE ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC COMING IN AND OUT OF THE AREA, AS EVENTS LIKE WEDDINGS BRING POSSIBLE CUSTOMERS FOR MANY BUSINESSES AROUND THE WINE COUNTRY AND THAT CAN ONLY BE A GOOD THING FOR ALL THE PARTIES INVOLVED.

THANK YOU,



32740 Tulley Ranch Rd.











Temecula Ca 92592

951-203-0200

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. Print Name	Jamie Burgener	Signature	
Address	33544 Wildomar, Ca 92595	Phone	
		Email	Jami817@yahoo
2. Print Name	Tracy Sulstrom	Signature	
Address	41795 Davidson St. Murrieta Ca.	Phone	(661) 478-6454
		Email	tracysulstrom@aol.com
3. Print Name	TIM SANDIFER	Signature	
Address	10472 KAMUELA DR HB 92616	Phone	(714) 394-2375
		Email	tim.sandifer@hdtaxi.com
4. Print Name	Wendy Offshaek	Signature	
Address	Ceresita Lomas, San Luis Obispo Ca.	Phone	(661) 478-7855
		Email	WendyOffshaek@aol.com
5. Print Name	Melissa Sprunt	Signature	
Address	<del>41795 Davidson St. Murrieta Ca.</del>	Phone	
		Email	MSprunt@jmi.com
6. Print Name	Andrea Zimovka	Signature	
Address		Phone	
		Email	
7. Print Name	Martone Perez	Signature	
Address		Phone	
		Email	
8. Print Name	Stefano Lator	Signature	
Address	18808 Thornwood Huntington B CA	Phone	92646
		Email	Stefano
9. Print Name	JILL MORENO	Signature	
Address	41734 HOLSTED MURRIETA CA	Phone	(951) 894-6686
		Email	
10. Print Name	TRAVIS SULSTROM	Signature	
Address	27630 HARTFORD AVE 91384	Phone	661-212-1311
		Email	

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. Print Name	ROSE AIKEN	Signature	<i>Rose Aiken</i>
Address	32012 HUMMINGBIRD WAY TEMECULA, CA	Phone	951-294-8375
2. Print Name	John M. Moore	Signature	<i>John M. Moore</i>
Address	46077 Parado Del Sol Temecula, CA 92592	Phone	(951) 302-3702
3. Print Name	Cladelle Ramilo	Signature	<i>Cladelle Ramilo</i>
Address	23025 Blooming Meadow Rd. Moreno Valley, CA 92557	Phone	(909) 910-9742
4. Print Name	Mike Leichty	Signature	<i>Mike Leichty</i>
Address	23962 Alessandro Blvd Moreno Valley	Phone	951-697-1101
5. Print Name	Brittany Peters	Signature	<i>Brittany Peters</i>
Address	45045 Rudeau St. Tem, CA 92592	Phone	951-951-1258
6. Print Name	JORDAN PETERS	Signature	<i>Jordan Peters</i>
Address	45045 Rudeau St. Tem, CA 92592	Phone	
7. Print Name	MARTA SWEANEY	Signature	<i>Marta Sweaney</i>
Address	9352 Hawthorne Ave	Phone	951 662-5171
8. Print Name	Ken Kapecky	Signature	<i>Ken Kapecky</i>
Address	508 N. Nevada	Phone	760-696-1101
9. Print Name	CAROL BRISWOLD	Signature	<i>Carol Briswold</i>
Address	3024 Gomez Dr	Phone	951-813-4512
10. Print Name	Jordan Bryant	Signature	<i>Jordan Bryant</i>
Address	20486 Deer Meadow Rd	Phone	(951) 525-5321
		Email	carol@darwalkscatering.com
		Email	ajp@yaho.com

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. Print Name	Kevin Lane	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	1951 W. Gaffey St #72 Sun Pedro	Phone	(714) 953-7557				
2. Print Name	TODD NEEDLE	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	6000 E. RIDGEWOOD CT ANAHEIM CA 92807	Phone	(714) 921 9892				
3. Print Name	J.D. TRAPOLI	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	18808 THORNWOOD CIR.	Phone	(714) 343-3234				
4. Print Name	CRYSTAL OVERN	Signature		Phone		Email	trapoli@lycos.com
Address	12781 PANORAMA PL. 3A 225	Phone	12781 Panorama				
5. Print Name	Wendy Offshoot	Signature		Phone		Email	COATOVERN@C... CO
Address	22454 Guadalupe Sources	Phone					
6. Print Name	MIKE DEVINE	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	22454 WADLAMAR DR SAUBERS	Phone					
7. Print Name	Cindy Goetting	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	25221 Summerhill Ln Stevenson Park CA 93811	Phone	93811 661 287-3341				
8. Print Name	DAN Goetting	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	25221 Summerhill Ln Stevenson Park CA 93811	Phone					
9. Print Name	Carolann Davis	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	23414 BEATING WAY CANYON LAKE CA 92507	Phone	951-259-3635				
10. Print Name	CHRIS FAIRCLOD	Signature		Phone		Email	
Address	7283 SURFBIRD CIR. CARLSBAD CA. 92011	Phone	760 214 7422				

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. <u>Print Name</u>	Andrea Ybarra	Signature		Phone	951.760.1725	Email	andrea.ybarra@temecula.com
Address	PO Box 2010 Lindale, TX 75771						
2. <u>Print Name</u>	Brian Marrical	Signature		Phone	951-834-5210	Email	
Address	7221 UNIVERSIDE DR. PG LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92530						
3. <u>Print Name</u>	Holly Call	Signature		Phone	951.672.1013	Email	
Address	29787 BERRY BLVD MONTEBELLO CA 92581						
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Tom Cloud	Signature		Phone	951-926-6290	Email	
Address	36899 Northway Rd						
5. <u>Print Name</u>	JENNIFER PALOMO	Signature		Phone	674-4924 (951)	Email	
Address	188 N. TORO RANCH LAKE ELSINORE						
6. <u>Print Name</u>	JASON TEFFLER	Signature		Phone	951-795-3659	Email	
Address	33200 WARM SPRING WAY WINCHESTER CA 92596						
7. <u>Print Name</u>	Christian Rios	Signature		Phone	951-818-9319	Email	
Address	777 South Tanager St #14 Corona CA 92677						
8. <u>Print Name</u>	JILLIAN O'KEEFE	Signature		Phone	951-245-8167	Email	
Address	15390 MADRONE CT. L.E. CA 92530						
9. <u>Print Name</u>	Doy Tamer	Signature		Phone	951-244-8462	Email	
Address	23665 Johnson Lane <sup>Quintanilla</sup> CA 92597						
10. <u>Print Name</u>	Frosa Herrera	Signature		Phone	(951) 973-8607	Email	
Address	22620 Mountain						

# OAK MEADOWS

## LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. Print Name	LEO Spruill	Signature	<i>Leo Spruill</i>
Address	3292 Valley View Ave 92860	Phone	951 748 5350
2. Print Name	Leah Tucker	Signature	<i>Leah Tucker</i>
Address	534 7th St. Norco, CA 92860	Phone	(951) 201-0542
3. Print Name	Robert Gonzalez	Signature	<i>Robert Gonzalez</i>
Address	208 Britton Ct.	Phone	(951) 224-3925
4. Print Name	FRANCISCO ROMERO	Signature	<i>Francisco Romero</i>
Address	26286 Wilkes Dr Sun City 92585	Phone	714 301 3580
5. Print Name	JOSE DE ARMAS III	Signature	<i>Jose De Armas</i>
Address	3934 JESSIE CIR, TEMECULA CA 92591	Phone	(949) 973-5771
6. Print Name	MARIA JACKSON'S	Signature	<i>Maria Jackson</i>
Address	32575 EL CENTENO LANE MERIDEE CA 92584	Phone	(714) 293-7010 / (951) 723-8904
7. Print Name	Mike Shroyer	Signature	<i>Mike Shroyer</i>
Address	22055 Mustang Ct, CL. 92587	Phone	951-244-6461
8. Print Name	Layne Powell	Signature	<i>Layne Powell</i>
Address	45629 Corte Royal	Phone	951 302 7479
9. Print Name	Rich Fowler	Signature	<i>Rich Fowler</i>
Address	27645 Commerce Str, Temecula 92590	Phone	
10. Print Name	Joseph Ybarra	Signature	<i>Joseph Ybarra</i>
Address	18530 Eucalyptus Ave Lake E. 92537	Phone	951-213-8802
		Email	Jybarra55@yahoo.com

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.








- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. Print Name	HOLLIE STEELE	Signature	
Address	1010 Escondido Cyn Rd	Phone	951-877-2080
		Email	HSTEELE@SCOI.COM
2. Print Name	Adam Lankford	Signature	
Address	3738 Victoria Lane	Phone	661-400-4098
		Email	ajl83915@yahoo.com
3. Print Name	Wendy Lankford	Signature	
Address	29708 Deer Trail Ln, Carsegold 95621	Phone	
		Email	
4. Print Name	Jane Gulstrom	Signature	
Address	7010 Escondido, Acton Ca	Phone	
		Email	
5. Print Name	Cindy Roche	Signature	
Address	1653 Utah Cir Costa Mesa, CA	Phone	
		Email	
6. Print Name	Stephanie Adams	Signature	
Address	8886 Kendor Cir Bp 90120	Phone	
		Email	
7. Print Name	JULIE + MATT GORDON	Signature	
Address	729 W. WILSHIRE AVE. FULLERTON, CA 92832	Phone	
		Email	
8. Print Name	Bryan Morris	Signature	
Address	810 Cheshire Cir 92628	Phone	
		Email	
9. Print Name	Kevin and Tamara Kane	Signature	
Address	1952 North Coffey #12, Sp4031	Phone	
		Email	
10. Print Name		Signature	
Address		Phone	
		Email	

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.





- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. <u>Print Name</u>	Jake Anderson	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	21442 Abasco M.O. CA 92001	<u>Phone</u>	949 775 2583
2. <u>Print Name</u>	Neda Andersen	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	24042 Peralta Laguna Hills, CA	<u>Phone</u>	949 933 1069
3. <u>Print Name</u>	Michael	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	22414 Bannockburn Laguna Hills, CA	<u>Phone</u>	(310) 307-4354
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Angela Aglio	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	3661 Glen Oaks Rd Temecula 92591	<u>Phone</u>	951-676-4662
5. <u>Print Name</u>	Nick Crimeni	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	173 GRIFFIN LANE HENEQUEN	<u>Phone</u>	951-492-8180
6. <u>Print Name</u>	VOLKER WIL	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	23011 JOAQUIN RIBBEAN MURFRESA CA 92562	<u>Phone</u>	911-858-1585
7. <u>Print Name</u>	Joe DiLullo	<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>	32740 Tully Ranch Rd Tem	<u>Phone</u>	951-202-4200
8. <u>Print Name</u>		<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>		<u>Phone</u>	
9. <u>Print Name</u>		<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>		<u>Phone</u>	
10. <u>Print Name</u>		<u>Signature</u>	
<u>Address</u>		<u>Phone</u>	

# OAK MEADOWS LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

<b>1. Print Name</b> <u>IAN INSERRA</u>	<b>Signature</b> 
<b>Address</b> <u>P.O. BOX 936 WINCHESTER CA 33159 TAYLOR ST. 92596</u>	<b>Phone</b> <u>(951) 296-3195</u> <b>Email</b> <u>IANSERRA@VANDU.COM</u>
<b>2. Print Name</b> <u>ALAN BRANSON</u>	<b>Signature</b> 
<b>Address</b> <u>92950 US160 CT TEMECULA CA, 92592</u>	<b>Phone</b> <u>951-795-5851</u> <b>Email</b>
<b>3. Print Name</b> <u>SHAWNAN D. WAGES</u>	<b>Signature</b> 
<b>Address</b> <u>17379 Curtis Ave. Lake Elsinore, CA 92530</u>	<b>Phone</b> <u>(951) 678-9124</u> <b>Email</b>
<b>4. Print Name</b> <u>Erik Solis 163/9111 A Wallace</u>	<b>Signature</b> 
<b>Address</b> <u>elsi ave ca 92530</u>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>
<b>5. Print Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>
<b>6. Print Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>
<b>7. Print Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>
<b>8. Print Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>
<b>9. Print Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>
<b>10. Print Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>Phone</b> <b>Email</b>

# OAK MEADOWS

## LAND OF DREAMS

✓ YES, I support allowing Oak Meadows to continue to host special events at their vineyard as regulated within Riverside County's rules and ordinances.

- Oak Meadows attracts people to the Temecula Wine Country from all over Southern California, who would not have normally come to the City of Temecula and its wine country.
- Oak Meadows helps generate business for local companies and create jobs by relying on a variety of local services that contribute to Oak Meadows' special events.

1. <u>Print Name</u>	CHERYL MARSHALL	Signature	<i>Cheryl Marshall</i>
Address	37380 GLENDAKS RD TEMECULA	Phone	951 303-9697
		Email	cheriemarshall@gsn
2. <u>Print Name</u>	Ray Mizell	Signature	<i>Ray Mizell</i>
Address	38910 Avenida Arriba	Phone	951 303 1267
		Email	
3. <u>Print Name</u>	Judy Mizell	Signature	<i>Judy Mizell</i>
Address	38950 Avenida Arriba	Phone	951-303-1267
		Email	
4. <u>Print Name</u>	Aurie Weimann	Signature	<i>Aurie Weimann</i>
Address	39010 Avenida Arriba	Phone	302-3804
		Email	
5. <u>Print Name</u>	Mike Weimann	Signature	<i>Mike Weimann</i>
Address	39010 Avenida Arriba	Phone	302-3804
		Email	
6. <u>Print Name</u>	Lisa Duty	Signature	<i>Lisa Duty</i>
Address	37410 Glenoaks Rd	Phone	302-1222
		Email	
7. <u>Print Name</u>	MIKE DUTY	Signature	<i>Mike Duty</i>
Address	37410 Glenoaks Rd	Phone	302-1222
		Email	
8. <u>Print Name</u>	Johnny Hernandez	Signature	<i>Johnny Hernandez</i>
Address	37311 Camino Del Vino	Phone	(751) 712-8970
		Email	
9. <u>Print Name</u>	DAVE MASTERJOHN	Signature	<i>Dave Masterjohn</i>
Address	36005 GLENDAKS	Phone	951-775-4005
		Email	dmasterjohn@yahoo
10. <u>Print Name</u>	Jordan Sack	Signature	<i>Jordan Sack</i>
Address	36005 Glen Oaks	Phone	
		Email	

---

Anthony & the Oak  
Meadow Staff

6-27-08

Thank you for all your hard  
work and ensuring our wedding turned  
out perfectly. Our day turned out to  
be everything we wanted and more.  
We will never forget it.

Sincerely,

David & Jennifer Smoot

---

Anthony,

Thank you so much  
for all your wonderful  
assistance during  
our wedding planning.  
Oak Meadows will always  
hold a special place  
in our hearts. Best,  
Cand & Brian

---

our day  
was truly perfect ☺

---

Thank you,

"We Do"  
Thank you  
for being a part of our day

Thank you so much for allowing  
us to celebrate our wedding day  
at Oak Meadows. Your staff and  
you are amazing. We are so thankful  
we have had our wedding at such  
a beautiful place.

The Sappenfield's  
Aaron and Carrie

---

To The OAK Meadows Family ,

Thank you


Thank you

Thank you

It really has been A Pleasure

Wendy Bill

Perez  
}



  
AMERICAN GREETINGS  
AGF08T8Q  
©AGG, INC.

---

Frank, Anthony & Family,  
We wanted to thank y'all, first and foremost  
for letting us have our wedding at such a  
beautiful site. It truly was a wedding I  
always dreamed about but never thought I  
would have. The pictures were absolutely  
beautiful! Anthony, thank you for all you  
did that day. Your patience and grace in  
handling the little mishaps were admirable.  
I only wish I could have handled it in the  
same way! Thank you also for the book  
I Promise. Both Jay and I have had the

April 28, 2009

In regards to: Jennings/Murphy Wedding April, 17 2009

Oak Meadows  
36101 Glenoaks Rd.  
Temecula, CA. 92592

Attention: Frank and all the staff

Dear Oak Meadows,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for making my daughter, Stephanie's, wedding absolutely beautiful. The service you provide is priceless. I would recommend your establishment to anyone, planning a wedding or other celebration, whole heartedly.

The grounds were immaculate, absolutely gorgeous, the perfect setting for an evening wedding. The lighting, fire rings, and fountains made everything so romantic and beautiful. I would not be surprised if there were a few engagements that evening.

Your staff was amazing, very professional and courteous. They were on top of everything. They were there when you needed them, and basically out of sight when you didn't. I was impressed with how quickly everything was cleared without making anyone feel rushed. And with them having all of our belongings together at the end of the evening, making it easy for us to leave, without worrying that we left anything behind, was fabulous. I could not have asked for anything more. They made everything perfect.


Diana Ross was a godsend. She took care of every little detail with perfection, the ceremony and reception was completely flawless. She made everything flow beautifully. And she was so attuned to all our needs, that as the mother of the bride, I was astonished that I could actually enjoy myself, without having to worry over any of the details. She made it possible for the bride and groom to relish in the moment, and to have a virtually memorable evening.

The caterer was extraordinary, and the buffet was amazing. I have been to many weddings, and it was by far the best food I have ever tasted.

I have received so many compliments from our guests, all of them saying it was the most beautiful wedding they have ever attended. As much as I would like to take all the credit for creating the perfect atmosphere, I let everyone know that, it could not have been done without you and your wonderful venue and staff.

Thank you again for making Stephanie and Christopher's wedding an event to remember.

Sincerely,



Lea Jennings

**Lake Oak Meadows Beautiful Site**

Date: November 23, 2008 11:22:21 AM PST

Dear Anthony and Barbie,

My husband and I were recently married at your site, Saturday, September 13th, and we just wanted to thank you for allowing us to have the perfect wedding! Even two months after the wedding friends and family are still raving how our day was the "wedding of the century" and how the site was absolutely gorgeous! They said we could not have chosen a more beautiful location. We can't express enough how breath taking Lake Oak Meadows really is. The pictures that you have on your website, does not do it justice.

Also, we thank you for taking our requests to improve your location. Back in August of 2007, when we first booked our wedding with you, we requested that you put plants in front of the brown fence around the filters, and you did. We also requested an extension on the dance floor, and you made that happen. You really care about making a girl's wedding the one she always dreamed of.

I have attached some beautiful pictures of your site and our wedding. Please use any of them as you wish.

Thank you,  
Jason and Rebecca Michael

Frank and Hilsa,

Thank you so much  
for having such a  
wonderful event venue,  
I had so many  
compliments on Oak

---

Meadows, I was very  
proud. Jim & I read  
the book "I Promise"  
on our honeymoon in  
Grand Cayman... it  
was wonderful!! I see  
why you believe living  
by the book has kept  
your wedding strong!!

Can't wait to see the  
pictures!! Thanks for everything  
Nancy Sulstrom

Anthony + Aglio family,

We were married at  
your wedding site on Nov. 8  
2005. We just wanted to  
thank you for the most  
beautiful and perfect  
wedding I could ever have  
dreamed of! Your kindness  
and generosity is very much  
appreciated! Thanks for  
everything. Bob + Leah Gallinore  
(Kelly's ~~mother~~ mom)

43263 Brookway Dr  
Temcula Ca 92582  
760-390-8308  
garyboeldt@yahoo.com[**fax**]  
www.elitemusicworks.com

**[Company Name]**

# Fax

<b>To:</b> Ron Goldman	<b>From:</b> Gary J Boeldt II
<b>Fax:</b>	<b>Pages:</b> 2
<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Date:</b> 4/16/2009
<b>Re:</b> Lake Oak Meadows	<b>cc:</b>

**Urgent**

**• Comments:** Select this text and delete it or replace it with your own. To save changes to this template for future use, choose Save As from the File menu. In the Save As Type box, choose Document Template. Next time you want to use it, choose New from the File menu, and then double-click your template.

3.21.10

To whom it concerns -

This project is my worst  
nightmare coming true. The thought  
of 130 events is beyond all.

The noise & traffic from  
this place is and has been  
terrible. If they wanted such an  
operation they should not be in a  
residential area - Rancho California  
would be more suitable.

I'm sad they have been  
allowed to operate with  
permits or consideration to the  
people who live nearby.

Sincerely -  
The Cutler Edge Ranch  
Glen Oaks Rd

Terrence

P.S. The events now go much  
longer than 10 PH!

Riverside County Planning Department  
P.O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502

March 22, 2010

Attn: Kinika Hesterly

Ref: Appeal of plot plan no. 23376/variance no. 1839

To whom this may concern:

I have received notification of that Oak Meadows has requested that the amount of events that they are currently approved for be increased and I must strongly protest this proposal for the following reasons.

1. My home sits approximately 100 yards from the current location of where the weddings and receptions are held. It sits in a location that seems to be susceptible to noise from the events to be clearly heard. Anyone who doubts this is: welcome to come to my home on an event night and see for themselves. Not only can you hear the noise loudly from my front porch but even inside my house I must close all my windows and turn up the volume of my TV in order to drown out the music, DJs on the PA system, and the hollering from the patrons.
2. It has been over six months since Oak Meadows was given permits to proceed with their last request to build (among other things) a temporary dance pavilion and a banquet hall. It was my understanding that the banquet hall would be used for the wedding receptions which would mitigate most of the noise. To date I have seen no construction of any facilities that would lead me to believe that this will be completed anytime in the near future.

This spring Oak Meadows has started having events again and this now begins the third year I have had to endure this noise. Just last night they had an event and it was very loud and annoying. I can't imagine what it will be like if they are allowed to increase their events from 30 to 130 and on top of that they are asking that it be allowed to carry on one hour longer than it does already.

Last year during the last round of hearings and after talking to Mr. & Mrs. Aglio I was assured that allowing them to proceed with their plans would result in them having an indoor banquet hall so that the events would be held indoors thus eliminating most of the noise. However so far none of this has happened and I am concerned that it may be some time before it does. Now I see that permission to have jazz concerts are now being asked for and I must say I have a hard time believing that these events would be held indoors and I think any reasonable person would agree that they won't be quite.

I am a "live and let live" type of person by nature and strongly believe that we should live in a free country. To me that means people should be able to do what they like as long as it doesn't infringe on the rights of others. In this case however the Aglio's are getting to do what they want, but it is at **my** expense. Let me be clear here, I have never had a problem with them having events or how many they have, but what I do have a problem with is the noise they create and up until now nobody has done much to prevent it. So the question I have is: what about my rights?

I would request that until the Aglio's complete the work that was granted on the original permit, specifically the banquet pavilion, they not be granted permission for any additional events to be held. I would actually love it if you could suspend all events until the construction is completed, but do not feel this would be realistic. I would further request that the request for jazz concerts be denied completely unless it is specified in the permit that they be held indoors.

Please keep in mind while you decide the outcome of this request that my rights are just as important as anyone else's. During the time of year when the weather is the nicest is when Oak Meadows has the majority of their events. That is also the time of year when I like to enjoy my yard and like to spend time outdoors. It is very hard to enjoy yourself outdoors when you have to listen to a constant barrage of DJ's talking over a PA system and people yelling and screaming. Once again I would invite anyone who doubts me to come to my property when one of these events is being held and judge for yourself and then ask yourself if you would want to live next door to Oak Meadows and put up with this.

One last point I would like to make, I have read letters supporting Oak Meadows and in most cases the people writing those letters are people who have something to gain from these events. Photographers, caterers, and florists all have a vested interest in them being allowed to do as many events as possible and as far as I can tell none of them live anywhere near Oak Meadows. In one of the letters it was mentioned that we shouldn't have moved out here if this was going to bother us. I just want to state for the record that I have lived in my home since 1994, long before Oak Meadows existed and never once did the Aglio's ask me if it would bother me if they put on weddings next door before they started doing them. Once again I will re-state my believe that people should be able to do what they like **AS LONG AS IT DOES NOT INFRINGE ON THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS**. In the case of Oak Meadows as things stand right now it is infringing on **MY RIGHTS**. Thank you for taking the time to read this.



Ed Meyers  
39621 Avenida Ascencion  
Temecula, CA 92592  
(951) 695-0594

March 29, 2014

Riverside Co. Planning Dept.

Concerning plot plan # 23376  
and Variance # 1839.

I've lived 200 yards from the location in question for the last ten years. My feelings are these. The owner of this property bought property that wasn't zoned for this intended purpose. He paid less than he would have for property zoned accordingly. Then he built this wedding facility without permits. When he was caught he then asked to be re-zoned, all the time continuing to conduct business. In order to claim to be a winery he has to plant grapes on seven of his ten acres. With the existing ponds, parking lots, and grass areas, not to mention the buildings he proposes this is impossible. yet he continues ahead with his plans. Why doesn't the County shut him down until this is settled. Why have laws concerning zoning and building permits if you just ignore them.

Chris VanderLans



April 6, 2010

County of Riverside  
Supervisor Jeff Stone, 3rd District  
4080 Lemon St., Riverside, CA 92502-1527


Dear Supervisor Stone,

The current 2020 Vision to expand the Temecula Valley Wine Country and the new policy area requirements may be one of the final and most important changes that directly affect the quality, feel and importance of Temecula Valley as a world class Wine Growing region. The spirit of the current C/V zone and the purpose/mission statement of the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association is to grow quality wine grapes, produce world class wines, and to promote the interest of wineries and vineyards in Riverside County and the California wine industry as a whole. Our purpose is very clear and the C/V policy within Riverside County has been consistent in limiting uses and requiring fully operational agricultural businesses.

The policy area requires the growing of grape vines, the onsite crushing and producing of wine, and allows for the direct selling of wine to the public. Secondary to each of these mission purposes is a provision that may allow a fully operational winery to promote and produce weddings, corporate events and limited entertainment for clients as an incidental and secondary use. The county of Riverside at one time had a "Special Occasion Facility" designation within the C/V zone but it was determined that this use was not compatible with the nature of the Vineyard Policy area and was not the mission of the TVWA.

The act of creating and constructing a wedding facility that includes multipurpose structures is a somewhat simpler task when compared with the act and passion of building a winery and making wine. Winemaking and wineries require an incredible investment in research, planting, nurturing, producing, selling, and ultimately waiting many years to confirm that you "got it right". This expense is incurred annually. The nature of quality is time and commitment. To ensure the legacy of great wines in the Temecula Valley we must demand that the C/V policy regulates new wineries and requires new partners to commit to the mission and purpose set forth. Building a wedding facility with a winery theme, or a bottle shop with Crate and Barrel gifts, is not fair. It violates the Riverside County required conditions, the spirit of the vineyard policy area, and the spirit of the community as a whole. Any applicant needs only to read the Sonoma / Napa policy area requirements to understand the greater flexibility and opportunity present here in Riverside County. Lake Oak Meadows has taken that flexibility too far.

The location and grounds of Lake Oak Meadows provide a natural appeal and the presentation and operation appears to be first class and is well advertised. At issue is the protection of the C/V policy area and the promotion of wineries. Weddings are a component of our wine country but we are first and foremost a wine country that grows grapes and employs vineyard workers and winemakers, not wedding coordinators, photographers, and DJ's.



This application and appeal requires additional review and mandatory compliance conditions. With the size of the man-made lake, gross acres, parking, legitimate planted vineyard acreage totaling 75%, the combined 10 rooms and the present nature of the advertised operation, it must be confirmed that this is a winery first. The vineyard area policy is clear in that the primary purpose must be to make wine. The nature of this appeal is not.

The Riverside County Planning Commission and County Code Enforcement have been very reasonable and willing to bring each applicant into compliance and approve fully operational wineries that make wine with the additional benefit of producing weddings and events.

The applicant can be assured that the Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association seeks to be an inclusive entity. Once specific required conditions are met, and the "winery first" approach is taken, we will support them and welcome them with open arms. We are looking for responsible partners with first class operations that are committed to the future quality of the Temecula Valley AVA. Our mission and purpose toward this end will not change.

Sincerely,

Board of Directors  
Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association Board

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Bradley".

David Bradley, Secretary

cc: Supervisor Bob Buster, 1<sup>st</sup> District  
Supervisor John F. Tavaglione, 2<sup>nd</sup> District  
Supervisor John Benoit, 4<sup>th</sup> District  
Supervisor Marion Ashley, 5<sup>th</sup> District  
Mr. John Petty, 3<sup>rd</sup> District Planning Commissioner  
Mr. Frank Anglio, Lake Oak Meadows

## Hesterly, Kinika

---

**From:** Stan Wright [stanwright1@dslextreme.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 07, 2010 8:33 AM  
**To:** Hesterly, Kinika  
**Cc:** Ed Meyers  
**Subject:** Oak Meadows Appeal

Dear Ms. Hesterly,

As the current planner, I am sure that you are aware of the intense opposition to this project. Oak Meadows joined the vintners association but has never become a verifiable winery. All show. 75% in grapes can never be achieved. General approval of the project are secondary, not primary features of a real winery, of which Oak Meadows is not. Because this property can never meet the requirements of a winery, this project should have been denied. All issues related to this current appeal were initially denied. Approval of this appeal puts additional stress on the neighborhood and would suggest that we truly do not have codes or that the codes do not have meaning.

It should be noted that it is doubtful that Mr. Aglio has a construction loan for this project or all of his permanent improvements would be complete. Temporary in Mr. Aglio's mind means permanent gratis as the event profits fund any and all improvements. Thus the appeal for more events with longer hours. Oak Meadows already runs the events up to 11pm regardless of how the project was previously conditioned. The Oak Meadow way is to violate all codes and requirements as much as possible in order to do it their way. Fines? No problem and a cost of doing business.

This project has set the stage for a neighborhood class action lawsuit as it continually violates related codes as the County refuses to enforce the noise ordinance. Please reject this appeal.

Best Regards,

Stan Wright  
39525 De Marquez Court  
Temecula, CA  
951-676-4948

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
and  
**INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

A **PUBLIC HEARING** has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** to consider the project shown below:

**APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 / VARIANCE NO. 1839** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes a winery, bed & breakfast facility and special events facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. The project proposes a 4,288 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,950 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 9,205 square foot 10 room bed & breakfast facility, a 192 square foot guard office, a 690 square foot storage building and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project proposes 108 parking spaces. The appeal request is for the increase of wedding events from 30 to 130 and that the hours of operation of wedding events are extended from 9:00 PM to 10:00 PM on Friday and Saturday. The project also proposes 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts. The variance proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet - APN: 942-050-004. (Quasi-judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter.  
DATE OF HEARING: April 7, 2010  
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER  
BOARD CHAMBERS, 1ST FLOOR  
4080 LEMON STREET  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Project Planner, Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or email [khesterl@rctlma.org](mailto:khesterl@rctlma.org), or go to the County Planning Department's Planning Commission agenda web page at [http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/pc/current\\_pc.html](http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/pc/current_pc.html).

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a mitigated negative declaration. The Planning Commission will consider the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., (with the exception of Noon-1:00 p.m. and holidays) at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on a proposed project may do so, in writing, between the date of this notice and the public hearing or appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Commission may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands, within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
Attn: Kinika Hesterly  
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
and  
**INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**A PUBLIC HEARING** has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** to consider the project shown below:

**APPEAL OF PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 103 parking spaces. The project will have 65 special events comprised of 30 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts - APN: 942-050-004. (Quasi-Judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 a.m. or as soon as possible thereafter.  
DATE OF HEARING: September 30, 2009  
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER  
BOARD CHAMBERS, 1ST FLOOR  
4080 LEMON STREET  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Project Planner, Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or email [khesterl@rcplma.org](mailto:khesterl@rcplma.org), or go to the County Planning Department's Planning Commission agenda web page at [http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/pc/current\\_pc.html](http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/pc/current_pc.html).

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a mitigated negative declaration. The Planning Commission will consider the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., (with the exception of Noon-1:00 p.m. and holidays) at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on a proposed project may do so, in writing, between the date of this notice and the public hearing or appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Commission may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands, within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
Attn: Kinika Hesterly  
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
and  
**INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**A PUBLIC HEARING** has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Subdivision Ordinance No. 460, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY DIRECTOR'S HEARING** to consider the project shown below:

**PLOT PLAN NO. 23376** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed. The project shall provide 103 parking spaces - APN(s): 942-050-004.(Quasi-Judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 1:30 p.m. or as soon as possible thereafter.  
DATE OF HEARING: July 13, 2009  
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER  
4080 LEMON STREET  
12th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM 12A  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Lisa Sheldon, at 951-955-5719 or e-mail [lsheido@rctlma.org](mailto:lsheido@rctlma.org), or go to the County Planning Department's Director's Hearing agenda web page at [http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/dh/current\\_dh.html](http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/dh/current_dh.html)

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has recommended adoption of a mitigated negative declaration. The Planning Director will consider the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration, at the public hearing. The case file for the proposed project and the proposed mitigated negative declaration may be viewed Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., (with the exception of Noon-1:00 p.m. and holidays) at the County of Riverside Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502. For further information or an appointment, contact the project planner.

Any person wishing to comment on a proposed project may do so, in writing, between the date of this notice and the public hearing or appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Director, and the Planning Director will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Director at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that, as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Director may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements, or any properties or lands, within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
Attn Lisa Sheldon,  
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

A **PUBLIC HEARING** has been scheduled, pursuant to Riverside County Land Use Ordinance No. 348, before the **RIVERSIDE COUNTY DIRECTOR'S HEARING** to consider the project shown below:

**PLOT PLAN NO. 23376 / VARIANCE NO. 1839** – CEQA Exempt – Applicant: Kelly Smith – Engineer/Representative: Inland Valley Development - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) – Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area – Location: Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino, and easterly of Milkweed Way – 10.25 Gross Acres - Zoning: Citrus Vineyard (C/V) - **REQUEST:** The plot plan proposes to permit an existing unpermitted winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room. In addition, the project proposes to construct a 2,100 square foot underground tasting and barrel room in conjunction with three (3) new buildings comprised of a 9,205 square foot bed and breakfast with 10 rooms, a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, and a 7,450 square foot banquet hall, a 192 square foot guard office, and a 400 square foot temporary dance pavilion to be used until the banquet hall is constructed. The project shall be constructed within four (4) phases. Phase I shall include the temporary dance pavilion, detention basin and swales. Phase II shall include the construction of the banquet hall and remodel of the existing agricultural barn into a production room and caretaker's unit. Phase III shall include the construction of the gift shop and tasting room and guard office. Phase IV will include the construction of the underground barrel and tasting room and bed and breakfast. The existing trailers will be removed (except building H). The project shall provide 103 parking spaces. The variance is a request to allow for a setback for an existing modular office building in the rear of the property to vary from the required side yard setback of 50 feet (Article XIVb, Section 14.74, d., (7)). The building is located 20 feet from the property line - APN(s): 942-050-004. (Quasi-Judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: 1:30 p.m or as soon as possible thereafter.  
DATE OF HEARING: May 18, 2009  
PLACE OF HEARING: RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER  
4080 LEMON STREET  
12th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM 12A  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

For further information regarding this project, please contact Lisa Sheldon, at 951-955-5719 or e-mail [lisheldo@rctlma.org](mailto:lisheldo@rctlma.org), or go to the County Planning Department's Director's Hearing agenda web page at [http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/dh/current\\_dh.html](http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/planning/content/hearings/dh/current_dh.html).

The Riverside County Planning Department has determined that the above-described application is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Planning Director will consider the proposed application at the public hearing.

The case file for the proposed project may be viewed Monday through Friday, from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. at the Planning Department office, located at 4080 Lemon St. 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.

Any person wishing to comment on the proposed project may do so in writing between the date of this notice and the public hearing; or, may appear and be heard at the time and place noted above. All comments received prior to the public hearing will be submitted to the Planning Director, and the Planning Director will consider such comments, in addition to any oral testimony, before making a decision on the proposed project.

If this project is challenged in court, the issues may be limited to those raised at the public hearing, described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Director at, or prior to, the public hearing. Be advised that as a result of public hearings and comment, the Planning Director may amend, in whole or in part, the proposed project. Accordingly, the designations, development standards, design or improvements,

or any properties or lands within the boundaries of the proposed project, may be changed in a way other than specifically proposed.

Please send all written correspondence to:  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
Attn: Lisa Sheldon  
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

**PROPERTY OWNERS CERTIFICATION FORM**

I, VINNIE NGUYEN, certify that on 3/8/2010,

The attached property owners list was prepared by Riverside County GIS,

APN (s) or case numbers PP 23376/Var 01839 For

Company or Individual's Name Planning Department,

Distance buffered ~~600~~ 1000'

Pursuant to application requirements furnished by the Riverside County Planning Department, Said list is a complete and true compilation of the owners of the subject property and all other property owners within 600 feet of the property involved, or if that area yields less than 25 different owners, all property owners within a notification area expanded to yield a minimum of 25 different owners, to a maximum notification area of 2,400 feet from the project boundaries, based upon the latest equalized assessment rolls. If the project is a subdivision with identified off-site access/improvements, said list includes a complete and true compilation of the names and mailing addresses of the owners of all property that is adjacent to the proposed off-site improvement/alignment.

I further certify that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that incorrect or incomplete information may be grounds for rejection or denial of the application.


NAME: Vinnie Nguyen

TITLE GIS Analyst


ADDRESS: 4080 Lemon Street 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Riverside, Ca. 92502

TELEPHONE NUMBER (8 a.m. – 5 p.m.): (951) 955-8158

✓ 3/8/2010   
Expires: 9/8/2010

1000 feet buffer



**Selected parcel(s):**

924-350-004	924-350-006	941-200-015	941-200-016	941-210-020	941-210-021	941-210-024
941-210-025	941-220-001	941-220-002	941-220-003	941-220-018	942-030-005	942-030-010
942-040-008	942-040-009	942-040-010	942-040-011	942-040-012	942-040-013	942-050-002
942-050-003	942-050-004	942-050-007	942-050-008	942-050-009	942-050-010	942-050-011
942-050-012	942-050-013	942-060-013	942-060-020	942-060-021	942-070-012	942-070-016
942-070-017	942-070-018	942-070-021	942-070-022	942-070-023	942-070-028	942-070-029
	942-070-030	942-070-031	942-070-032	942-070-033		

**\*IMPORTANT\***

This information is made available through the Riverside County Geographic Information System. The information is for reference purposes only. It is intended to be used as base level information only and is not intended to replace any recorded documents or other public records. Contact appropriate County Department or Agency if necessary. Reference to recorded documents and public records may be necessary and is advisable.

MAP PRINTED ON...03/8/2010



APN: 924350004 ASMT: 924350004  
CHRIS VANDERLANS  
SANDY VANDERLANS  
36400 GLENOAKS RD  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 924350006 ASMT: 924350006  
GARY L LANDBERG  
MIRIAM L LANDBERG  
P O BOX 890850  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 941200015 ASMT: 941200015  
HOLLY VOGT GUILLORY  
39155 CALLE ANITA RD  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 941200016 ASMT: 941200016  
TERRY A KOBYSLSKI  
KATHLEEN L KOBYSLSKI  
39377 CALLE ANITA  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 941210020 ASMT: 941210020  
DIEGO MARTIN ABBES  
ANDREA ERICA ABBES  
ADRIAN EDUARDO SILBERMAN  
HILLARY LYNNE SILBERMAN  
11515 TRAILRUN CT  
RIVERSIDE CA 92505

APN: 941210021 ASMT: 941210021  
ROBERT E KING  
JUDITH L KING  
P O BOX 890352  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 941210024 ASMT: 941210024  
NICOLETTE I DENNEY  
39580 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 941210025 ASMT: 941210025  
TERRY W TOKLE  
CHERYL L TOKLE  
36262 AVENIDA DE ACACIA  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 941220001 ASMT: 941220001  
RICHARD G MELENDEZ  
RACHAEL G MELENDEZ  
39710 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 941220002 ASMT: 941220002  
MARY JEAN YOCKEY  
33565 PAUBA RD  
TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 941220003 ASMT: 941220003  
SCOTT DANIELS  
39776 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 941220018 ASMT: 941220018  
ARCHIE RANNALS  
DOREEN RANNALS  
39890 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 942030005 ASMT: 942030005  
FERNANDO CHAVIRA  
GLORIA LORETTA CHAVIRA  
1100 VERA CRUZ ST  
MONTEBELLO CA 90640

APN: 942030010 ASMT: 942030010  
HUDSON WALNUT GROUP  
4754 LASHEART DR  
LA CANADA CA 91011

APN: 942040008 ASMT: 942040008  
DAVID WALTER LOS  
DIANE C LOS  
22436 ATOMO  
MISSION VIEJO CA 92692

APN: 942040009 ASMT: 942040009  
JOSE TORRES  
IRMA TORRES  
MARIBEL TORRES  
C/O MARIBEL TORRES  
20784 SAGE ST  
PERRIS CA 92570

APN: 942040010 ASMT: 942040010  
SARA ELLEN HOSTETLER  
39375 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942040011 ASMT: 942040011  
SHARON A EILAT  
36123 FOX HOLLOW RD  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942040012 ASMT: 942040012  
MANUEL E QUINANOLA  
GAY DELMAR QUINANOLA  
36120 FOX HOLLOW  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942040013 ASMT: 942040013  
SALLY A HERNANDEZ  
JOHNNY G HERNANDEZ  
RICHARD G HERNANDEZ  
39311 CAMINO DEL VINO ST  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942050002 ASMT: 942050002  
THOMAS W WOODWARD  
CAROLE L WOODWARD  
36015 GLEN OAKS RD  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942050003 ASMT: 942050003  
ROGER D MILTON  
KRISTY M MILTON  
P O BOX 890835  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942050004 ASMT: 942050004  
FRANK AGLIO  
36101 GLENOAKS RD  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942050007 ASMT: 942050007  
BEVERLY A MEREDITH  
P O BOX 890037  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942050008 ASMT: 942050008  
JOHN J KILLEN  
JACQUELINE S KILLEN  
39560 MILKWEED WAY  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942050009 ASMT: 942050009  
ROY V HOWARD  
KATHLEEN A HOWARD  
39600 MILKWEED WAY  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942050010 ASMT: 942050010  
M & J RAMSAY CROP  
P O BOX 607  
TEMECULA CA 92593

APN: 942050011 ASMT: 942050011  
EDWIN C MEYERS  
SHEREE M MEYERS  
39621 AVENIDA ASCENCION  
TEMECULA CA. 92592



APN: 942050012 ASMT: 942050012  
DIANE CARSON  
RICHARD CARSON  
P O BOX 892573  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942050013 ASMT: 942050013  
JERRY DOTSON  
LINDA DOTSON  
39695 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 942060013 ASMT: 942060013  
STEVE LEITHEIM  
EVELYN LEITHEIM  
35925 GLENOAKS RD  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942060020 ASMT: 942060020  
CHARLES W EMBICK  
GLENDA L EMBICK  
P O BOX 890098  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942060021 ASMT: 942060021  
JOSEPH F RAYMOND  
JO ELLEN RAYMOND  
101 MAXIMO WAY  
PALM DESERT CA 92260

APN: 942070012 ASMT: 942070012  
PHILLIP D SIVERT  
PATRICIA L SIVERT  
35770 MONTE DE ORO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942070016 ASMT: 942070016  
CHARLES DALL  
BOBBI DALL  
39885 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942070017 ASMT: 942070017  
GREGG W ENGLISH  
CHERYL A ENGLISH  
39875 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942070018 ASMT: 942070018  
EDWIN A HUDSON  
CHERYL D HUDSON  
39725 CAMINO DEL VINO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942070021 ASMT: 942070021  
DAVID HAVLENA  
COLLEEN HAVLENA  
35690 MONTE DE ORO RD  
TEMECULA CA 92592

APN: 942070022 ASMT: 942070022  
KENNETH D TEASDALE  
LORILYN C TEASDALE  
35700 MONTE DE ORO  
TEMECULA CA. 92591

APN: 942070023 ASMT: 942070023  
JAMES R NIEDERECKER  
ELISA L NIEDERECKER  
P O BOX 890337  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942070028 ASMT: 942070028  
DANIEL ZITA  
SHERRY ZITA  
39575 DE MARQUEZ CT  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942070029 ASMT: 942070029  
WILLIAM H MOYER  
DIANN M MOYER  
39555 DE MARQUEZ CT  
TEMECULA CA. 92592



Centralized Correspondence,  
Southern California Gas Company  
P.O. Box 3150  
San Dimas, CA 91773

Eastern Information Center  
Dept. of Anthropology  
1334 Watkins Hall, University of  
California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521-0418

Rancho California Water District  
42135 Winchester Rd.  
P.O. Box 9017  
Temecula, CA 92590-4800

Southern California Edison  
2244 Walnut Grove Ave., Rm 312  
P.O. Box 600  
Rosemead, CA 91770

Temecula Valley  
Unified School District  
31350 Rancho Vista Rd.  
Temecula, CA 92592-6200

Temecula Wine Growers  
P.O. Box 1601  
Temecula, CA 92593

Applicant/Owner:  
Frank Aglio  
31915 Rancho California Rd.,  
Ste. 200-334  
Temecula, CA 92591

Eng-Rep:  
Larry Markham  
41635 Enterprise Circle, North  
Temecula, CA 92590



APN: 942070030 ASMT: 942070030  
WENDELL S WRIGHT  
ROBYN S WRIGHT  
P O BOX 890066  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942070031 ASMT: 942070031  
GARY F WARNE  
YIANOULA WARNE  
P O BOX 891862  
TEMECULA CA 92589

APN: 942070032 ASMT: 942070032  
WILLIAM PETER CARL GRIFFIN  
DONNA L GRIFFIN  
35920 MONTE DE ORO  
TEMECULA CA. 92592

APN: 942070033 ASMT: 942070033  
CHAD JOHNSON  
CARRIE JOHNSON  
P O BOX 892458  
TEMECULA CA 92589

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT  
Permit Assistance Center

J\* REPRINTED \* T0802235

4080 Lemon Street  
Second Floor  
Riverside, CA 92502  
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road  
Suite A  
Murrieta, CA 92563  
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd  
Indio, CA 92211  
(760) 863-8271

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Received from: OAK MEADOWS RANCH INC  
paid by: CK 304  
CA FISH & GAME EA41927  
paid towards: CFG05274 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE  
at parcel: 36101 GLENOAKS RD TEM  
appl type: CFG3  
\$1.53

By SBROSTRO Apr 10, 2008 11:43  
posting date Apr 10, 2008

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST: RECORD FEES	\$1.53

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT  
Permit Assistance Center

J\* REPRINTED \* T0802236

4080 Lemon Street  
Second Floor  
Riverside, CA 92502  
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road  
Suite A  
Murrieta, CA 92563  
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd  
Indio, CA 92211  
(760) 863-8271

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Received from: OAK MEADOWS RANCH INC  
paid by: CK 1132 CA FISH &GAME EA41927 \$62.47  
paid towards: CFG05274 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE  
at parcel: 36101 GLENOAKS RD TEM  
appl type: CFG3

By \_\_\_\_\_ Apr 10, 2008 11:43  
SBROSTRO posting date Apr 10, 2008

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST: RECORD FEES	\$62.47

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT  
Permit Assistance Center

M\* REPRINTED \* R0910556

4080 Lemon Street  
Second Floor  
Riverside, CA 92502  
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road  
Suite A  
Murrieta, CA 92563  
(951) 694-5242

38686 El Cerrito Rd  
Indio, CA 92211  
(760) 863-8271

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Received from: OAK MEADOWS RANCH INC \$1,993.00  
paid by: CK 7049  
CA FISH & GAME EA41927  
paid towards: CFG05274 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE  
at parcel: 36101 GLENOAKS RD TEM  
appl type: CFG3

By \_\_\_\_\_ Jul 23, 2009 11:18  
SBROSTRO posting date Jul 23, 2009

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST	\$1,993.00

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**  
**TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY**

*George A. Johnson · Agency Director*

**Planning Department**

*Ron Goldman · Planning Director*

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Project/Case Number: Plot Plan No. 23376 / Variance No. 1839 and Environmental Assessment No. 41927

Based on the Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project, subject to the proposed mitigation measures, will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES REQUIRED TO AVOID POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. (see Environmental Assessment and Conditions of Approval)

**COMPLETED/REVIEWED BY:**

By: Kinika Hesterly Title: Project Planner Date: March 8, 2010

Applicant/Project Sponsor: Frank Aglio Date Submitted: April 10, 2008

**ADOPTED BY:** Board of Supervisors

Person Verifying Adoption: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

The Mitigated Negative Declaration may be examined, along with documents referenced in the initial study, if any, at:

Riverside County Planning Department 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501

For additional information, please contact Kinika Hesterly at (951) 955-1888.

Revised: 3/08/10

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP23376\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\5.05.10 PC\Mitigated Negative Declaration.docx

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA41927 ZCFG05274

**FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY**

# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

## TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY

George A. Johnson · Agency Director

### Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

TO:  Office of Planning and Research (OPR)  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044  
 County of Riverside County Clerk

FROM: Riverside County Planning Department  
 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor  
P. O. Box 1409  
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

38686 El Cerrito Road  
Palm Desert, California 92211

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code.

"Oak Meadows Winery" Environmental Assessment No. 41927 and Plot Plan No. 23376 / VAR01839

*Project Title/Case Numbers*

Kinika Hesterly  
*County Contact Person*

(951) 955-1888  
*Phone Number*

N/A  
*State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to the State Clearinghouse)*

Frank Aglio  
*Project Applicant*

P.O. Box 547, San Clemente, CA 92674  
*Address*

36101 Glen Oaks Road – Southerly of Glen Oaks Road, westerly of Camino Del Vino and easterly of Milkweed Way.  
*Project Location*

Plot Plan No. 23376 proposes a winery, vineyards and wedding facility consisting of a covered patio with an outdoor fireplace, a pond, and a 1,750 square foot barn to be remodeled into a wine production room and caretaker's unit. In addition, the project proposes a 6,900 square foot gift shop and tasting room, a 5,861 square foot gathering room, a 1-bedroom 4,659 square foot Bed & Breakfast facility, a 7,450 square foot banquet hall with underground parking, a 192 square foot guard office, a 400 square foot dance facility, and to permit an existing garage/storage building. The existing trailers will be removed. The project proposes 108 parking spaces and an area for overflow parking, 99 weddings, 30 small group gatherings/business meetings, 3 movie nights and 2 jazz concerts per year.

Variance No. 1839 proposes to reduce the side yard setback requirement for an existing building used for storage along the westerly property line from 50 feet to 20 feet.  
*Project Description*

This is to advise that the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, as the lead agency, has approved the above-referenced project on \_\_\_\_\_, and has made the following determinations regarding that project:

1. The project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. (\$2,010.25 plus \$64.00)
3. Mitigation measures WERE made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan/Program WAS adopted.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations WAS NOT adopted for the project.

This is to certify that the Mitigated Negative Declaration, with comments, responses, and record of project approval is available to the general public at: Riverside County Planning Department, 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

Date Received for Filing and Posting at OPR: \_\_\_\_\_

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP23376\DH-PC-BOS Hearings\5.05.10 PCINOD Form.5.05.10.docx

Please charge deposit fee case#: ZEA41927 ZCFG05274 .

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY