

Carolyn Syms Luna
Director

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

K. Hesterby

DATE: October 13, 2011

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Planning Department - Riverside Office

SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444, PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 - MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

(Charge your time to these case numbers)

The attached item(s) require the following action(s) by the Board of Supervisors:

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Place on Administrative Action (Receive & File; EOT) | ☒ Hearing Item |
| ☐ Labels provided If Set For Hearing | ☒ Publish in Newspaper: |
| ☐ 10 Day ☐ 20 Day ☐ 30 day | (3rd Dist) Press Enterprise and The Californian |
| ☐ Place on Consent Calendar | ☒ Mitigated Negative Declaration |
| ☐ Place on Policy Calendar* | ☒ 10 Day ☐ 20 Day ☐ 30 day |
| ☐ Place on Section Initiation Proceeding (GPIP) | ☒ Notify Property Owners (app/agencies/property owner labels provided) |
| | Controversial: ☒ YES ☐ NO |

Designate Newspaper used by Planning Department for Notice of Hearing:
(3rd Dist) Press Enterprise and The Californian

Please schedule on the November 8, 2011 BOS Agenda

Documents to be sent to County Clerk's Office for Posting within five days:

Notice of Determination and Mit Neg Dec Forms
Fish & Game Receipt (CFG04532)

BACKGROUND

The project was approved at Planning Commission on 9/21/11.

BOS sent. 10.13.11

Riverside Office • 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, California 92502-1409
(951) 955-3200 • Fax (951) 955-1811

Desert Office • 38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, California 92211
(760) 863-8277 • Fax (760) 863-7555

"Planning Our Future... Preserving Our Past"

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



FROM: TLMA - Planning Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
October 6, 2011


SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444, PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Ken and Christina Falik –Third Supervisorial District - Location: Easterly of De Portola Road and Southerly of Camino Del Vino at 37750 De Portola Road – 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) - **REQUEST:** The general plan amendment proposes to remove the subject property from the Valle de los Caballos Policy Area and place the property into the Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area. The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Citrus/Vineyard (C/V). The plot plan proposes that the existing 7,829 square foot, two-story building, which includes a 3,456 square foot garage, be used as a winery, wine-sampling room, special occasions facility with catering, and residence. The project proposes fifty (50) special occasions per year and 34 parking spaces.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41137**, 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 **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107** based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVAL of **CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444** based upon the findings and conclusions


Carolyn Syms Luma
Planning Director

Initials:
CSL:vc/dm D.M.

(Continued on next page)

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE OFF

DATE

Tina Grande

Departmental Concurrence

☒ Policy

☐ Consent

Dep't R

☐ Policy

☐ Consent

Per Exec. Ofc.:

Prev. Agn. Ref.

District: Third

Agenda Number:

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

Re: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 AND PLOT
PLAN NO. 22271

October 6, 2011

Page 2 of 2

incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVAL of **PLOT PLAN NO. 22271**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

ADOPTION of **PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107 to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated into the staff report.

BACKGROUND

The Plot Plan and Zone Change were originally heard by the Planning Commission on April 7, 2010, in accordance with Board Policy A-57 (Review of Unauthorized Businesses). The two applications were continued to allow time for the 3rd District Planning Commissioner to visit the subject site. Later it was determined necessary for the applicant to file a General Plan Amendment (GPA) application, which would then be processed concurrently with the Plot Plan and Zone Change. Those two applications were continued numerous times by the Commission while the GPA worked its way through the General Plan Initiation Process (GPIP). After the Board initiated the GPA and staff had completed Tribal Consultation, as required by the Government Code, these 3 applications were subsequently advertised for a public hearing before the Planning Commission.

At the September 21, 2011 Planning Commission hearing, staff presented a memo containing several emails received relative to the project, and recommended modifications to certain conditions of approval¹ dealing primarily with the project's hours of operation. The Commission discussed, and testimony was taken relative to, the fact that the facility was operating without land use approval. Additional discussion revolved around days and hours of operation; potential noise concerns, with restrictions for special occasion events, except weddings, to occur indoors, and limitations regarding outdoor amplified sounds; as well as Water Quality Management Plans and required Best Management Practices (BMPs) and management thereof. The Commission, as part of their approval action, accepted the recommended modifications to the conditions of approval, and directed staff to modify the project description.

Subsequent to the hearing, Staff prepared an Addendum Staff report reflecting the modified project description.

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP22271\DH-PC-BOS\BOS 2011\Form 11P - 2011.PP22271 BOS clean version.doc

¹ **Modified Conditions of Approval**

10. EVERY. 1 (pg. 1)
10. PLANNING. 8 (pg. 10)
10. PLANNING. 38 (pg. 13)
10. PLANNING. 39 (pg. 13)
10. TRANS. 5 (pgs. 16-18)
60. TRANS. 2 (pg. 27)

Agenda Item No.: 3.2
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisory District: Third
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly
Planning Commission: September 21, 2011
Continued From: 6/22/11, 2/16/11, 12/01/10,
9/15/10, 7/14/10, 5/05/10 and 4/07/10

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444
PLOT PLAN NO. 22271
Environmental Assessment No. 41137
Applicant: Ken & Christina Falik

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

ADDENDUM STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The project description has been changed to include catering and revised hours of operation. The updated project description reads:

The plot plan proposes that the existing 7,829 square foot, two-story building, which includes a 3,456 square foot garage, be used as a winery, tasting room, special occasions facility with catering and residence.

The project proposes to host up to fifty (50) special occasions per year, with a maximum of 100 guests. The winery proposes to be open for wine tasting 10 am to 6 pm daily. The special occasions will occur on Saturdays only and are required to cease at 10 pm. The project proposes 34 parking spaces and special occasions will be parked by valet.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The order of recommendations was revised as follows:

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41137**, 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,

TENTATIVE APPROVAL of **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107** based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

TENTATIVE APPROVAL of **CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444** based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVAL of **PLOT PLAN NO. 22271**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report, and,

ADOPTION of **PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107 to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated into the staff report.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER SEPTEMBER 21, 2011**

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.2: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444, PLOT PLAN NO. 22271** – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration– Applicant: Christina Falik – Engineer/ Representative: Same as applicant- Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road and Southerly of Camino Del Vino at 37750 De Portola Road, Temecula, CA 92592– 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) (Quasi-judicial)

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The general plan amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Policy Area from Valle de los Caballos to Citrus/Vineyard for the subject site. The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Citrus/Vineyard (C/V). The plot plan proposes that the existing 7,829 square foot, two-story building, with a 3,456 square foot garage, be used as a winery, wine-sampling room, special occasion's facility and residence. The project proposes a maximum of fifty (50) special occasions and 34 parking spaces. – APN: 927-280-036.

III. **MEETING SUMMARY**

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly at 951-955-1888 or e-mail khesterl@rctlma.org.

There were no speakers in favor of the subject proposal:

There were no speakers in a neutral position or in opposition of the subject proposal.

IV. **CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**

Noise and number of special occasions

V. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0,

ADOPTED a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41137**, 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,

TENTATIVELY APPROVED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107 based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

TENTATIVELY APPROVED CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

APPROVED PLOT PLAN NO. 22271, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

ADOPTED PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107 to the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated into the staff report.

CD

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER SEPTEMBER 21, 2011**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER JUNE 22, 2011
RANCHO COMMUNITY CHURCH**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 3.2: PLOT PLAN NO. 22271/ CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444** – CEQA Exempt – Applicant: Kenneth and Christina Falik – Engineer/Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road, northerly of Oak Mountain Road, and southerly of Galway Downs Drive. – 20 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) (Quasi-judicial)

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

To change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) – APN: 927-280-036.

III. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly at 951-955-1888 or e-mail khesterl@rctlma.org

There were no speakers in favor of the subject proposal:

There were no speakers in a neutral position

There were no speakers in opposition of the subject proposal.

IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

NONE

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0

CONTINUED TO AUGUST 24, 2011 (THIS HEARING CANCELLED)

CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER FEBRUARY 16, 2011
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.7: PLOT PLAN NO. 22271/ CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444** – CEQA Exempt – Applicant: Kenneth and Christina Falik – Engineer/Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road, northerly of Oak Mountain Road, and southerly of Galway Downs Drive. – 20 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) (Quasi-judicial)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- II. To change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5) – APN: 927-280-036.
- III.

MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly at 951-955-1888 or e-mail khesterl@rctlma.org.

There were no speakers in favor of the subject proposal:

There were no speakers in neutral of the subject proposal.

There were no speakers in a position or in opposition of the subject proposal.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

NONE

IV. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0:

CONTINUED CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 and PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 to June 22, 2011 to allow time for GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107 to complete the initiation process at the Board of Supervisors.

V. **CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER DECEMBER 1, 2010
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 4.8: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 – CEQA Exempt–**
Applicant: Christina Falik – Engineer/ Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road & Southerly of Camino Del Vino – 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10). (Legislative)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- II. The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural 10-Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10). The plot plan proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage. 1,500 square feet of the garage is used for the tasting room and 2,244 square feet is used for the wine production and storage area. The residence/ caretaker's unit is located above the garage. The project proposes to host fifty (50) special events per year with approximately 50-100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and small weddings. The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some holidays from 11:00 am to 5:00 pm. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special events – APN: 927-280-036. (Continued from 4/07/10 & July 14, 2010)

III.

MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or e-mail khesterl@rctlma.org.

The following person(s) spoke in favour of the subject proposal:

None

There were no speakers in a neutral position or in opposition of the subject proposal.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

NONE

IV. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

The Planning Commission, by a vote of 5-0 recommended to the Board of Supervisors;

CONTINUE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 and PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 WITH DISCUSSION to February 16, 2011.

V. **CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER SEPTEMBER 15, 2010
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER**

- I. AGENDA ITEM 4.9: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 - CEQA Exempt**
– Applicant: Christina Falik – Engineer/ Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. – Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road & Southerly of Camino Del Vino – 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10). (Quasi-judicial)

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural 10-Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10). The plot plan proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage. 1,500 square feet of the garage is used for the tasting room and 2,244 square feet is used for the wine production and storage area. The residence/ caretaker's unit is located above the garage. The project proposes to host fifty (50) special events per year with approximately 50-100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and small weddings. The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some holidays from 11:00 am to 5:00 pm. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special events – APN: 927-280-036.

III. MEETING SUMMARY

The following staff presented the subject proposal:

Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly Phone: 951-955-1888 or e-mail khesterl@rctlma.org

The following person(s) spoke in favor, of the subject proposal.

None

There were no speakers in a neutral position 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 TO DECEMBER 1, 2010

VI. CD

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTE ORDER JULY 14, 2010
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT**

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 3.1: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 – CEQA Exempt–**
Applicant: Christina Falik – Engineer/ Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road & Southerly of Camino Del Vino – 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10)

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural 10-Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10). The plot plan proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage. 1,500 square feet of the garage is used for the tasting room and 2,244 square feet is used for the wine production and storage area. The residence/ caretaker's unit is located above the garage. The project proposes to host fifty (50) special events per year with approximately 50-100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and small weddings. The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some holidays from 11:00 am to 5:00pm. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special events – APN: 927-280-036. (Continued from 4/07/10). (Legislative)

III. **MEETING SUMMARY**

Subject proposal did not require a presentation.

Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly, at 951-955-1888 or e-mail 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; recommended to the Board of Supervisors;

CONTINUE CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 and PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 WITHOUT DISCUSSION
to September 15, 2010.

VI. **CD**

The entire discussion of this agenda item can be found on CD. For a copy of the CD, please contact Desiree Bowie, Interim Planning Commission Secretary, at (951) 955-0222 or E-mail at dbowie@rctlma.org.

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

- I. **AGENDA ITEM 7.7: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271** - CEQA Exempt-
Applicant: Christina Falik - Engineer/ Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) - Location: Easterly of De Portola Road & Southerly of Camino Del Vino - 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) - **APN:** 927-280-036 - (Continued from 4/07/10) - (Legislative)
- II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural 10-Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10). The plot plan proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage. 1,500 square feet of the garage is used for the tasting room and 2,244 square feet is used for the wine production and storage area. The residence/ caretaker's unit is located above the garage. The project proposes to host fifty (50) special events per year with approximately 50-100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and small weddings. The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some holidays from 11:00 am to 5:00pm. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special events.
- III. **MEETING SUMMARY**
The following staff presented the subject proposal:
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly, Ph: (951) 955-1888 or E-mail 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 Zuppardo absent), continued the subject proposal to July 14, 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.

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

- I. AGENDA ITEM 7.5: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 - CEQA Exempt-**
Applicant: Christina Falik - Engineer/ Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) - Location: Easterly of De Portola Road & Southerly of Camino Del Vino - 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) - **APN: 927-280-036 -** (Legislative)
- II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural 10-Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (A-1-10). The plot plan proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage. 1,500 square feet of the garage is used for the tasting room and 2,244 square feet is used for the wine production and storage area. The residence/ caretaker's unit is located above the garage. The project proposes to host fifty (50) special events per year with approximately 50-100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and small weddings. The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some holidays from 11:00 am to 5:00pm. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special events.
- III. MEETING SUMMARY**
The following staff presented the subject proposal:
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly, Ph: (951) 955-1888 or E-mail khesterl@rctlma.org
- The following spoke in favor of the subject proposal:
Kenneth Falik, Applicant, 669 Fontana Way, Laguna Beach, CA 92651
- No one spoke in a neutral position 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 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.

Agenda Item No.: 3.2
Area Plan: Southwest
Zoning Area: Rancho California
Supervisory District: Third
Project Planner: Kinika Hesterly
Planning Commission: September 21, 2011
Continued From: 6/22/11, 2/16/11, 12/01/10,
9/15/10, 7/14/10, 5/05/10 and 4/07/10

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444
PLOT PLAN NO. 22271
Environmental Assessment No. 41137
Applicant: Ken & Christina Falik

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION:

The general plan amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Policy Area from Valle de los Caballos to Citrus/Vineyard for the subject site.

The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Citrus Vineyard (C/V).

The plot plan proposes that the existing 7,829 square foot, two-story building, with a 3,456 square foot garage, be used as a winery and residence to address the existing code violation for an illegal land use at the site. 1,500 square feet of the garage is proposed to be used for the tasting room and the remaining 1,956 square feet is proposed to be used for the winery operation. The residence will use 4,373 square feet.

The project proposes to host up to fifty (50) special occasions per year, with a maximum of 100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and weddings. The winery proposes to be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and holidays from 11:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special occasions.

The project site is located easterly of De Portola Road, northerly of Oak Mountain Road, and southerly of Galway Downs Drive.

FURTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

Although the plot plan and change of zone were continued from June 22nd to August 24th, the project was not heard on August 24, 2011 because that Planning Commission hearing date was cancelled. Despite the hearing cancellation, the project was required to be re-advertised to a subsequent date for the purpose of including the general plan amendment with the change of zone and plot plan.

On July 20, 2011, consultation with the Soboba tribe occurred and the Senate Bill 18 process was completed. The Senate Bill 18 process is a statutory mandate that all General Plan Amendments, according to California Government Code 65352.3, allow California Native American tribes to indicate whether they would like to consult with the Planning Department for the purpose of preserving or mitigating impacts to places, features and objects. The Soboba tribe did not request preservation or mitigation during the consultation.

On June 22, 2011, the plot plan and change of zone were continued at Planning Commission to August 24, 2011 to allow the Soboba Tribe to coordinate and attend a consultation meeting with staff per the tribe's request to consult during the 90 day period for the General Plan Amendment SB 18 process.

AKA
8/23

On February 16, 2011, the plot plan and change of zone were continued at Planning Commission to allow the 90 day Senate Bill 18 process for the general plan amendment. The SB 18 consultation request period ended on May 23, 2011.

On February 8, 2011, the general plan amendment was initiated by the Board of Supervisors.

The General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 1107) was continued for 30 days at the January 11, 2011 Board of Supervisor's meeting so that Supervisor Stone could look into potential impacts of the GPA on the neighboring property to the west.

On December 1, 2010, the plot plan and change of zone were continued to allow the general plan amendment to continue General Plan Initiation Proceedings (GPIP).

The submittal of the GPA occurred on October 13, 2010 which began the GPIP process.

On September 15, 2010, the plot plan and change of zone were continued to allow the applicant to apply for a General Plan Amendment (GPA) that proposes that the Citrus Vineyard Policy Area be extended to the subject site in order for special events to be considered at the site.

On July 14, 2010, the project was continued to allow the applicant to resolve corrections. Geology corrections were resolved and Transportation is working with the applicant on a fair share payment agreement for De Portola Road. Special events remain an outstanding concern with Planning and staff is researching the process needed to allow special events at the property.

On May 5, 2010, the project was continued to allow the applicant to resolve departmental corrections. These corrections were not resolved as of the writing of the staff report.

On April 7, 2010, the project was continued to allow Commissioner Petty and staff to visit the site and meet with the project applicants. This site visit and meeting occurred on April 21, 2010.

ISSUES OF CONCERN:

1. General Plan Amendment/SB 18 – Resolved

Staff was previously unable to make a recommendation for decision at Planning Commission because the SB 18 tribal consultation had not occurred. The SB 18 tribal consultation took place on July 20th and no comments or issues were relayed by the Soboba tribe. The Soboba tribe is the only tribe who requested consultation. Staff can now make a recommendation for decision.

2. Code Violation - Operating Without Land Use Approval

The applicant has been operating the winery and tasting room, in addition to hosting special events, without permits. Thus, planning staff cannot ensure the public's safety, health, and welfare is protected until the applicant has complied with the requirements of the County departments. A code violation was issued in 2008 for the operation of a winery and tasting room without land use approval.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Existing Land Use (Ex. #1): | Single family residence, unpermitted winery and special occasion facility |
| 2. Surrounding Land Use (Ex. #1): | Scattered rural residences to the north, east, |

south, and west. Additionally, Oak Mountain Winery (PP21447) and Renzoni Winery (PP22263) are located in the project vicinity.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 3. Proposed Zoning (Ex. #3): | Citrus Vineyard (C/V) |
| 4. Surrounding Zoning (Ex. #3): | Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum to the south and east, and Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to the west. |
| 5. Existing General Plan Land Use: | Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum); Valle de los Caballos Policy Area |
| 6. Proposed General Plan Land Use: | Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum); Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area |
| 7. Project Data: | Total Acreage: 20.01 gross acres
Total Net Acreage: 19.61 acres
Conserved Area: 2.44 acres |
| 8. Environmental Concerns: | See attached environmental assessment |

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ADOPTION of **PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107** to the **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**, based on the findings and conclusions incorporated into the staff report; and,

TENTATIVE APPROVAL of **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107** based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

TENTATIVE APPROVAL of **CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444** based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report; and,

ADOPTION of a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** for **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 41137**, 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 **PLOT PLAN NO. 22271**, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and based upon the findings and conclusions incorporated in the staff report.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1) The proposed project is in conformance with the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) Land Use Designation and the proposed Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area.
- 2) The proposed project is consistent with the proposed Citrus Vineyard (C/V) zoning classification of Ordinance No. 348, and with all other applicable provisions of Ordinance No. 348.
- 3) The public's health, safety, and general welfare are protected through project design.

- 4) The proposed project is conditionally compatible with the present and future logical development of the area.
- 5) The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- 6) The proposed project will preclude reserve design for the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP).

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

1. The project site is designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum): Valle de los Caballos; on the Southwest Area Plan.
2. The proposed use is consistent with the Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) Land Use Designation and the proposed Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area.
3. The project site is surrounded by properties which are designated Rural: Rural Residential (R:RR) (5 Acre Minimum) to the north, east and west and Agriculture: Agriculture (AG: AG) (10 Acre Minimum) to the west and south across De Portola Road.
4. The zoning for the subject site is proposed to be Citrus Vineyard (C/V).
5. The proposed use is permitted subject to approval of a plot plan in the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) zone.
6. The proposed use is consistent with the development standards set forth in the Citrus Vineyard (C/V) zone.
7. The project site is surrounded by properties which are zoned Residential Agricultural – 2½ Acre Minimum (R-A-2½) and Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to the east and west and Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to west and south across De Portola Road.
8. Similar uses have been constructed and are operating in the project vicinity.
9. This project is located within a Criteria Area of the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRCMSHCP) and a portion of the site has been set aside for conservation (HANS01716).
10. Environmental Assessment No. 41137 identified the following potentially significant impacts:
 - a. Biological Resources
 - b. Hydrology / Water Quality
 - c. Noise
 - d. Transportation/Traffic

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, one (1) letter, expressing concern with the project, has been received. A letter of concern was received from Herbert and Erin Kinney, dated March 29, 2010.
2. The project site is not located within:
 - a. A city of sphere of influence;
 - b. A 100-year flood plain, an area drainage plan, or dam inundation area;
 - c. A High Fire Area;
 - d. An Alquist-Priolo fault hazard zone; or,
 - e. A Specific Plan.
3. The project site is located within:
 - a. The boundaries of the Temecula Valley Unified School District;
 - b. The Valle de los Caballos Policy Area;
 - c. Cell Nos. 6807 and 6808 of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan;
 - d. Zone A (13.85 miles) of the Ord. 655 Mt. Palomar Lighting Influence Area; and,
 - e. The Stephens Kangaroo Rat Fee Area.
4. The subject site is currently designated as Assessor's Parcel Number 927-280-036.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT GPA01107/CZ07444/PP22271 VICINITY/POLICY AREAS

Date Drawn: 08/08/11
Vicinity Map

Supervisor Stone
District 3



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 31, 32

Assessors Bk. Pg. 927-28
Thomas Bros. Pg. 960 F4
Edition 2009

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.lima.ca.us/index.html>




RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01107/CZ07444/PP22271

Supervisor Stone
District 3

LAND USE

Date Drawn: 08/08/11
Exhibit 1



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 31, 32

Assessors Bk. Pg. 927-28
Thomas Bros. Pg. 960 F4
Edition 2009



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.pln.riverside.ca.us/index.html>

0 300 600 1,200 1,800 2,400 Feet

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01107/CZ07444/PP22271

PROPOSED ZONING

Supervisor Stone
District 3

Date Drawn: 08/08/11
Exhibit 3



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 31, 32

Assessors Bk. Pg. 927-28
Thomas Bros. Pg. 960 F4
Edition 2009



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) 959-3200 (Western County), or in Indio at (760) 863-8277 (Eastern County) or website at <http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/index.html>


RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

GPA01107/CZ07444/PP22271

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Supervisor Stone
District: 3

Date Drawn: 08/08/11
Exhibit 6



Zoning Area: Rancho California
Township/Range: T7SR1W
Section: 31, 32

Assessors Bk. Pg. 927-28
Thomas Bros. Pg. 960 F4
Edition 2009

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.tma.co.riverside.ca.us/index.html>

0 300 600 1,200 1,800
Feet

Proposed Hospitality District





CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT



Subject Property

PARCEL 1 OF PARCEL MAP 4/12-13, RECORDED
IN BOOK 49, PAGES 93 AND 94 OF THE OFFICIAL
RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY CALIFORNIA
FEBRUARY, 2007

PARCEL 1 OF PARCEL MAP 4/12-13, RECORDED
IN BOOK 49, PAGES 93 AND 94 OF THE OFFICIAL
RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY CALIFORNIA
FEBRUARY, 2007

[illegible]

[illegible]

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 41137

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): General Plan Amendment No. 1050, Change of Zone No. 7444 and Plot Plan No. 22271

Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department

Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409

Contact Person: Kinika Hesterly, Urban Regional Planner

Telephone Number: (951) 955-1888

Applicant's Name: Kenneth and Christina Falik

Applicant's Address: 669 Fontana Way, Laguna Beach CA 92651

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description:

The general plan amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Policy Area from Valle de los Caballos to Citrus Vineyard.

The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural 10-Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Citrus Vineyard (C/V).

The plot plan proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage. 1,500 square feet of the garage is used for the tasting room and 2,244 square feet is used for the wine production and storage area. The residence is located above the garage. The project proposes to host fifty (50) special occasions per year with approximately 50-100 guests, which include wine maker dinners, private corporate parties, and small weddings. The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some holidays from 11:00 am to 5:00pm. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special occasions.

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

C. Total Project Area: 20.01 gross acres

Residential Acres:	Lots:	Units: 1	Projected No. of Residents: 3
Commercial Acres: 20.01	Lots: 1	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 3,744	Est. No. of Employees: 4
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other:			

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 927-280-036

E. Street References: The project is located Easterly of De Portola Road and southerly of Camino Del Vino.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Township 7 South, Range 1 West and Section 31 and Section 32

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is located within the Community of Rancho California within the Southwest Area Plan. The project site is to the east and fronts De Portola Road. The site

contains an existing two-story residence and winery/tasting room. The first floor of the residence has been converted into a winery and tasting room. The site contains vineyard planting, residential/urban/exotic planting in the area near the residence and riverside sage scrub. The property slopes upwards from an elevation at 1270 feet above sea level at De Portola Road to 1434 feet above sea level at the site's eastern boundary. The northeastern portion of the site has been prescribed for preservation due to the location of sensitive plant species.

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 Rural: Rural Residential (R: RR) (5 Acre Minimum) land use designation of the site 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:** The project site is located within two MSHCP criteria cells (6807 and 6808) within cell group C. The project has been conditioned to offer 2.44 acres of the northeastern portion of the site for dedication for conservation. 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 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 site currently contains an existing single family residence. 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

C. Foundation Component(s): Rural (R)

D. Land Use Designation(s): Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum)

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

F. Policy Area(s), if any: Valle De Los Caballos

G. Proposed Policy Area: Citrus Vineyard

H. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **Area Plan(s):** Southwest Area Plan
2. **Foundation Component(s):** Rural and Agricultural
3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) to the north, south and east and Agriculture (AG) (10 Acre Minimum) to the west
4. **Overlay(s):** N/A
5. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Valle De Los Caballos to the north, east, and south and Citrus Vineyard Rural Policy Area to the west.

I. 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

J. Existing Zoning: Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10)

K. Proposed Zoning, if any: Citrus/Vineyard (C/V)

L. Proposed Policy Area: Citrus/Vineyard

M. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum to the south and east, and Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to the west.

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.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Recreation |
| ☐ Agriculture & Forest Resources | ☒ Hydrology / Water Quality | ☒ Transportation / Traffic |
| ☐ Air Quality | ☐ Land Use / Planning | ☐ Utilities / Service Systems |
| ☒ Biological Resources | ☐ Mineral Resources | ☐ Other: |
| ☐ Cultural Resources | ☒ Noise | ☐ Other: |
| ☐ Geology / Soils | ☐ Population / Housing | ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Public Services | |

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT

PREPARED

- ☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

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

August 8, 2011
Date

Kinika Hesterly
Printed Name

For Carolyn Syms Luna, 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
AESTHETICS Would the project				
1. Scenic Resources	☐	☐	☐	☒
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure C-7 "Scenic Highways"

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located adjacent to De Portola Road. The General Plan indicates that the project is not located within a designated scenic corridor; therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features, or obstruct a prominent scenic vista or view open to the public, as these features do not exist on the project site. Additionally, the project will not result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The design of the proposed winery is compatible with the existing environmental and surrounding setting, and will, therefore, have a less than significant impact on scenic resources.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan, the project site is located 13.85 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. All proposed outdoor lighting shall comply with Ordinance No. 655, which includes the use of low pressure sodium vapor lighting or overhead high pressure sodium vapor lighting with shields or luminaries. (COA 10.PLANNING.30) 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: On-site Inspection, Project Application Description

Findings of Fact:

a) & b) The proposed project will introduce sources of light which include exterior building illumination, indoor winery and tasting 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 order to avoid potential impacts related to new sources of light, the project has been conditioned to hood and direct any new sources of light away from neighboring properties so as not to shine directly upon adjoining properties or public right-of-ways. (COA 10.PLANNING.5) This is a standard Condition of Approval and is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. 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
--	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Findings of Fact:

a) A small portion of the southwestern portion of the site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance (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). However, the proposed project would maintain a primarily agricultural use with just 75% of the net useable area planted in vineyards. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The project site is not located within an agricultural preserve and not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The project will not conflict with other agricultural uses within the project vicinity. The proposed project would maintain a primarily agricultural use with 75% percent of the net useable project area planted in vineyards. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

c) The project is not located within 300 feet of existing agriculturally zoned property. In addition, the proposed use is an agricultural use; therefore the proposed project will not cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of existing agriculturally zoned property. Therefore, there is no impact.

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. Therefore, the impact is considered 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
5. Forest				
a) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3 "Parks, Forests and Recreation Areas," and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project is not within the vicinity of forest land and therefore, will not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land, result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use, or involve other changes that could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

6. Air Quality Impacts	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook Table 6-2

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

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 cumulatively contribute to pollutant violations. 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 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 may impact air quality in the short-term additional during construction or grading 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

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

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. 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, 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. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

f) The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan,

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?				
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, On-site Inspection, Environmental Programs Review, PDB04858

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within two MSHCP criteria cells (6807 and 6808) within cell group C. The project has completed the Habitat Acquisition and Negotiation Strategy process and it was determined that 2.44 acres of the northeast portion of the site should be conserved and dedicated towards a conservation easement. The conservation area shall be offered for dedication via a conservation easement to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), as County directs or authorizes, and accepted by the RCA prior to issuance of any grading permit. Prior to acceptance of the offer of dedication by the RCA, the applicant shall submit a preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the dedication acreage, to the RCA for its review and approval. The RCA shall have sole and absolute discretion with respect to the approval of the information contained in the preliminary title report and the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (COA 20.EPD.1). Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

b) According to the habitat assessment, the project site does not contain 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). However, suitable habitat does occur within the site for Nevin's barberry but it is located outside the portion of the site to be developed. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) According to the habitat assessment, the project site does not contain 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. In addition, the site does not support suitable habitat for the burrowing owl. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

d) According to the habitat assessment, the MSHCP criteria cells that the project is located within contribute to the assembly of a constrained linkage area. The project has been conditioned to dedicate 2.44 acres towards a conservation easement (COA 20.EPD.1). Therefore, the project is not anticipated to 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) The project site does not support drainage features or riparian habitat(s) that fall under jurisdiction of local, regional, state, or federal resources agencies or those defined as riparian/riverine by Section 6.1.2 of the Riverside County MSHCP. Therefore, there is no impact.

g) The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: The 2.44 acre conservation area as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A shall be offered for dedication via a conservation easement to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), as County directs or authorizes, and accepted by the RCA prior to issuance of any grading permit. Prior to acceptance of the offer of dedication by the RCA, the applicant shall submit a preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the dedication acreage, to the RCA for its review and approval. The RCA shall have sole and absolute discretion with respect to the approval of the information contained in the preliminary title report and the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (COA 20.EPD.1).

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project				
8. Historic Resources	☐	☐	☐	☒
a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The historical records search indicated that historical resources are not located on the project site. The project site does not contain a historic site. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

b) The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

9. Archaeological Resources	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The site contains an existing residence/winery and tasting room, vineyards and parking area. The project has been conditioned if during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to project approval, the following procedures shall be followed. Unique cultural resources are defined, for this condition, as being multiple 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 its sacred or cultural importance. 1. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the archaeologist, the Native American tribal representative 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 representative and the archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of Planning staff, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources. 3. Grading of 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 mitigation (COA 10.Planning.41). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) The project may disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. If human remains are encountered, no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin (COA 10.PLANNING.41). This is a standard condition and not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes.

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

d) The proposed project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the project area. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

10. 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"

Findings of Fact:

The project is mapped as having portions within a highly sensitive paleontological area and therefore grading could destroy a unique paleontological resource, however, the County Geologist conditioned the project for a paleontological monitor during grading in the event that a resource is recovered. This is a standard condition and not considered unique pursuant to CEQA. The impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

11. 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 in Geology Report No. 2206

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project was reviewed by the County Geologist who was satisfied that the existing structure is safe and suitable for the intended use as a winery and tasting room. The Geologist did not indicate that the project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. Also, the project is not likely subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map or other substantial evidence of a known fault. The impact is considered less than significant.

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.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is located within an area designated as having a moderate potential for liquefaction. Adherence to California Building Code (CBC) will reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Adherence to code is not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

13. 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.

14. 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

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

spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

Source: On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan 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. (COA 60.BS GRADE.3) 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. 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.

15. 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) The project site is located in an area susceptible to subsidence. 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.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

Source: On-site Inspection, 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 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. No impact is anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. 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: Building & Safety Grading Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The property slopes upwards from an elevation at 1270 feet above sea level at De Portola Road to 1434 feet above sea level at the site's eastern boundary. The winery and tasting room are existing; although additional parking will be provided. Because the use is existing and minimal additions are proposed, the project is not anticipated to substantially change the topography or ground surface relief features. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The project will not create or fill slopes greater than 2:1. The project may create slopes greater than ten feet. In order to minimize the impact, the project has been conditioned to grade so that the slopes reflect the natural terrain.

c) The project will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

18. Soils	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in SECTION 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), 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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The development of the project site may have the potential to result in soil erosion during additional grading and construction. Standard conditions of approval have been issued regarding soil erosion that will further ensure protection of public health, safety, and welfare upon final engineering of the project and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

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.

19. Erosion

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?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Flood Control District review, Project Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) Implementation of the proposed project will involve additional 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. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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. In addition, Riverside County Flood Control has provided standard conditions of approval to ensure erosion impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels upon final engineering and are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

20. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

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:

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.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project

21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Source:

Findings of Fact:

The project will produce carbon dioxide from vehicular travel to and from the facility, and use electricity to operate the winery. However, the project will not produce enough GHG emissions from its construction or operation to be deemed cumulatively significant. Also, through compliance with California Energy Commission Title 24 requirements for building energy efficiency, direct and cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts would be reduced to a level below significance. These are standard requirements and are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
22. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is for a winery, tasting room and special event facility. Typically, this type of development does not require the routine use of acutely hazardous materials and will not generate hazardous waste. However, the facility will require a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet or 500 pounds, or any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances (COA 90. E Health. 1). The project has been conditioned that if further review of the site indicates additional environmental health issues, the Hazardous Materials Management Division reserves the right to regulate the business in accordance with applicable Ordinances (COA 90. E Health. 2). These are standard conditions of approval and are not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

In addition, during construction, hazardous materials such oil, diesel fuel, and gasoline may be transported to and used at the project site. The California State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) operates programs for proper hazardous waste disposal and transport and takes enforcement actions against those who mishandle or dispose of hazardous wastes improperly. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, also requires licensed hazardous waste haulers to collect and transport hazardous wastes. Compliance with the requirements of the California State Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health would reduce the impact to less than significant levels. Compliance with the requirements of the California DTSC and Riverside County of Environmental Health is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

b) The proposed project is not anticipated to result in 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. The project has been conditioned by Environmental Health

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

to have a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet, or 500 pounds, or for any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances (COA 90. E Health. 1). This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered 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 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.

23. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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.

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

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.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

24. 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?

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

25. 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?

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

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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)?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
polluted runoff?				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment 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 proposes to permit the conversion of an existing residence into a winery and tasting room with care taker's unit on the second floor. The building and parking areas are currently existing. The site also contains existing vineyards. According to the Flood Hazard Report, the topography of the site consists of well-defined ridges and natural watercourses that traverse the property. There is adequate area outside of the natural watercourses for building sites. The tentative exhibit shows the existing winery and tasting room to be located on ridges. The natural watercourses should be kept free of buildings and obstructions in order to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the area and to prevent flood damage to new buildings (COA 10. Flood RI. 1). 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) The project has been conditioned prior to grading permit issuance to submit copies of the BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation to the District for review (COA 60. Flood RI. 2). 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 proposed BMP's shall be shown on the grading plan (COA 60. Flood RI. 3). 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 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

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

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 project proposes to permit the conversion of an existing residence into a winery and tasting room with care taker's unit on the second floor. The building and parking areas are currently existing. The site also contains existing vineyards. The development of this site is not anticipated to adversely impact downstream property owners by increasing the rate and volume of flood flows. To mitigate water quality, the project has been conditioned prior to grading permit issuance to submit copies of the plans for BMPS and any other necessary documentation to the District for review (COA 60. Flood RI. 2). 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 proposed BMP's shall be shown on the grading plan (COA 60. Flood RI. 3). 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). Prior to grading permit issuance, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation 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 effects (COA 60. Flood RI. 2). Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned prior to grading permit issuance to submit copies of the BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation to the District for review (COA 60. Flood RI. 2). 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 proposed BMP's shall be shown on the grading plan (COA 60. Flood RI. 3).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by Flood during the Building and Safety Plan check process.

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

26. 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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain and 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain. The proposed project proposes less than 5,000 square feet of impervious area. As such, this proposal will not increase flow rates on downstream property owners; therefore, the project will not result in changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain. The project will 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The project site is not located in a 100-year flood plain. The project will not cause changes in the amount of surface water in any water body. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

27. Land Use	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
planned land use of an area?				
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: General Plan, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site's general plan land use designation is Rural: Rural Residential (R: RR) (5 Acre Minimum). The project proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage on a 20.01 gross acre parcel. The project also includes a maximum of 50 special occasions per year. The Rural Residential land use designation allows for one single family residence per five acres as well as limited animal keeping and agricultural activities. The vineyards and winery are agricultural uses and the tasting room and special occasions are secondary and in conjunction with the agricultural use. The project also includes a residence. The project is consistent with the planned land use of the site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The project site is not located within a City Sphere. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

28. Planning	☐	☐	☒	☐
a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?				
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is currently zoned Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10). The project includes a change of zone application to alter the zoning classification of the site to Citrus Vineyard (C/V). Winery and appurtenant and incidental uses are allowed with an established on-site vineyard. The project proposes a winery and tasting room and limited special occasions. The project site currently contains vineyards and proposes to increase the portion of the site planted in vineyards to 75% of the useable net acreage. Therefore, the project is consistent with the proposed zoning.

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

b) The project site is surrounded by properties zoned Rural Residential (R-R) to the north, Residential Agricultural – 10 Acre Minimum to the south and east, and Citrus Vineyard (C/V) to the west. The surrounding zoning allows for a mixture of agricultural and residential uses which is consistent with the proposed zoning of Citrus Vineyard (C/V). Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

c) Existing land uses surrounding the project site include a mixture of vacant land and single family residential on large lots to the north, south, east and west. Additionally, Leonesse Cellars (PP18776), Oak Mountain Winery (PP21447) and Renzoni Winery (PP22263) are located in the project vicinity. The proposed project has the potential to conflict with the existing and planned residences in the project vicinity. The project will be compatible with the surrounding properties containing residential uses through the restriction of hours of operation, number of special occasions and attendees and by prohibiting amplified music to be played outdoors. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) The project site's general plan land use designation is Rural: Rural Residential (R: RR) (5 Acre Minimum). The project proposes to permit an existing winery, tasting room and special event facility located in an existing 3,744 square foot garage on a 20.01 gross acre parcel. The project also includes a maximum of 50 special occasions per year. The Rural Residential land use designation allows for one single family residence per five acres as well as limited animal keeping and agricultural activities. The vineyards and winery are agricultural uses and the tasting room and special occasions are secondary and in conjunction with the agricultural use. The project also includes a residence. The project is consistent with the general plan land use of the site.

The project is also located within the proposed General Plan Policy Area, Citrus/Vineyard. This policy area was established as a distinct area that would ensure the continuation of the rural lifestyle and wine production in the area and also allows incidental commercial uses. Therefore, the project is consistent with the Citrus/Vineyard Policy Area and the impact is considered less than significant.

e) The proposed project shall not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community). The project is within an established rural community. As discussed above under d), the project is consistent with the policy area. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

29. 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

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?				
d) Expose people or property to hazards from 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

30. 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 ☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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. There is a private helicopter landing pad on a residential parcel to the southwest of the parcel; however, this is for the private use of the property owner only. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

31. Railroad Noise	☐	☐	☐	☒
NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐				

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

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.

32. Highway Noise	☐	☐	☐	☒
NA ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐				

Source: On-site Inspection, 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
33. 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 a maximum of 50 special occasions that could include large gatherings of people. The project does not propose to hold special occasions outdoors. Wedding ceremonies shall take place outdoors; however, receptions will be held indoors. Ordinance No. 847 prohibits sounds in excess of land use specific standards. For rural residential and agriculture land uses, the maximum sound level is 45 Db L_{max} . Exceptions to this standard are available for construction, single events, or continuous events; single event exceptions require approval of the Planning Director and continuous event exceptions require approval from the Planning Commission. 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. Furthermore, if a significant amount of complaints have been received, the project will be required to conduct noise monitoring reports. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the project will have a less than significant impact.

b) This project will cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project during construction of the road improvements and additions to the building and/or parking. To minimize ambient noise levels upon sensitive receptors during construction of the proposed project, grading and construction shall be restricted to daylight hours. 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 a maximum of 50 special occasions that could include large gatherings of people. Wedding ceremonies shall take place outdoors; however, receptions will be held indoors. Ordinance No. 847 prohibits sounds in excess of land use specific standards. Ordinance No. 847 prohibits sounds in excess of land use specific standards. For agriculture land uses, the maximum sound level is 45 Db L_{max} . Exceptions to this standard are available for construction, single events, or continuous events; single event exceptions require approval of the Planning Director and continuous event exceptions require approval from the Planning Commission. 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.

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

Furthermore, if a significant amount of complaints have been received, the project will be required to conduct noise monitoring reports. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the project will have a less than significant impact.

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: If a significant amount of complaints have been received within one year of approval, one year after issuance of occupancy, the Director may reconsider the hours of operation. If a significant amount of complaints are received, the permit holder will be required to produce noise monitoring reports in order to ensure compliance (COA 10. Planning.21 and COA 10. Planning.22).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Code Enforcement Department.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

34. Housing	☐	☐	☐	☒
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site currently contains an existing winery, tasting room and vineyards and will not be removing any housing; therefore, the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project may create employment opportunities, but not substantial enough to create a demand for additional housing. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

c) The project site does not contain housing; therefore, the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The project is not located within or near a County Redevelopment Project Area. Therefore, there is no impact.

e) The project is consistent with the general plan land use designation of the site. The project will not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. Therefore, there is no impact.

f) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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:

35. 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.28). 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. Sheriff Services

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact:

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

The project area is serviced by the Riverside County Sheriff's 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.28). 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. 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 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.

38. 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.28). 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.

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

39. Health Services	☐	☐	☒	☐
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact: In the event of an emergency, employees of the proposed project may access several hospitals 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

40. 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 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)?

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 just outside of County Service Area (CSA) No. 149, which is a maintenance district for streets and roadways within the Temecula Valley Wine Country. The project will not have an impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

41. Recreational Trails	☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

Source: Parks Review

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of recreational trails. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

42. Circulation

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?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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 that results in substantial safety risks?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: Transportation Department Review

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. The project was required to submit a traffic management plan.

a) Access to and from the site will be via De Portola Road. There will be signs at the entrance to direct visitors in and out of the facility and an acceleration/deceleration lane shall be constructed on De Portola Road. The applicant has been required to pay its fair share of the cost of improvements

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

towards a two-way turn lane on De Portola Road. No left turn pocket construction will occur as part of this project. The impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.

b) The facility is designed to provide fourteen (14) parking spaces, including 2 accessible parking spaces and will not result in inadequate parking capacity. The impact is considered less than significant.

c) 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. The impact is considered less than significant.

d) The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns. There will be no impact.

e) The project will not alter waterborne, rail or air traffic. There will be no impact.

f) The project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature due to the construction of an acceleration/deceleration lane. The impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.

g-h) The project will not require new or altered maintenance of roads and is not anticipated to cause a significant effect upon circulation during construction. The impact is considered less than significant.

i) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. There will be no impact.

j) The project will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). There will be no impact.

Mitigation: The applicant shall pay its fair share towards a two-way turn lane on De Portola Road (COA 90.TRANS.1). De Portola Road shall be improved with an acceleration/deceleration lane for traffic exiting and entering the winery (COA 90.TRANS.3).

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Transportation Department and Building and Safety Plan Check Review Process.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

43. Bike Trails

☐
☐
☐
☒

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact: The project site is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a bike trail. Therefore, there is no impact.

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
--	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

44. 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.

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.

45. 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. 1).

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

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. 2). 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.

46. 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 (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.

47. 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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Natural gas?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Communications systems?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Storm water drainage?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

e) Street lighting?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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, is 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 non-significant level.

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

48. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
49. 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

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

50. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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.

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:

PDB04858: "MSHCP Compliance Report Including; General Biological Analysis, Focused Habitat Assessment For the Burrowing Owl and 5 Sensitive Plant Species and Urban Wildlands Interface Guidelines Assessment (UWIG)", prepared by Jeff W. Kidd Biological Consulting, dated January 27, 2007

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

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

KH:kh

Y:\Planning Case Files-Riverside office\PP22271\DH-PC-BOS\PP22271 EA.doc
Revised: 1/03/11

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 1

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

EVERY DEPARTMENT

10. EVERY. 1 USE - PROJECT DESCRIPTION RECOMMND

The use hereby permitted is for a winery, tasting room, catering and special occasions facility. The existing residence will remain. The project will host up to fifty (50) special occasions per year with up to 100 guests per special occasion. Special occasions include wine-maker dinners, private corporate parties and weddings.

The winery will be open for wine tasting 10:00 am to 6:00pm daily.

The project will have 14 designated parking spaces and overflow parking in the northeast portion of the site to accommodate an additional 20 parking spaces for special occasions. Special occasion overflow parking is permitted by valet only.

(CONDITION REVISED AT PC ON 9/21/11.)

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. 22271 shall be henceforth defined as follows:

APPROVED EXHIBIT A = Plot Plan No. 22271, Exhibit A, Amended No. 3, dated June 19, 2009.

APPROVED EXHIBIT B & C = Floor Plans and Elevations for Plot Plan No. 22271, Exhibit B & C (Sheets 1-6) dated November 28, 2006.

10. EVERY. 4 USE - 90 DAYS TO PROTEST RECOMMND

The project developer has 90 days from the date of approval of these conditions to protest, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020, the imposition of any and all fees, dedications, reservations and/or other exactions imposed on this project as a result of this approval or conditional approval of this project.

10. EVERY. 5 USE - HOLD HARMLESS RECOMMND

The applicant/permittee or any successor-in-interest shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 2

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10. EVERY. 5 USE - HOLD HARMLESS (cont.)

RECOMMND

Riverside or its agents, officers, and employees (COUNTY) from the following:

(a) any claim, action, or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the COUNTY, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning the PLOT PLAN; and,

(b) any claim, action or proceeding against the COUNTY to attack, set aside, void or annul any other decision made by the COUNTY concerning the PLOT PLAN, including, but not limited to, decisions made in response to California Public Records Act requests.

The COUNTY shall promptly notify the applicant/permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall 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.

The obligations imposed by this condition include, but are not limited to, the following: the applicant/permittee shall pay all legal services expenses the COUNTY incurs in connection with any such claim, action or proceeding, whether it incurs such expenses directly, whether it is ordered by a court to pay such expenses, or whether it incurs such expenses by providing legal services through its Office of County Counsel.

BS GRADE DEPARTMENT

10.BS GRADE. 1 USE - GENERAL 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 - 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 3

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 3 USE - OBEY ALL GDG REGS (cont.) RECOMMND

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 - 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 - DUST CONTROL RECOMMND

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

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 - 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 - SLOPE STABL'TY ANLYS RECOMMND

A slope stability report shall be submitted and approved by the County Geologist and/or Building and Safety Engineer for all proposed cut and fill slopes over 30 feet in vertical height, or cut slopes steeper than 2:1 (horizontal to vertical)- unless addressed in a previous report. Fill slopes shall not be steeper than 2:1 (horizontal to vertical).

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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 4

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

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

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 - MINIMUM 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 - DRAINAGE & TERRACING RECOMMND

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

10.BS GRADE. 12 USE - 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 - 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 - RETAINING 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 5

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 15 USE - RETAINING WALLS (cont.) RECOMMND

shown on the Building and Safety Department form 284-197.

10.BS GRADE. 17 USE - MANUFACTURED SLOPES RECOMMND

Plant and irrigate all manufactured slopes equal to or greater than 3 feet in vertical height with drought tolerant grass or ground cover; slopes 15 feet or greater in vertical height shall also be planted with drought tolerant shrubs or trees in accordance with the requirements of Ordinance 457.

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. 20 USE - NPDES INSPECTIONS RECOMMND

Construction activities including clearing, stockpiling, grading or excavation of land which disturbs less than 1 acre and requires a grading permit or construction Building permit shall provide for effective control of erosion, sediment and all other pollutants year-round. The permit holder shall be responsible for the installation and monitoring of effective erosion and sediment controls. Such controls will be evaluated by the Department of Building and Safety periodically and prior to permit Final to verify compliance with industry recognized erosion control measures.

Construction activities including but not limited to clearing, stockpiling, grading or excavation of land, which disturbs 1 acre or more or on-sites which are part of a larger common plan of development which disturbs less than 1 acre are required to obtain coverage under the construction general permit with the State Water Resources Control Board. You are required to provide proof of WDID# and keep a current copy of the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) on the construction site and shall be made available to the Department of Building and Safety upon request.

Year-round, Best Management Practices (BMP's) shall be maintained and be in place for all areas that have been graded or disturbed and for all material, equipment and/or operations that need protection. Stabilized Construction

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 6

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.BS GRADE. 20 USE - NPDES INSPECTIONS (cont.)

RECOMMND

Entrances and project perimeter linear barriers are required year round. Removal BMP's (those BMP's which must be temporarily removed during construction activities) shall be in place at the end of each working day.

Monitoring for erosion and sediment control is required and shall be performed by the QSD or QSP as required by the Construction General Permit. Stormwater samples are required for all discharge locations and projects may not exceed limits set forth by the Construction General Permit Numeric Action Levels and/or Numeric Effluent Levels. A Rain Event Action Plan is required when there is a 50% or greater forecast of rain within the 48 hours, by the National Weather Service or whenever rain is imminent. The QSD or QSP must print and save records of the precipitation forecast for the project location area from (<http://www.srh.noaa.gov/forecast>) and must accompany monitoring reports and sampling test data. A Rain gauge is required on site. The Department of Building and Safety will conduct periodic NPDES inspections of the site throughout the recognized storm season to verify compliance with the Construction General Permit and Stormwater ordinances and regulations.

E HEALTH DEPARTMENT

10.E HEALTH. 1 CONTACT SAN DIEGO RWQCB

RECOMMND

The applicant is advised to contact the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) to obtain information regarding specific requirements for onsite wastewater treatment and disposal.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
San Diego Region
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-2952

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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 7

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

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

location of fire hydrants. Prior to installation, placement of markers must be approved by the Riverside County Fire Department.

10.FIRE. 2 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 VB construction per the 2010 CBC and Building(s) having a fire sprinkler system.

10.FIRE. 3 USE-#20-SUPER FIRE HYDRANT RECOMMND

Super fire hydrants) (6"x4"x 2-2 1/2") shall be located ot less than 25 feet or more than 250 feet from any portion of the building as measured along approved vehicular travel ways.

10.FIRE. 4 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. 5 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.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 8

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FIRE. 6

USE-#88A-AUTO/MAN GATES

RECOMMND

Gate(s) shall be automatic operated, minimum 24 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. (current plan check deposit base fee is \$126.00)

FLOOD RI DEPARTMENT

10.FLOOD RI. 1

USE FLOOD HAZARD REPORT

RECOMMND

Plot Plan 22271 is a proposal for the conversion of the garage of an existing residence into winery and tasting room, in the Rancho California area. The project is located northerly of Oak Mountain Road, easterly of De Portola Road, and southerly of Glaway Downs Drive.

The topography of the site consists of well-defined ridges and natural watercourses that traverse the property. There is adequate area outside of the natural watercourses for building sites. The tentative exhibit shows the proposed winery and tasting room to be located on ridges. The natural watercourses should be kept free of buildings and obstructions in order to maintain the natural drainage patterns of the area and to prevent flood damage to new buildings.

However, in order to comply with the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, the developer shall submit a final project specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) at the plan check stage. In order to accomplish the water quality mitigation/obligations of this project can likely be satisfied by implementing "site design" measures consisting of grading the driveway and the parking areas to drain to the landscaped areas.

10.FLOOD RI. 6

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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 9

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.FLOOD RI. 6 USE WQMP ESTABL MAINT ENTITY (cont.) RECOMMND

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 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.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

10.PLANNING. 3 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. 4 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 with.

10.PLANNING. 5 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. 6 USE- COLORS & MATERIALS RECOMMND

Building colors and materials shall be in substantial conformance with APPROVED EXHIBIT B&C.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 10

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 8 USE- HOURS OF OPERATION

RECOMMND

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

Wine tasting shall be allowed between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. daily.

Special occasions shall be allowed to occur on Saturdays only and cease at 10:00 p.m. Outdoor amplified sound shall cease at 8:00 p.m.

(CONDITION REVISED AT PC ON 9/21/11.)

10.PLANNING. 9 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),

1 space/45 square feet of serving area

10.PLANNING. 11 USE - NO OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

RECOMMND

No outdoor advertising display, sign or billboard (not including on-site advertising or directional signs) shall be constructed or maintained within the property subject to this approval.

10.PLANNING. 14 USE - PHASE BY NEW PERMIT

RECOMMND

Construction of this project may be done progressively in phases provided a plan is submitted with appropriate fees to the Planning Department and approved prior to issuance of any building permits. Phasing approval shall not apply to the requirements of any agency other than the Planning Department unless so indicated by the affected agency.

10.PLANNING. 17 USE - RECLAIMED WATER

RECOMMND

The permit holder shall connect to a reclaimed water supply for landscape watering purposes when secondary or reclaimed water is made available to the site.

10.PLANNING. 19 USE- NO RESIDENT OCCUPANCY

RECOMMND

No permanent occupancy shall be permitted within the property approved under this plot plan as a principal place

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 11

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 19 USE- NO RESIDENT OCCUPANCY (cont.) RECOMMND

of residence except the caretaker's dwelling as shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT A (second floor of winery). No person, except the 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. 20 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 Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 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.

10.PLANNING. 21 USE - EXTERIOR NOISE LEVELS RECOMMND

Exterior noise levels produced by any use allowed under this permit, including, but not limited to, any outdoor public address system, shall not exceed 45 db(A), 10-minute LEQ, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., and 45 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. The permit holder shall comply with the applicable standards of Ordinance No. 847.

10.PLANNING. 22 USE - NOISE MONITORING REPORTS RECOMMND

The permit holder may be required to submit periodic noise monitoring reports as determined necessary by the Code Enforcement Department. Upon written notice from the Code Enforcement Department 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 Code Enforcement Department, unless more time is allowed through written agreement by the Code Enforcement Department. The noise monitoring report shall be approved by the Office of Industrial Hygiene of the Health Service Agency (the permittee or the permittee's successor-in-interest shall be required to place on deposit sufficient funds to cover the costs of this approval prior

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 12

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 22 USE - NOISE MONITORING REPORTS (cont.) RECOMMND

to commencing the required report).

10.PLANNING. 24 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. 25 USE - CEASED OPERATIONS RECOMMND

In the event the use hereby permitted ceases operation
for a period of one (1) year or more, this approval shall
become null and void.

10.PLANNING. 30 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. 32 USE - ORD 810 O S FEE (1) RECOMMND

In accordance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 810, to
assist in providing revenue to acquire and preserve open
space and habitat, an Interim Open Space Mitigation Fee
shall be paid for each development project or portion of an
expanded development project to be constructed in Western
Riverside County. The amount of the fee for commercial or
industrial development shall be calculated on the basis of
"Project Area," which shall mean the net area, measured in
acres, from the adjacent road right-of-way to the limits
of the project development.

Any area identified as "NO USE PROPOSED" on the APPROVED
EXHIBIT shall not be included in the Project Area.

10.PLANNING. 33 USE - PERMIT SIGNS RECOMMND

No signs are approved pursuant to this project approval.
Prior to the installation of any on-site advertising or

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 13

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 33 USE - PERMIT SIGNS (cont.)

RECOMMND

directional signs, a signing plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Department pursuant to the requirements of Section 18.30 (Planning Department review only) of Ordinance No. 348.

10.PLANNING. 36 USE - C/V DESIGN GUIDELINES

RECOMMND

The project shall conform to the Citrus Vineyard Design Standards and Guidelines related to architecture.

10.PLANNING. 37 USE - BUSINESS LICENSING

RECOMMND

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

10.PLANNING. 38 USE- VINEYARD PLANTING

RECOMMND

14.71 acres of the site shall be planted in vineyards and maintained in perpetuity as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A.

(CONDITION REVISED AT PC ON 9/21/11.)

10.PLANNING. 39 USE- SPECIAL OCCASIONS

RECOMMND

Special occasions shall consist of weddings, winemaker dinners and other celebrations and spectator oriented events.

Special occasion hours of operation are allowed as conditioned in 10.PLANNING.008.

A maximum of 100 guests shall be allowed.

Fifty (50) special occasions are allowed per year. (Normal operations to be closed during events.)

Except for wedding ceremonies, all special occasions, including receptions, shall be held indoors.

(CONDITION REVISED AT PC ON 9/21/11.)

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 14

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 40

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. 41

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 its 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 ethnic/cultural group representative),

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 15

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.PLANNING. 41 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. 42 USE - GEO02206 RECOMMND

County Geologic Report (GEO) No. 2206 submitted for this project (PP22271) was prepared by Brian J. Brady, P.E. and is composed of a July 12, 2010 letter of certification that the existing structure is safe and suitable for the intended use as a Winery and Tasting Room.

GEO No. 2206 satisfies the requirement for a Geologic Study for Planning purposes. GEO No. 2206 is hereby accepted for Planning purposes. This approval is not intended, and should not be misconstrued as approval for grading permit. Engineering and other building code parameters will be reviewed and additional comments and/or conditions may be imposed by the Building and Safety Department upon application for grading and/or building permits. No structures for human occupancy shall be allowed within the limits of the mapped County Fault Zone unless subsurface fault hazard investigation reveals active faulting is not present beneath the proposed human occupancy structure.

10.PLANNING. 43 USE - PRODUCTION CAPACITY RECOMMND

Atleast 3,500 gallons of wine shall be produced at this site annually.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 16

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

TRANS DEPARTMENT

10.TRANS. 1 USE - STD INTRO 3(ORD 460/461) RECOMMND

With respect to the conditions of approval for the referenced tentative exhibit, 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.

10.TRANS. 2 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.

10.TRANS. 3 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. 4 USE - NO ADD'L ON-SITE R-O-W RECOMMND

No additional on-site right-of-way shall be required on De Portola Road since adequate right-of-way exists per PM 4/12.

10.TRANS. 5 USE - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN RECOMMND

Traffic Management Plan for PP22271

1.Introduction

The purpose of this Traffic Management Plan is to describe the Gershon Bachus Winery operation as well as the points of access from Riverside County maintained roadways.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 17

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 5

USE - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN (cont.)

RECOMMND

2.Project Description / Location

The site is located on De Portola Road just north of Pulgas Creek Road..

The project is on 20.01 gross acres and contains an existing two story residence. The garage area (3744 s.f.) of an existing single family home is being proposed as a Winery/Tasting room.

Over 75% of Plot Plan 22271 is either planted as vineyard or will be planted in the future.

3.Ingress/Egress

The project takes access from De Portola Road which is designated a Mountain Arterial Highway. (Draft Standard No. 95). The street is currently paved to a width of 24 feet.

Access to the site is provided by a 24 ft. wide driveway which connects directly to De Portola Road.

The proposed driveway connection to the De Portola Road is in accordance with Detail "A" which is included in this report. This is the same detail recently approved and constructed for Plot Plan 18776 which is located approximately one mile north of this plot plan.

Sight distance at the intersection of the driveway at De Portola Road shall meet a design speed of 55 mph for De Portola Road.

The project proponent shall provide an acceleration/ deceleration lane on De Portola Road at the project driveway per County Standard 803.

4.Parking

Onsite parking is in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 348, Section 18.12. A total of 14 parking spaces will be provided with two of these spaces designated as handicapped.

5.Hours of Operation

For hours of operation see Planning Department conditions

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 18

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

10. GENERAL CONDITIONS

10.TRANS. 5 USE - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN (cont.) (cont.)RECOMMND

of approval, 10.Planning.8.

The winery is operated by Mr. & Mrs. Ken Falik. No other employees will work in the tasting room. The Faliks live part-time onsite and will be in residence during operational periods of the tasting room and winery.

6.Special Events

See Planning Department conditions of approval for special events.

7.Signage

A "stop" sign will be placed on the access driveway where the driveway meets De Portola Road.

No Parking" signs shall be placed along De Portola Road to prohibit visitors from parking on the street.

(REVISED AT PC ON 9/21/11)

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

EPD DEPARTMENT

20.EPD. 1 EPD- MSHCP CONVEYANCE

RECOMMND

PRIOR TO 180 DAYS FROM PROJECT APPROVAL OR FINAL BUILDING INSPECTION THE FOLLOWING SHALL APPLY:

As determined through the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS file #1716) established by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, a total of 2.44 acres as shown on Exhibit "A", dated 05/07/07 and shown on PP22271 Ammended #3 exhibit dated 06/19/09 and labled as Conservation

Area shall be offered for dedication or via conservation easment to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), as County directs or authorizes, and accepted by the RCA prior to issuance of any grading permit. Prior to acceptance of the offer of dedication by the RCA, the applicant shall submit a preliminary title report and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the dedication acreage, to the RCA for its review and approval. The RCA shall have sole and absolute

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 19

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.EPD. 1 EPD- MSHCP CONVEYANCE (cont.)

RECOMMND

discretion with respect to the approval of the information contained in the preliminary title report and the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Title to the dedication acreage shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, leases (recorded and unrecorded) and taxes except those encumbrances and easements, which are in the sole discretion of the RCA are acceptable. Easements allowing for the management of fuel modification areas or detention basins shall not be accepted.

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 Director of Code Enforcement 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/winery may be further restricted.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 20

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

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. 7 USE- SKR FEE WITHIN 6 MONTHS

RECOMMND

WITHIN SIX (6) MONTHS OF THE APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 663, which generally requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance. The amount of the fee required to be paid may vary depending upon a variety of factors, including the type of development application submitted and the applicability of any fee reduction or exemption provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663. Said fee shall be calculated on the approved development project which is anticipated to be 20.01 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. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

20.PLANNING. 8 USE- SCHOOL MITIGATION

RECOMMND

WITHIN SIX (6) MONTHS OF PROJECT APROVAL: Impacts to the Temecula Valley Unified School District shall be mitigated in accordance with California State law.

20.PLANNING. 9 USE- ORD 810 OPEN SPACE FEE

RECOMMND

Within six (6) months of the effective date of this permit, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 810, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. The amount of

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 21

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

20.PLANNING. 9 USE- ORD 810 OPEN SPACE FEE (cont.)

RECOMMND

the fee will be based on the "Project Area" as defined in the Ordinance and the aforementioned Condition of Approval. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

20.PLANNING. 10 USE- ORD NO. 659 (DIF)

RECOMMND

Within six (6) months of the effective date of this permit, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities and the acquisition of open space and habitat necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development project described and defined in this Ordinance, and 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, which shall mean the net area, measured in acres, from the adjacent road right-of-way to the limits of the project development. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

20.PLANNING. 11 USE - COMMERCIAL UPGRADE

RECOMMND

Within 6 months of the effective date of this permit, all building permits necessary to cause the wine tasting building to meet commercial standards shall be submitted and finalized.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 22

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

20. PRIOR TO A CERTAIN DATE

TRANS DEPARTMENT

20.TRANS. 1

USE - TS/CENTER LANE FAIRSHARE

RECOMMND

De Portola Road shall ultimately be improved to have a two-way turn lane. The applicant shall pay the County of Riverside \$23,200 as its fair share of constructing the two-way turn lane within six (6) months of the approval of PP 22271 by the Board of Supervisors or prior to Final Inspection for any building or structure in PP 22271, whichever occurs first or as approved by the Director of Transportation.

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. 2

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, see form 284-47.

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.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 23

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

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. 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.

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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 24

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.BS GRADE. 10 USE IMPORT/EXPORT (cont.)

RECOMMND

Planning 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 MINOR REVIEW

RECOMMND

The scope of the District review will be limited to verification that this proposal has met its obligation under the County's municipal stormwater permit. A copy of the BMP improvement plans along with any necessary documentation shall be submitted to the Districts Plan Check Section for review. A copy of the improvement and grading plans shall be included for reference. The plans must receive the District's approval prior to issuance of 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 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. 8 USE- SKR FEE CONDITION

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 663, which generally requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance. The amount of the fee required to be paid may vary depending upon a variety of factors, including the type of development application submitted and the applicability of any fee reduction or exemption provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663. Said fee shall be calculated on the approved development project which is anticipated to be 20.01 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. In

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 25

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 8 USE- SKR FEE CONDITION (cont.)

RECOMMND

the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

60.PLANNING. 12 USE- FEE STATUS

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Plot Plan No. 22271, 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. 13 USE - PALEO PRIMP & MONITOR

RECOMMND

Portions of this site is mapped in the County's General Plan as having a high potential for paleontological resources (fossils). Proposed project site grading/earthmoving activities could potentially impact this resource. HENCE:

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:

1.The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside to create and implement a project-specific plan for monitoring site grading/earthmoving activities (project paleontologist).

2.The project paleontologist retained shall review the approved development plan and grading plan and shall conduct any pre-construction work necessary to render appropriate monitoring and mitigation requirements as appropriate. These requirements shall be documented by the project paleontologist in a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP). This PRIMP shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit.

Information to be contained in the PRIMP, at a minimum and in addition to other industry standard and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, are as follows:

1.Description of the proposed site and planned grading operations.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 26

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 13

USE - PALEO PRIMP & MONITOR (cont.)

RECOMMND

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. * The County of Riverside must be consulted on the repository/museum to receive the fossil material prior to being curated.

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 project paleontologist and all other professionals responsible for the report's content (eg. Professional Geologist), as appropriate. Two wet-signed original copies of the report(s) 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 27

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

60. PRIOR TO GRADING PRMT ISSUANCE

60.PLANNING. 13 USE - PALEO PRIMP & MONITOR (cont.) (cont.) RECOMMND

Check staff, the Land Use Counter or any other County office. In addition, the applicant shall submit proof of hiring (i.e. copy of executed contract, retainer agreement, etc.) a project paleontologist for the in-grading implementation of the PRIMP.

TRANS DEPARTMENT

60.TRANS. 1 USE-SBMT/APPVD GRADG PLAN/TRAN RECOMMND

When you submit a grading plan to the Department of Building and Safety, a copy of the grading plan shall be submitted and approved by the Transportation Department prior to a grading permit issuance.

Submit required grading plan to the Transportation Department, Plan Check Section, 8th Floor, 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, CA.

60.TRANS. 2 USE - SIGHT DISTANCE RECOMMND

The street improvements on De Portola Rd shall meet the sight distance design requirements for 55 mile per hour speed criteria.

(ADDED AT PC ON 9/21/11)

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 - PERC TEST REQD RECOMMND

The applicant must provide a satisfactory detailed soils percolation test performed in accordance with the procedures outlined in the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health (DEH) Technical Guidance Manual.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 28

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.E HEALTH. 2 USE - SEPTIC PLANS

RECOMMND

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 (DEH) Technical Guidance 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.

80.E HEALTH. 3 USE - SSDS CERTIFICATION

RECOMMND

Certification of existing septic systems required. The certification must be completed by a C42 licensed contractor.

80.E HEALTH. 4 USE - FOOD PLANS REQD

RECOMMND

A total of three complete set of plans for each food establishment are needed including a fixture schedule, a finish schedule, and a plumbing schedule in order to ensure compliance with the California Uniform Retail Food Facilities Law and/or current regulations.

80.E HEALTH. 5 USE - RWQCB OK

RECOMMND

A clearance letter from the appropriate California Regional Water Quality Control Board is 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 29

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

80.FIRE. 2 USE-#4-WATER PLANS (cont.)

RECOMMND

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 MINOR REVIEW

RECOMMND

The scope of the District review will be limited to verification that this proposal has met its obligation under the County's municipal stormwater permit. A copy of the BMP improvement plans along with any necessary documentation shall be submitted to the Districts Plan Check Section for review. A copy of the improvement and grading plans shall be included for reference. The plans must receive the District's approval prior to issuance of 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.

80.FLOOD RI. 3 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&C.

80.PLANNING. 4 USE- CONFORM TO FLOOR PLANS

RECOMMND

Floor plans shall be in substantial conformance with that shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT B&C.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 30

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

80. PRIOR TO BLDG PRMT ISSUANCE

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 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 their requirements 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 nd the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan.

80.PLANNING. 21 USE- FEE STATUS

RECOMMND

Prior to issuance of building permits for Plot Plan No. 22271, 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. 22 USE - VINEYARD PLANTING

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, 14.71 net acres of the site shall be planted in vineyards.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 31

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

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 BUS PLAN

RECOMMND

The facility will require a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet or 500 pounds, or any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances.

90.E HEALTH. 2 USE - HAZMAT REVIEW

RECOMMND

If further review of the site indicates additional environmental health issues, the Hazardous Materials Management Division reserves the right to regulate the business in accordance with applicable County Ordinances.

90.E HEALTH. 3 USE - HAZMAT CONTACT

RECOMMND

Contact a Hazardous Materials Specialist, Hazardous Materials Management Division, at (951) 358-5055 for any additional requirements.

EPD DEPARTMENT

90.EPD. 1 MAP- MSHCP CONVEYANCE

RECOMMND

PRIOR TO FINAL BUILDING PERMIT INSPECTION OR PRIOR TO 180 DAYS FROM PROJECT APPROVAL THE FOLLOWING SHALL APPLY:
As determined through the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS file #1716), established by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, a total of 2.44 acres as shown on Exhibit "A" dated 05/07/07 and shown on PP22271 ammended #3 exhibit dated 06/19/09 and labled as Conservation Area shall be offered for dedication or via conservation easment to the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), as County directs or authorizes, and accepted by the RCA prior to issuance of any grading or building permit, whichever occurs first. Prior to acceptance of the offer of dedication by the RCA, the applicant shall submit a preliminary title report and

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 32

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.EPD. 1 MAP- MSHCP CONVEYANCE (cont.)

RECOMMND

Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the dedication acreage, to the RCA for its review and approval. The RCA shall have sole and absolute discretion with respect to the approval of the information contained in the preliminary title report and the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Title to the dedication acreage shall be free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, easements, leases (recorded and unrecorded) and taxes except those encumbrances and easements, which are in the sole discretion of the RCA are acceptable. Easements allowing for the management of fuel modification areas or detention basins shall not be accepted.

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.

90.FIRE. 2 USE-#12A-SPRINKLER SYSTEM

RECOMMND

Install a complete fire sprinkler system per NFPA 13 2010 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 33

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.FIRE. 3 USE-#35-VOICE FIRE ALARM

RECOMMND

Applicant or developer shall be responsible to install a manual and automatic pre-recorded VOICE Fire Alarm System. Plans must be submitted to the Fire Department for approval prior to installation.

90.FIRE. 4 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" (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. 5 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, e-mail 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 34

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.FLOOD RI. 2 USE BMP - EDUCATION (cont.)

RECOMMND

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.

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.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

90.PLANNING. 3 USE- PARKING PAVING MATERIAL

RECOMMND

A minimum of fourteen (14) parking spaces shall be provided as shown on the APPROVED EXHIBIT A, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Department. The parking area shall be surfaced to current standards as approved by the Department of Building and Safety. Twenty (20) overflow parking spaces shall also be provided as shown on APPROVED EXHIBIT A.

90.PLANNING. 4 USE- ACCESSIBLE PARKING

RECOMMND

A minimum of two (2) 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 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 35

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 4 USE- ACCESSIBLE PARKING (cont.)

RECOMMND

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."

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. 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. 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. 15 USE- TRASH ENCLOSURES

RECOMMND

One (1) trash enclosure which is adequate to enclose a minimum of one (1) bin 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, architecturally enhanced, and shall be made with masonry block and 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

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 36

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 15 USE- TRASH ENCLOSURES (cont.)

RECOMMND

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. 16 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. 23 USE- SKR FEE CONDITION

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, or upon building permit final inspection, whichever comes first, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 663, which generally requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance.

The amount of the fee required to be paid may vary, depending upon a variety of factors, including the type of development application submitted and the applicability of any fee reduction or exemption provisions contained in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663. Said fee shall be calculated on the approved development project which is anticipated to be 20.01 acres (gross) in accordance with APPROVED EXHIBIT A. If the development is subsequently revised, this acreage amount may be modified in order to reflect the revised development project acreage amount. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

90.PLANNING. 24 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.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 37

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #:PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 27 USE- ORD 810 O S FEE (2)

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, or upon building permit final inspection prior to use or occupancy for cases without final inspection or certificate of occupancy (such as an SMP), whichever comes first, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County 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 and the aforementioned Condition of Approval. In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 810 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

90.PLANNING. 28 USE - ORD NO. 659 (DIF)

RECOMMND

Prior to the issuance of either a certificate of occupancy or prior to building permit final inspection, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, which requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in the Ordinance. Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 has been established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and installation of facilities and the acquisition of open space and habitat necessary to address the direct and cumulative environmental effects generated by new development project described and defined in this Ordinance, and 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, which shall mean the net area, measured in acres, from the adjacent road right-of-way to the limits of the project development.

In the event Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 is rescinded, this condition will no longer be applicable. However, should Riverside County Ordinance No. 659 be rescinded and superseded by a subsequent mitigation fee ordinance, payment of the appropriate fee set forth in that ordinance shall be required.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 38

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.PLANNING. 29 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 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 - TS/CENTER LANE FAIRSHARE

RECOMMND

De Portola Road shall ultimately be improved to have a two-way turn lane. The applicant shall pay the County of Riverside \$23,200 as its fair share of constructing the two-way turn lane within six (6) months of the approval of PP 22271 by the Board of Supervisors or prior to Final Inspection for any building or structure in PP 22271, whichever occurs first or as approved by the Director of Transportation.

90.TRANS. 2 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. 3 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 limit of construction at a grade and alignment as approved by the Riverside County Transportation Department.

10/04/11
11:19

Riverside County LMS
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Page: 39

PLOT PLAN:TRANSMITTED Case #: PP22271

Parcel: 927-280-036

90. PRIOR TO BLDG FINAL INSPECTION

90.TRANS. 3 USE - IMP PLANS (cont.)

RECOMMND

NOTE: Before you prepare the street improvement plan(s), please review the Street Improvement Plan Policies and Guidelines from the Transportation Department Web site: www.rctlma.org/trans/land_dev_plan_check_guidelines.html.

90.TRANS. 4 USE - DEDICATION

RECOMMND

De Portola Road is a County maintained road and shall be improved with AC pavement tapering for a acceleration and deceleration lane at the project driveway entrance per County Standard No. 803, Ordinance 461, and as approved by the Director of Transportation.

- NOTE:
1. Edge of pavement returns at winery driveway entrance shall be constructed with 35 foot radius returns.
 2. No parking signs shall be installed along De Portola Road as directed by the Transportation Department.

Hesterly, Kinika

From: Terilee [casacolibri@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 5:14 PM
To: Hesterly, Kinika; Bowie, Desiree; Syms Luna, Carolyn; Neal, Greg; Mares, David
Cc: Stone, Jeff; Johnson, George; Elisa; Paul; Terilee; Mehta-Cooper, Mitra
Subject: Re: PC Agenda Item 3.2, 9/21/11, PP 22271

Dear Ms. Hesterly:

I have read your reply and have the following remarks per item #:

2) Please explain what "valet parking" has to do with the overall number of spaces. The number of cars is the number of cars, regardless of who parks them. Perhaps the number of guests needs to be reduced to 75 if there is lack of adequate space for parking.

4) Requiring a business to comply with a certain dB level, whether it's 45 or 105, is NOT mitigation and this faulty practice needs to stop. This is a completely ineffective method to safeguard the well-being of neighboring properties. As I've said in the past for other projects lacking true mitigation, the term means to "avoid, minimize or reduce" an impact, not apply a violation after the impact has occurred. You have no idea what mitigation to consider/require for this project without a noise study. You are simply making assumptions, when in fact there exists a reasonable and valid assessment to reveal the facts of how this project will affect the area. Aren't the facts important?

5) You are again assuming there are no other forms or sources of noise if receptions are held indoors. This is simply false. I have outlined several sources which your department needs to consider. Sound will travel far and wide from the top of this property.

6) My request was for a number, not the vague term "significant". I am again requesting what exact number your department considers "significant".

And regarding my added comment that 50 events/year was excessive and should be decreased to 25, as is the case with most of the other DePortola wineries, needs to be seriously considered.

If as a planner, you cannot justify the need of a noise study for this project, situated literally on top of a huge hill, I believe there will be our answer to how your department intends to safeguard those who live here. I have zero confidence that this county knows how to effectively mitigate this very real impact.

Very disappointing, but not surprising.

Sincerely,
Terilee Hammett

From: "Hesterly, Kinika" <KHESTERL@rctlma.org>
To: 'Terilee' <casacolibri@verizon.net>; "Bowie, Desiree" <DBOWIE@rctlma.org>; "Syms Luna, Carolyn" <CLUNA@rctlma.org>; "Neal, Greg" <GNEAL@rctlma.org>; "Mares, David" <DMARES@rctlma.org>
Cc: "Stone, Jeff" <JESTONE@rcbos.org>; "Johnson, George" <GJOHNSON@rctlma.org>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 3:01 PM
Subject: RE: PC Agenda Item 3.2, 9/21/11, PP 22271

Hi Ms. Hammett,

Please see my responses to the items of concern you listed in the e-mail below. In addition to listing them here, I have also included my responses in the body of your e-mail.

1. The hours are being changed from 11 am - 5 pm to 10 am - 6 pm in an effort to be consistent with local tasting room hours of operation.
2. Parking will occur by valet for special occasions/events as indicated on the site plan. A condition of approval requiring valet parking for special occasions is being added to the project.
3. Although the applicant requested to operate the tasting room "by appointment only," this is not a requirement and the language "by appointment only" will be removed from the staff report materials, including the conditions of approval.
4. The applicant will be required to comply with decibel level requirements and conditions of approval addressing noise such as the condition of approval requiring special events to be held indoors with the exception of wedding ceremonies.
5. On July 14, 2010, staff was concerned about special occasions but because the special occasions are required to be held indoors (except for wedding ceremonies), noise from special occasions is no longer a concern.
6. Significant noise complaints will continue to be evaluated by Code Enforcement and the Riverside County Sheriff Department.

I will be providing your e-mail to the Planning Commission, at the public hearing tomorrow, for inclusion in the public record.

Thank you,

Kinika Hesterly - Urban Regional Planner IV
Riverside County Planning - 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92502 - Khesterl@rctlma.org
(951) 955-1888 phone - (951) 955-1811 fax

Please Note: Our office is closed every Friday.

From: Terilee [mailto:casacolibri@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 11:00 AM
To: Hesterly, Kinika; Planning Commissioners; Syms Luna, Carolyn
Cc: Stone, Jeff; Terilee
Subject: PC Agenda Item 3.2, 9/21/11, PP 22271

Dear Ms. Hesterly:

I am writing with concerns with the above project, but first, I would like to bring to your attention that Wednesday's PC agenda was not posted for online review until this morning. It would be greatly appreciated for this info to be made available more readily for review by the public.

Items of concern with PP 22271:

1. Hours of Operation: Two different times are provided in the COA which need to be clarified: Either 11 to 5 or 10 to 6.

The hours are being changed from 11 am - 5 pm to 10 am - 6 pm in an effort to be consistent with local tasting room hours of operation.

2. 34 parking spaces does not seem adequate for 100 guests.

Parking will occur by valet for special occasions/events as indicated on the site plan. A condition of approval requiring valet parking for special occasions is being added to the project.

3. Wine tasting "by appointment" is not a functional requirement. I know for a fact that most "by appointment" wineries simply make the customer call ahead. Why does this winery have this, vs. being open 11-5/10-6? Is this to limit the number of customers? If so, it will not.

Although the applicant requested to operate the tasting room "by appointment only," this is not a requirement and the language "by appointment only" will be removed from the staff report materials, including the conditions of approval.

4. The Mitigated Negative Declaration for EA 41137 cannot be adequately proposed without a **noise study** for this project. This winery is literally on top of a hill, with a very high likelihood of noise transmission to neighboring residents. A noise study, approved by the Office of Industrial Hygiene, must be required. The applicant will be required to comply with decibel level requirements and conditions of approval addressing noise such as the condition of approval requiring special events to be held indoors with the exception of wedding ceremonies.

The statement "The public's health, safety and general welfare are protected through project design" cannot be valid without a noise study.

5. The statement "Special events remain an outstanding concern with Planning and staff is researching the process needed to allow special events at the property" can be resolved with a noise study. On July 14, 2010, staff was concerned about special occasions but because the special occasions are required to be held indoors (except for wedding ceremonies), noise from special occasions is no longer a concern.

6. As per info in EA 41137, pg. 31: The increase in ambient noise levels will include many aspects associated with this type of commercial use: Car doors slamming, car alarms beeping, loud/drunken conversations, etc. The noise pollution is not simply from the number of people, or music.

The Planning Dept. is commended on the requirement for only indoor special occasion events. The requirement of "no outdoor amplified sound" should also be required. And, a noise study is the only reliable way anyone, owners, planners and commissioners alike, will know just what impact this winery will have on the surroundings.

What is considered "a significant amount of excessive noise complaints"? Ten? Two?

This "recommended mitigation measure" is NOT true mitigation, but depends on actions by others once the impact has occurred. Complaints are not avoiding or lessening the impact; they are the result of the impact. Significant noise complaints will continue to be evaluated by Code Enforcement and the Riverside County Sheriff Department.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important concerns. Noise pollution will be the demise of this beautiful area if it is not thoroughly mitigated by all commercial land uses.

Sincerely,
Terilee Hammett
Glenoak Hills Representative
Wine Country Community Plan

Hesterly, Kinika

From: Elisa Niederecker [winecountryplanrep@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 8:36 PM
To: Hesterly, Kinika; George Johnson; Syms Luna, Carolyn; Neal, Greg
Subject: Fw: PC Agenda Item 3.2, 9/21/11, PP 22271

Ms Hesterly,

I am agreement with the points that Terilee has made in the previous emails. The County can not keep approving projects such as this one without the proper mitigation and consideration for neighboring properties. It is the responsibility of the County to protect the rights of all property owners not just the winey owners.

Respectfully,

Elisa Niederecker

Temecula Wine County Resident and Ad Hoc Committee Member

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Terilee <casacolibri@verizon.net>

To: "Hesterly, Kinika" <KHESTERL@rctlma.org>; "Bowie, Desiree" <DBOWIE@rctlma.org>; "Syms Luna, Carolyn" <CLUNA@rctlma.org>; "Neal, Greg" <GNEAL@rctlma.org>; "Mares, David" <DMARES@rctlma.org>

Cc: "Stone, Jeff" <JESTONE@rcbos.org>; "Johnson, George" <GJOHNSON@rctlma.org>; Elisa <winecountryplanrep@yahoo.com>; Paul <twcr@me.com>; Terilee <casacolibri@verizon.net>; Mitra <mmehta@rctlma.org>

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 5:14 PM

Subject: Re: PC Agenda Item 3.2, 9/21/11, PP 22271

Dear Ms. Hesterly:

I have read your reply and have the following remarks per item #:

2) Please explain what "valet parking" has to do with the overall number of spaces. The number of cars is the number of cars, regardless of who parks them. Perhaps the number of guests needs to be reduced to 75 if there is lack of adequate space for parking.

4) Requiring a business to comply with a certain dB level, whether it's 45 or 105, is NOT mitigation and this faulty practice needs to stop. This is a completely ineffective method to safeguard the well-being of neighboring properties. As I've said in the past for other projects lacking true mitigation, the term means to "avoid, minimize or reduce" an impact, not apply a violation after the impact has occurred. You have no idea what mitigation to consider/require for this project without a noise study. You are simply making assumptions, when in fact there exists a reasonable and valid assessment to reveal the facts of how this project will affect the area. Aren't the facts important?

5) You are again assuming there are no other forms or sources of noise if receptions are held indoors. This is simply false. I have outlined several sources which your department needs to consider. Sound will travel far and wide from the top of this property.

6) My request was for a number, not the vague term "significant". I am again requesting what exact number your department considers "significant".

And regarding my added comment that 50 events/year was excessive and should be decreased to 25, as is the case with most of the other DePortola wineries, needs to be seriously considered.

Hesterly, Kinika

From: Erin Kinney [avocadoerin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 6:52 PM
To: Hesterly, Kinika; Syms Luna, Carolyn
Subject: Comments for PP24771 Agenda item 3.2

RE: PP24771

GBV Winery, De Portola Rd Temecula

Dear Kinika, Planning Director and Commissioners ,

My husband and I live above this winery and we have a line of sight to the property. We are aware of many nearby residents who are being chased out of their homes by "bar like" noise (from other wineries) and also noise from events. We are very concerned that we could experience the same issues with this winery since it is close to us. We recommend a thorough review of the conditions here and we have a few concerns and request some changes/additions.

10.PLANNING 008

We request this be changed to 9pm. There is alot of loud noise associated with everyone preparing to leave a party, car alarms and lots of bar like noise (and it takes time for everyone to depart). The Planning Department is not taking this into consideration. The loud noise goes way past the 10pm mark and this is not acceptable in a residential area.

10.PLANNING 022

Noise monitoring should be done by the Office of Industrial Hygiene, not Code Enforcement. Code Enforcement is still using their personal observations for compliance rather than science. We request an acoustical study be required for GBC Winery. It is well known that you can hear little at 200 ft and alot at 800 ft depending on the terrain. This winery sits on top of a hill similar to Oak Mountain Winery (where there are severe noise issues for the neighbors). The Office on Industrial Hygiene is the only qualified department to address this.

We request no outdoor music anytime (except for wedding ceremony) and doors must be kept closed when there is indoor music. Masia De Yabar Winery conditions read: "no amplified music (live or recorded) may be held outdoors. All special events shall be held within the proposed tasting room." We request the same conditions for GBV. Although this project is conditioned to not allow events outdoors except wedding ceremony's. This will not protect residences nearby from the wine tasting "bar noise" on a patio which is experienced by many homeowners now. A good example would be Oak Mountain Winery where one neighbor has to leave their home nearly every weekend during the summer due to the screaming, yelling, laughing, loud music, and car alarms associated with the partying atmosphere. An acoustical study was recommend by Planning Dept for Oak Mountain but was never done. Lets raise the bar now, require an acoustical study and avoid the problem in the first place. Not wait and see and rely on a code enforcement action that provides no mitigation.

How can you say that "The public's health, safety and general welfare are protected through project design", when the project was built without permits and Planning had no part in the design?

10.PLANNING 039 The conditions show 50 events per year. We recommend 25 events as is the case with Frangipani Winery, Oak Mountain, Masia De Yabar and Cougar Winery. The residences that will be stuck in the new "commercial winery zone" after the new plan is adopted need to be protected, not driven out of their homes.

10.TRANS 005 This project needs to have a left hand turning lane as originally required by Transportation Department. De Portola Rd is in dire need of safety standards being upheld. George Johnson stated at the recent community meeting in Temecula City Hall that left hand turning lanes would be required for Wineries on De Portola Rd. We are requesting a left hand turning lane for public safety.

20.PLANNING 003 As in Fazelli Winery COA's. We would like to see the "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 may be further

restricted." This should not be addressed by Code Enforcement as it states in the current conditions. And there needs to be a trigger mechanism for this so it actually happens.

Regards,

Herbert and Erin Kinney

41925 Avenida Ortega, Temecula

Hesterly, Kinika

From: Erin Kinney [avocadoerin@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 9:00 AM
To: Hesterly, Kinika
Subject: PP22271

Hello Kinika,

I have a question about one of the conditions on this permit.

Condition trans 005:

"Sight distance at the intersection of the driveway at DePortola Road meets the 45 mph design speed for DePortola Road."

De Portola rd is posted 55 MPH, not 45 mph. At 55 mph the sight distance would need to be much greater. A wrong calculation puts the driving public at great risk. Could you please elaborate on why you are using 45mph instead of 55 mph?

Thank you,

Erin Kinney

September 20, 2011

Ms. Kineka Hesterly
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 95th Floor
Riverside, CA

VIA EMAIL TO : KHESTERL@rctlma.org

Dear Ms. Hesterlie,

My husband, Brian Brady and I are next door neighbors to Gershon Bachus Vintners (GBV.) Our 10 acre property sits next to GBV, and our residence is directly below their villa. We have been home for most of their wedding events over the past 3.5 years.

We have been acquainted with Ken and Christina Falik, of GBV, since the completion of their project in 2007, and we have found them to be extremely thoughtful and conscientious when it comes to being good neighbors and members of the community. We have been home, both inside and out on our patio, and we do not hear any loud music from their property during their weddings. The ceremonies occur outside between 4:00 and 5:30, and there is usually an hour-long cocktail hour on their back patio, which is directly above our house. We have never experienced any disruptive noise even when the group is outside. The majority of the party is inside their reception room by 7:00 p.m. and we haven't noticed noise during that time either. The Faliks personally attend every wedding and sit on the patio to monitor everything.

Ken and Christina have been very gracious and friendly to us and everyone in the neighborhood, and they go out of their way to ensure that our privacy is maintained. They always notify us in advance when they are having a wedding. In the unlikely event that we are ever disturbed, they have given us their personal cell numbers to call. Christina is the coordinator for every event, and she is very diligent about making sure that all details are addressed, and that the party is contained.

Their tasting room has never been any issue. They have a seated tasting, and they hold maybe 30 people. They post the days they are open for tastings, and they close with a sign when they are hosting an event. They do not welcome party buses; therefore, we have never witnessed any bad behavior from their property.

I have been wine tasting at GBV on several occasions, and it is a well orchestrated and classy one-on-one experience. Ken and Christina are almost always there.

Sincerely,



Carol Lee Brady
37850 De Portola Road
Temecula, CA 92529

Hesterly, Kinika

Subject: FW: Gershon Bachus zone change

From: Susan Clay [<mailto:sclay@verizon.net>]

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 1:56 PM

To: Bowie, Desiree

Subject: Gershon Bachus zone change

Ms. Bowie,

I do not agree that the zoning change should be approved. The surrounding area is zoned residential and currently the Oak Mountain Winery is causing many problems with residents. The county needs to stop allowing wineries to be plopped down in existing residential areas. The winery has been operating a tasting room illegally and now the county is accommodating them. This is not right. Also the county continues to impose conditions of approval that they don't enforce. Everything looks good on paper but the conditions are not implemented. An example of this is the condition that the winery provide acceleration and deceleration lanes on de Portola. There is no timeframe indicated in the conditions of approval as to when this should occur. These same conditions have been put on other wineries but have never materialized. No more wineries with tasting rooms and special events should be allowed until the county demonstrates that it will enforce the conditions it has imposed.

Susan Clay

**COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT REVIEW
INITIAL CASE TRANSMITTAL
RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - RIVERSIDE
P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409**

DATE: November 28, 2006

TO:

Transportation Dept.
Environmental Health Dept.
Flood Control District
Fire Department
Dept. of Bldg. & Safety (Grading)
Dept. of Bldg. & Safety (Vasquez)
Regional Parks & Open Space Dist.
Co. Geologist
Environmental Programs Dept.
P.D. Trails Coordinator – J. Jolliffe
Rod Kahura – South County # 5158
Commissioner Petty

Supervisor Stone
Co. Waste Management Dept.
Co. Sheriff's Office
Rancho Calif. Water Dist.
Southern Ca. Edison Co.
Southern Ca. Gas Co.
EIC "Attachment A"
Riverside Transit Agency
Pechanga Band of Indians
Temecula Valley Wine Growers Assoc.
Temecula Agricultural Conservancy – P. Bailly

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 – EA41137 – Applicant: Kenneth and Christina Falik – Engineer/Representative: Hall & Foreman Inc. - Third Supervisorial District – Rancho California Zoning Area - Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road, northerly of Oak Mountain Road, and southerly of Galway Downs Drive. – 20 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) - **REQUEST:** A change of zone from Residential Agriculture 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Light Agriculture 5 Acre Minimum (A-1-5), and the conversion of the ground floor/garage of an existing residence into a public winery and tasting room. – APN: 927-280-036 - Related Cases: HANS00375 - Concurrent Cases: NONE

Please review the attached exhibit(s) for the above-described project. This case is scheduled for a **CPR meeting on December 14, 2006**. 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 / **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.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Planning Department

Ron Goldman · Planning Director

Set ID# CC004042

**APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE
RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**

SECTIONS I, II, AND VI BELOW MUST BE COMPLETED FOR ANY AMENDMENT TO THE AREA PLAN MAPS OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

FOR OTHER TYPES OF AMENDMENTS, PLEASE CONSULT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF FOR ASSISTANCE PRIOR TO COMPLETING THE APPLICATION.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: PP 22271 GPA 01107 DATE SUBMITTED: 9/20/10

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name Christina Faulk E-Mail: christina@kencocompany.com

Mailing Address: 669 Fontana Way Laquea Park CA 92651
Street

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (949) 497 6090 Fax No: (949) 497 1870

Engineer/Representative's Name: N/A E-Mail: _____

Mailing Address: _____
Street

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: () Fax No: ()

Property Owner's Name: Christina Faulk E-Mail: Same

Mailing Address: Same as above
Street

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (949) 497 6090 Fax No: (949) 497-1870

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.

EA 41137 / CFG04532 / 0207444

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.


AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary. Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of your application, you will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be NO refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

CHRISTINA E KENNETH FAUK

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT



SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.


All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

CHRISTINA FAUK

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

KENNETH FAUK

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)



SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the subject property is owned by persons who have not signed as owners above, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s):

927-280-036

Section:

Township:

Range:

Double Ranch

Approximate Gross Acreage:

20

General location (nearby or cross streets): North of Pulgas Creek Rd, South of Galaway Downs East of de Portola, West of Finca Verde

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Thomas Brothers map, edition year, page number, and coordinates: Riverside 2005 Pg 90074

Existing Zoning Classification(s): RA 10

Existing Land Use Designation(s): Residential ag - RR

Proposal (describe the details of the proposed general plan amendment):

Change area to C-V to comply with submitted
plot plan 22271.
to be included in the C-V policy area

Related cases filed in conjunction with this request:

Prior zone request change NO. 7444 for A-1
now needs to be CV for events
Winery PP has been submitted

Has there been previous development applications (parcel maps, zone changes, plot plans, etc.) filed on the project site? Yes ☒ No ☐

Case Nos. PP 22271 / zone 7444

E.A. Nos. (if known) 42171 E.I.R. Nos. (if applicable): 524

Name of Company or District serving the area the project site is located (if none, write "none.")		Are facilities/services available at the project site?	
		Yes	No
Electric Company	<u>SC&E</u>	☒	☐
Gas Company	<u>SC&E</u>	☒	☐
Telephone Company	<u>Verizon</u>	☒	☐
Water Company/District	<u>Rancho Cal Water</u>	☒	☐
Sewer District	<u>on site disposal</u>	☐	☒

Is water service available at the project site: Yes ☒ No ☐

If "No," how far away are the nearest available water line(s)? (No. of feet/miles) _____

Is sewer service available at the site? Yes ☐ No ☒

If "No," how far away are the nearest available sewer line(s)? (No. of feet/miles) _____

Is the project site located in a Recreation and Park District or County Service Area authorized to collect fees for park and recreational services? Yes ☐ No ☒

Is the project site located within 8.5 miles of March Air Reserve Base? Yes ☐ No ☒

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Which one of the following watersheds is the project site located within (refer to Riverside County GIS for watershed location)? (Check answer):

☐ Santa Ana River ☒ Santa Margarita River ☐ San Jacinto River ☐ Colorado River

HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the applicant for any development project to consult specified state-prepared lists of hazardous waste sites and submit a signed statement to the local agency indicating whether the project is located on or near an identified site. Under the statute, no application shall be accepted as complete without this signed statement.

I (we) certify that I (we) have investigated our project with respect to its location on or near an identified hazardous waste site and that my (our) answers are true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge. My (Our) investigation has shown that:

☒ The project is not located on or near an identified hazardous waste site.

☐ The project is located on or near an identified hazardous waste site. Please list the location of the hazardous waste site(s) on an attached sheet.

Owner/Representative (1) _____ Date _____

Owner/Representative (2) _____ Date _____

NOTE: An 8½" x 11" legible reduction of the proposal must accompany application.

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE AREA PLAN MAPS OF THE GENERAL PLAN:

AREA PLAN MAP PROPOSED FOR AMENDMENT (Please name):

General Plan

EXISTING DESIGNATION(S): RR-5

PROPOSED DESIGNATION(S): CW-10

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

JUSTIFICATION FOR AMENDMENT (Please be specific. Attach more pages if needed.)

The General Plan Wine Country 2020 will include our site. We are adjacent now to CV zone and have been working with the County since 2006 to be approved as a winery, tasting room w/ special events. Initially we were told to change zone to A-1-10 for winery which would allow us to have a tasting room, winery and events. All zone changes submitted to the County referenced this intent. We were advised recently that only CV zone will allow these activities and we must amend General Plan to include us in the CV zone.

See Attachments

III. AMENDMENTS TO POLICIES: -See Attachments

(Note: A conference with Planning Department staff is required before application can be filed. Additional information may be required.)

A. LOCATION IN TEXT OF THE GENERAL PLAN WHERE AMENDMENT WOULD OCCUR:

Element: _____ Area Plan: Southwest Area Plan

B. EXISTING POLICY (If none, write "none." (Attach more pages if needed): Valle de los Caballos -

C. PROPOSED POLICY (Attach more pages if needed): Will include 37750 de Artale in the CV zone.

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

D. JUSTIFICATION FOR CHANGE (Please be specific. Attach more pages if needed):

Plot Plan has been in progress since 11/2006 for a winery, tasting room w/ events. We are in proposed wine country community plan #1077, change of zone T111 which is scheduled for approval.

* Please see attachments

IV. OTHER TYPES OF AMENDMENTS:

(Note: A conference with Planning Department and/or Transportation Department staff for amendments related to the circulation element is required before application can be filed. Additional information may be required.)

A. AMENDMENTS TO BOUNDARIES OF OVERLAYS OR POLICY AREAS:

Policy Area:

(Please name)

Proposed Boundary Adjustment (Please describe clearly):

B. AMENDMENTS TO CIRCULATION DESIGNATIONS:

Area Plan (if applicable):

Road Segment(s)

Existing Designation:

Proposed Designation:

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

C. JUSTIFICATION FOR AMENDMENT (Please be specific. Attach more pages if needed):

See attachment

V. CASE INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT:

FILING INSTRUCTIONS FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION

The following instructions are intended to provide the necessary information and procedures to facilitate the processing of a Land Use application. Your cooperation with these instructions will insure that your application can be processed in the most expeditious manner possible.

THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FILING PACKAGE MUST CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING:

- ✓1. One completed and signed application form.
- ✓2. One copy of the current legal description for each property involved as recorded in the Office of the County Recorder. A copy of a grant deed of each property involved will suffice.
- NA 3. If any of the properties involved do not abut a public street, a copy of appropriate documentation of legal access (e.g. recorded easement) for said property shall be provided.
- ✓4. For applications to amend Area Plan Maps, forty (40) copies of Exhibit "A" (Site Plan). The exhibit must include the information described below. All exhibits must be folded no larger than 8½' x 14.'
- ✓5. One (1) recent (less than one-year old) aerial photograph of the entire Project Site with the boundary of the site delineated.
- ✓6. Two 8½" x 11" photocopies of a U. S. Geological Survey Quadrangle Map delineating the Site boundaries (Note: each photocopy must not have been enlarged or reduced, have a North arrow, scale, quadrangle name, and Section/Township/Range location of the site.)
- ✓7. A minimum of three (3) ground-level panoramic photographs (color prints) clearly showing the whole project site. Include a locational map identifying the position from which the photo was taken and the approximate area of coverage of each photograph.
- 8. Digital images of the aerial photograph, Exhibit A (Site Plan), the U.S.G.S. Map, and the panoramic photographs of the site in a format acceptable to the Planning Department (e.g. TIFF, GIF, JPEG, PDF)
- ✓9. Deposit-based fees for the General Plan Amendment, and Environmental Assessment deposit-

PP22271

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Planning Department
Robert C. Johnson Planning Director

APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ZONE

CHECK ONE AS APPROPRIATE:

☒ **Standard Change of Zone**

CCDD 4042

There are three different situations where a Planning Review Only Change of Zone will be accepted:

- ☐ **Type 1:** Used to legally define a Planning Area within a Specific Plan.
☐ **Type 2:** Used to change a SP zoning ordinance text within a Specific Plan.
☐ **Type 3:** Used when a Change of Zone application was conditioned for in a prior application

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: C207444 DATE SUBMITTED: 11-2-06

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: HALL & FOREMAN INC. E-Mail: dlohmfinc.com

Mailing Address: THREE BETTERWORLD CIRCLE, SUITE 200
TEMECULA CA 92590
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 294-9300 Fax No: (951) 294-9301

Engineer/Representative's Name: SAME AS ABOVE E-Mail: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (_____) _____ Fax No: (_____) _____

Property Owner's Name: KENNETH FALIK & CHRISTINE FALIK E-Mail: KENNETH@KENCOCOMPANY.com

Mailing Address: 37750 DE PORTOLA
TEMECULA CA 92592
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 693-9151 Fax No: (_____) _____

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.

EA41137 / CFG04532

APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ZONE

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary. Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of your application, you will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be NO refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

DONALD O. LOHR

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT



SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

KENNETH FALIK

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)



SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

CHRISTINE FALIK

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)



SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 927-280-036

Section: _____ Township: A PORTION OF THE PAUBA RANCHO

Range: _____

Approximate Gross Acreage: 20.01 AC

General location (street address, cross streets, etc.): North of PULGAS CREEK ROAD, South of

GALWAY DOWNS DR., East of DE PORTOLA ROAD, West of AVENIDA VERDE

Thomas Brothers map, edition year, page number, and coordinates: 960 E-4

APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ZONE

Proposal (describe the zone change, indicate the existing and proposed zoning classifications. If within a Specific Plan, indicate the affected Planning Areas):

EXISTING ZONING RA-10 PROPOSED ZONING A-1 -5

Related cases filed in conjunction with this request:

A WINERY PLOT PLAN HAS CURRENTLY BEEN SUBMITTED

C207444

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Planning Department
Robert C. Johnson Planning Director

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

CHECK ONE AS APPROPRIATE:

CC004042

☒ PLOT PLAN ☐ CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT ☐ TEMPORARY USE PERMIT
☐ REVISED PERMIT ☐ PUBLIC USE PERMIT ☐ VARIANCE

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

CASE NUMBER: PP22271 DATE SUBMITTED: 11-2-06

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: HALL & FOREMAN INC E-Mail: dlohr@hfinc.com

Mailing Address: THREE BETTERWORLD CIRCLE, SUITE 200
TEMECULA CA 92590
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 294-9300 Fax No: (951) 294-9301

Engineer/Representative's Name: SAME AS ABOVE E-Mail: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (_____) _____ Fax No: (_____) _____

Property Owner's Name: KENNETH FALIK & CHRISTINE FALIK E-Mail: KENNETH@KENCOCOMPANY.COM

Mailing Address: 37750 DE PORTOLA
TEMECULA CA 92592
City State ZIP

Daytime Phone No: (951) 693-9151 Fax No: (_____) _____

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate page that reference the application case number and lists the names, mailing addresses, and phone numbers of all persons having an interest in the real property or properties involved in this application.

The Planning Department will primarily direct communications regarding this application to the person identified above as the Applicant. The Applicant may be the property owner, representative, or other assigned agent.

EA 41137 / CFG-04532

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONCURRENT FEE TRANSFER

The signature below authorizes the Planning Department and TLMA to expedite the refund and billing process by transferring monies among concurrent applications to cover processing costs as necessary. Fees collected in excess of the actual cost of providing specific services will be refunded. If additional funds are needed to complete the processing of your application, you will be billed, and processing of the application will cease until the outstanding balance is paid and sufficient funds are available to continue the processing of the application. The applicant understands the deposit fee process as described above, and that there will be NO refund of fees which have been expended as part of the application review or other related activities or services, even if the application is withdrawn or the application is ultimately denied.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

DONALD O. LOHR

PRINTED NAME OF APPLICANT

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

AUTHORITY FOR THIS APPLICATION IS HEREBY GIVEN:

I certify that I am/we are the record owner(s) or authorized agent and that the information filed is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. An authorized agent must submit a letter from the owner(s) indicating authority to sign the application on the owner's behalf.

All signatures must be originals ("wet-signed"). Photocopies of signatures are **not** acceptable.

KENNETH FALIK

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

CHRISTINE FALIK

PRINTED NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

If the property is owned by more than one person, attach a separate sheet that references the application case number and lists the printed names and signatures of all persons having an interest in the property.

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 927-280-036

Section: A PORTION OF THE PAUBA RANCHO
Township: _____ Range: _____

Approximate Gross Acreage: 20.01 AC

General location (street address, cross streets, etc.): North of PULGAS CREEK ROAD, South of GALWAY DOWNS DRIVE, East of DE PORTOLA ROAD, West of AVENIDA VERDE.

Thomas Brothers map, edition year, page number, and coordinates: 960 E-4

Proposal (describe project, indicate the number of proposed lots/parcels, units, and the schedule of the subdivision, Vesting Map, PRD):

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

DEVELOP A WINERY AND TASTING ROOM IN THE GROUND FLOOR OF AN EXISTING
RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURE.

Related cases filed in conjunction with this request:

NONE

HANS00375

Is there a previous development application filed on the same site: Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, provide Case No(s). _____ (Parcel Map, Zone Change, etc.)

E.A. No. (if known) _____ E.I.R. No. (if applicable): _____

Have any special studies or reports, such as a traffic study, biological report, archaeological report, geological or geotechnical reports, been prepared for the subject property? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, indicate the type of report(s) and provide a copy: _____

Is water service available at the project site: Yes ☒ No ☐

If "No," how far must the water line(s) be extended to provide service? (No. of feet/miles) _____

Is sewer service available at the site? Yes ☐ No ☒

If "No," how far must the sewer line(s) be extended to provide service? (No. of feet/miles) SEPTIC

Will the proposal result in cut or fill slopes steeper than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet? Yes ☐ No ☒

How much grading is proposed for the project site?

Estimated amount of cut = cubic yards: -0-

Estimated amount of fill = cubic yards -0-

Does the project need to import or export dirt? Yes ☐ No ☒

Import _____ Export _____ Neither _____

What is the anticipated source/destination of the import/export?

N/A

What is the anticipated route of travel for transport of the soil material?

N/A

APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

How many anticipated truckloads? N/A truck loads.

What is the square footage of usable pad area? (area excluding all slopes) _____ sq. ft.

Is the development proposal located within 8½ miles of March Air Reserve Base? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, will any structure exceed fifty-feet (50') in height (above ground level)? Yes ☐ No ☐

Does the development project area exceed more than one acre in area? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, in which one of the following watersheds is it located (refer to Riverside County GIS for watershed location)?

Check answer:

☐ Santa Ana River

☒ Santa Margarita River

☐ San Jacinto River

☐ Colorado River

HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the applicant for any development project to consult specified state-prepared lists of hazardous waste sites and submit a signed statement to the local agency indicating whether the project is located on or near an identified site. Under the statute, no application shall be accepted as complete without this signed statement.

I (we) certify that I (we) have investigated our project with respect to its location on or near an identified hazardous waste site and that my (our) answers are true and correct to the best of my (our) knowledge. My (Our) investigation has shown that:

☒ The project is not located on or near an identified hazardous waste site.

☐ The project is located on or near an identified hazardous waste site. Please list the location of the hazardous waste site(s) on an attached sheet.

Owner/Representative (1) _____

Date 10-30-06

Owner/Representative (2) _____

Date _____

FOR HALL & FOREMAN, INC.

BJB ASSOCIATES
Brian J. Brady P.E.
37850 De Portola Road, Temecula CA 92592
Phone: 760-604-3471 Fax: 951-699-6635

July 12, 2010

County of Riverside
Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA

To whom it may Concern,

RE: PP22271
Geology/Planning

A condition of approval for PP22271 requires that a civil engineer certify that the property located at 37750 De Portola Road, Temecula, CA 92592 (originally approved in 2006 with all prior engineering and geology reports) is safe for the new intended use as a Winery/Tasting Room. Mr. Dave Jones, Riverside County Geology department has consented to waive any new reports since the footprint of the property has not changed since its original approval in 2006, as long as an engineer would sponsor the intended use.

As a matter of reference

Gunvant Thakkar submitted a grading plan. The county review letter required a qualitative stability evaluation on all cut slopes on-site. This report was provided by RGS Engineering Geology (Christopher Krall) in 2004, filed under APN 927-280-036 Parcel 1 of Parcel Map 4/12-13. The Riverside County Soil Report review BFR 031653 was dated 4/19/2004.

As per the telephone confirmation from Dave Jones to property owner Christina Falik on May 27, 2010, this letter will serve as my certification that the property located at 37750 De Portola Road, Temecula CA 92592 is safe and suitable for the intended use as a winery and tasting room without further study or geological reports.

Sincerely,



Brian J. Brady P.E.
BJBassociates@aol.com
Temecula, CA



**TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN
PLOT PLAN 22271
GERSHON BACHUS WINERY
May 2009**

1. *Introduction*

The purpose of this Traffic Management Plan is to describe the Gershon Bachus Winery operation as well as the points of access from Riverside County maintained roadways.

2. *Project Description / Location*

The site is located on De Portola Road just north of Pulgas Creek Road..

The project is on 20.01 gross acres and contains an existing two story residence. The garage area (3744 s.f.) of an existing single family home is being proposed as a Winery/Tasting room.

3. *Ingress/Egress*

The project takes access from De Portola Road which is designated a Mountain Arterial Highway. (Draft Standard No. 95). The street is currently paved to a width of 24 feet.

Access to the site is provided by a 24 ft. wide driveway which connects directly to De Portola Road.

The geometrics include 50-foot radii on either side of the 24-foot driveway joining the existing pavement for DePortola Road and include acceleration and deceleration lanes per Riverside County Standard No. 803.

This proposed connection detail is shown on Sheet 1 of Plot Plan 22271.

Sight distance at the intersection of the driveway at DePortola Road meets the 45 mph design speed for DePortola Road.

4. *Parking*

Onsite parking is in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 348, Section 18.12. A total of 14 parking spaces will be provided with two of these spaces designated as handicapped.

No traffic volume information is available on the County Web Site. We estimate an average daily trip count (both ways) to be 3000 trips per day.

5. *Hours of Operation / Average number Visitors*

The winery will be open for wine tasting by appointment only Friday through Sunday and some Holidays from 11:00am to 5:00pm.

The average number of visitors is 10-20 or 5-8 cars.

The average length of stay for wine tasting is 60 minutes.

The winery is operated by Mr. & Mrs. Ken Falik. The Faliks live part-time onsite and will be in residence during operational periods of the tasting room and winery.

6. *Special Events*

Proposed Special Events: Weddings, Wine pickup dates, Winemaker Dinners

Average Special Event visitors: 50-100 guests

Except for a 20 minute outdoor wedding, these events will be held indoors.

A. 50 events per year (Normal operations closed during events)

B. Mandatory valet parking for all guests

C. Continuous shuttle transportation provided to/from local hotels

D. Parked cars are stacked as needed

E. By appointment only

7. *Signage*

A winery sign is proposed at the entrance to the site.

A "stop" sign will be placed on the access driveway where the driveway meets DePortola Road. It will be located 60 feet east of the centerline of DePortola Road and 5 feet north of the edge of pavement for the driveway.



**Riverside County
Waste Management Department**

Hans W. Kernkamp, General Manager-Chief Engineer

December 27, 2006

Alisa Krizek, Project Planner
Riverside County Planning Department
9th Floor, CAC – P.O. Box 1409
Riverside, CA 92502-1409

RE: Plot Plan No. 22271 — Conversion of an Existing Residence into a Public Winery and Tasting Room

Dear Ms. Krizek:

The Riverside County Waste Management Department (Department) has reviewed the proposed project, located southerly of Galway Downs Drive, northerly of Oak Mountain Road, and easterly of De Portola Road in Rancho California. It 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 projects provide adequate area(s) for collecting and loading recyclable materials (i.e., paper products, glass and other recyclables).

The Department is recommending that the following conditions be made a part of any Conditions of Approval for the project:

1. **Prior to issuance of a building permit**, 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**, 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions, please call me at (951) 486-3283.

Sincerely,

Sung Key Ma, Planner

Enclosure: Initial Case Transmittal
Doc. #50199



Carolyn Syms Luna
Director

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Environmental Programs Department

June 21, 2007

Mr. & Mrs. Kenneth Falik
669 Fontana Way
Laguna, CA 92651

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Falik:

Re: JPR 07-05-21-01 Determination Letter – Partial Conservation
HANS No. 1716
Case No. PP22271
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 927-280-036


This letter is to inform you that the HANS determination for the subject property was forwarded to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) for Joint Project Review (JPR) pursuant to Section 6.6.2 of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). As stated on the attached "RCA JPR Review", the RCA has concurred with the County that partial conservation is described for this property (exhibit attached).

The Environmental Programs Department (EPD) will be calling you to schedule a HANS II meeting to determine if compensation is warranted as per Section 6.1.1 of the MSHCP. Negotiation of incentives must be concluded within 120 days. Notwithstanding, you may proceed with the planning process for the remainder of the property. Please note that this determination does not preclude compliance with any conditions incorporated into your final project approval.

If you have questions concerning the attached comments, please contact the EPD at (951) 955-6892.

Sincerely,

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT



Jared Bond
Ecological Resources Specialist

JB:mt

xc: Karin Watts-Bazan, Deputy County Counsel
Greg Neal, EPD
Ken Graff, RCA
Monica Thill, EPD
Sarah Lozano, RCA
Alisa Krizek, Planner

Environmental Programs Department – County of Riverside
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, California 92501 Phone: (951) 955-6097 Fax: (951) 955-0090



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 07 05 21 01

Date: 6/04/07

Project Information

Permittee: County of Riverside
Case Information: HANS 1716
Site Acreage: 20.0 acres
Portion of Site Proposed for
MSHCP Conservation Area: 2.44 acres

Criteria Consistency Review

Consistency Conclusion: *The project is consistent with both the Criteria and other Plan requirements.*

Data:

Applicable Core/Linkage: Constrained Linkage 24 and Proposed Core 7
Area Plan: Southwest Area Plan

APN	Sub-Unit	Cell Group	Cell
927-280-036	SU 3 – Vail Lake	C	6807 6808

Comments:

- Cell Group C will contribute to assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 24 as well as Proposed Core 7. The project site is located on the western edge of Core 7, and north of Proposed Constrained Linkage 24. Proposed Linkage 24 is comprised of the portion of Temecula Creek east of Redhawk Parkway and west of Pauba Road. This Linkage provides Habitat for wetland species and a connection to Core Areas in Wilson Valley. The Linkage is constrained by existing roadways and planned community Development. Proposed Core 7 is comprised of a mosaic of upland and wetland habitat types in the Vail Lake, Sage and Wilson Valley areas. The proposed large intact habitat blocks provide Live-In Habitat for a number of Planning Species and movement for species connecting to other Core Areas located in the Agua Tibia Wilderness, San Bernardino National Forest and Beauty Mountain Management Area.
- The dimensional data provided for Proposed Constrained Linkage 24 indicate a width ranging from 1,000 to 1,500 feet to the south of the property.
- The project site is located in Cell Group C. Conservation within this Cell Group will contribute to assembly of Proposed Core 7 and Proposed Constrained Linkage 24. Conservation within this Cell Group will focus on Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat along Temecula Creek and adjacent chaparral, coastal sage scrub, grassland, woodland and forest habitat. Areas conserved within this Cell Group will be connected to chaparral, coastal sage scrub, riparian scrub, woodland and forest habitat proposed for conservation in Cell Group D to the southeast



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 07052101

Date: 6/04/07

and to Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub habitat proposed for conservation in Cell #7134 to the southwest. Conservation within this Cell Group will range from 60%-70% of the Cell Group focusing in the southern and central portions of the Cell Group.

- d. The proposed project is developed with one single family residence and vineyards in the western half of the project site. The Permittee notes that the project is asking for commercial zoning to allow for sales of wine on site. No other disturbance or structures are reported to be part of the project. An area of undisturbed chaparral and sage scrub habitat located in the northeast portion of the parcel will contribute to Proposed Core 7 and is proposed for conservation, totaling approximately 2.4 acres. The location of the proposed project does not conflict with the Reserve Assembly objectives for this area. Therefore, with the 2.4 acre contribution, the project would not conflict with the Reserve Assembly in this area.

Other Plan Requirements

Data:

Section 6.1.2 – Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool Mapping Provided:

- Yes. The *MSHCP Compliance Report* prepared by Kidd Biological Consulting, dated January 27, 2007, indicates that the project does not support Riparian/Riverine/Vernal pool habitat or fairy shrimp habitat.

Section 6.1.3 – Narrow Endemic Plant Species Surveys Provided:

- Yes. The project site is located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area for Slender-Horned Spineflower and Many-stemmed dudleya. The project site is also located in the Criteria Area Species Survey Area for Nevin's Barberry, Vail Lake Ceanothus, and Round-leaved filaree.

Section 6.3.2 – Additional Species Surveys Provided:

- Yes. The project site is located in the Burrowing Owl Survey Area.

Section 6.1.4 – Guidelines Pertaining to Urban/Wildland Interface:

- Yes. The property is located near Conservation areas.

Comments:

- a. Section 6.1.2: According to the *MSHCP Compliance Report* prepared by Kidd Biological Consulting, dated January 27, 2007, "This site lacks riparian/riverine and vernal pool habitats. A blue-line stream is located one parcel to the north however it does not occur on site....nor does it receive any water from the subject property. This site is dominated by sandy soils and is situated on a fairly steep southwest



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 07.05.21.01

Date: 6/04/07

facing slope lacking suitable habitats such as vernal pools and other depressions suitable for the fairy shrimp." The project demonstrates compliance with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP.

- b. Section 6.1.3: The project site is located within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA) for Slender-Horned Spineflower and Many-stemmed dudleya. The project site is also located in the Criteria Area Species Survey Area (CASSA) for Nevin's Barberry, Vail Lake Ceanothus, and Round-leaved filaree. Based in the Kidd Report and information provided by the Permittee, there is no suitable habitat for the two NEPSSA species, nor is there suitable habitat fore the CASSA species. The site is reported to having sandy soils, does not have cryptogamic crusts or mature alluvial scrubs to support the Slender-Horned Spineflower, no gabbro soils and pyrozinite rich outcroppings to support the Vail Lake Ceanothus, nor alluvial washes for the Nevin's Barberry. The project demonstrates compliance with Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP.
- c. Section 6.3.2: The project site is located in the Burrowing Owl survey area. The Kidd report indicates that the site does not support "suitable nesting or foraging habitats for the burrowing owl. No owls or their sign (feathers, pellets, nest material, excrement, and tracks) were observed on site. The Permittee also indicates that the site does not support suitable small mammal burrows and that the existing vineyards on site do not provide suitable foraging habitat.
- d. Section 6.1.4: To preserve the integrity of areas dedicated as MSHCP Conservation Areas that are proposed to occur adjacent to development, the guidelines contained in Section 6.1.4 related to controlling adverse effects for development adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area should be considered by the Permittee in their actions relative to the project. Specifically, the Permittee should include as project conditions of approval the following measures:
 - i. Incorporate measures to control the quantity and quality of runoff from the site entering the MSHCP Conservation Area. In particular, measures shall be put in place to avoid discharge of untreated surface runoff from developed and paved areas into MSHCP Conservation Areas.
 - ii. Land uses proposed in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area that use chemicals or generate bioproducts, such as manure, that are potentially toxic or may adversely affect wildlife species, habitat, or water quality shall incorporate measures to ensure that application of such chemicals does not result in discharge to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The greatest risk is from landscaping fertilization overspray and runoff.
 - iii. Night lighting shall be directed away from the MSHCP Conservation Area to protect species within the MSHCP Conservation Area from direct night lighting. Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in the MSHCP Conservation Area is not increased.
 - iv. Proposed noise-generating land uses affecting the MSHCP Conservation Area shall incorporate setbacks, berms, or walls to minimize the effects of noise on MSHCP Conservation Area resources pursuant to applicable rules, regulations, and guidelines related to land use noise standards.
 - v. Consider the invasive, non-native plant species listed in Table 6-2 of the MSHCP in approving landscape plans to avoid the use of invasive species for the portions of the project that are adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area. Considerations in reviewing the applicability of this list shall



RCA Joint Project Review (JPR)

JPR #: 07.05.21.01

Date: 6/04/07

include proximity of planting areas to the MSHCP Conservation Areas, species considered in the planting plans, resources being protected within the MSHCP Conservation Area and their relative sensitivity to invasion, and barriers to plant and seed dispersal, such as walls, topography, and other features.

- vi. Proposed land uses adjacent to the MSHCP Conservation Area shall incorporate barriers, where appropriate, in individual project designs to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or dumping into the MSHCP Conservation Areas. Such barriers may include native landscaping, rocks/boulders, fencing, walls, signage, and/or appropriate mechanisms.
- vii. Manufactured slopes associated with the proposed site development shall not extend into the MSHCP Conservation Area.

SNS

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 PLOT PLAN NO. 22271
From: Erin Kinney [avocadoerin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 1:23 PM
To: Hesterly, Kinika
Subject: CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 / PLOT PLAN NO. 22271
Attachments: SW09031021[1].pdf

Dear Kinika,

I am writing in response to a public hearing letter received last week. This was the only notification we received so far. We live in Glenoak Hills at 41925 Avenida Ortega. We are one of the closest neighbors to this project. We have several concerns. One is the 65db allowed until 10 pm. Residential zone allows for 45db maximum during the day and night. There is a reason for this, our quality of life.

Glenoak Hills is north east of all the wineries on De Portola. The breeze blows to us from the south west every day and evening. This creates a condition for sound to travel great distances and disturb the enjoyment of our homes. Right now we have 5 operating wineries on De Portola that we hear regularly and easily. Oak Mountain and Keyways being the loudest with their DJ's and outdoor music. All those wineries are allowed 50 plus events per year. That means that we could be potentially be looking at listening to 5 events every weekend year round. Also we have a professional/commercial motocross track just north of this parcel that contributes major noise to Glenoak Hills (I've attached Sheriff's report with sound measurements). The cumulative effect on the residents of this community is just not acceptable and more wineries are coming in the near future. We have no problem with wineries having events and making money and generally, we enjoy having them there. But the residents need to have more consideration when it comes to outdoor events and noise.

We recommend that the conditions of approval include OUTDOOR amplified music events be limited to 5 per year maximum and they must comply with the 65db at the property line during those events.


We also agree that De Portola is getting very busy and left hand turning lanes are a must. Leoness Winery which is just north of this winery is very dangerous without the left hand lane. There have been several accidents and we are always hearing screeching brakes in front of that winery. This will help put a stop the "build it now and ask permission from the County later" mentality that creates these problems in the first place.

Lastly is the runoff of dirt onto DePortola that ends up in front of Keyways. No doubt all the grading/clearing without approvals from all the wineries etc. is contributing to this mess and hope the conditions of approval help to address that matter.

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444 PLOT PLAN NO. 22271

Thank you for your time and we hope you take into consideration our unique community and it's residents.

Herbert and Erin Kinney



Herbert and
Erin Kinney
Property

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:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1107, CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 7444, PLOT PLAN NO. 22271 – Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration – Applicant: Christina Falik – Engineer/ Representative: Same as applicant- Third Supervisorial District - Rancho California Zoning Area – Southwest Area Plan: Rural: Rural Residential (RR) (5 Acre Minimum) – Location: Easterly of De Portola Road and Southerly of Camino Del Vino at 37750 De Portola Road, Temecula, CA 92592– 20.01 Gross Acres - Zoning: Residential Agriculture – 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) - **REQUEST:** The general plan amendment proposes to amend the General Plan Policy Area from Valle de los Caballos to Citrus/Vineyard for the subject site. The change of zone proposes to change the site's zoning classification from Residential Agricultural - 10 Acre Minimum (R-A-10) to Citrus/Vineyard (C/V). The plot plan proposes that the existing 7,829 square foot, two-story building, with a 3,456 square foot garage, be used as a winery, wine-sampling room, special occasion's facility and residence. The project proposes a maximum of fifty (50) special occasions and 34 parking spaces. – APN: 927-280-036. (Quasi-judicial)

TIME OF HEARING: **9:00 a.m.** or as soon as possible thereafter.
 September 21, 2011
 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, 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.

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 Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., 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

PROPERTY OWNERS CERTIFICATION FORM

I, VINNIE NGUYEN, certify that on 8/3/2011.

The attached property owners list was prepared by Riverside County GIS.

APN (s) or case numbers GPA01107/CZ07444/PP22271 For

Company or Individual's Name Planning Department.

Distance buffered 1200'.

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 2nd Floor

Riverside, Ca. 92502

TELEPHONE NUMBER (8 a.m. – 5 p.m.): (951) 955-8158

✓ 8/3/2011 *con*
Expires: 2/3/2012

1200 feet buffer



Selected Parcels

927-280-039	927-280-040	927-660-038	927-660-005	927-280-026	927-280-019	927-280-024	927-660-026	927-640-004	927-280-008
927-280-010	927-620-006	927-280-037	927-150-008	927-660-027	927-310-002	927-280-007	927-660-003	927-280-035	927-650-035
927-660-039	927-280-036	927-650-021	927-280-025	927-660-029	927-640-003	927-280-028	927-620-005	927-280-020	927-280-021
927-620-004	927-640-008	927-640-009	927-640-011	927-640-012	927-640-015	927-150-012	927-620-007		



1,200 600 0 1,200 Feet

Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.



ASMT: 927150008, APN: 927150008
JOHN BAIRD, ETAL
37555 DE PORTOLA RD
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927150012, APN: 927150012
TSM PROP
531 W HOLT BLVD
ONTARIO CA 91762

ASMT: 927280007, APN: 927280007
ALLEN SORCE, ETAL
37100 OAK MOUNTAIN RD
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927280010, APN: 927280010
FOXTAIL RANCH
C/O JAMES ARTHUR SORCE
37100 OAK MOUNTAIN RD
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927280019, APN: 927280019
CAROL BRADY, ETAL
37850 DE PORTOLA RD
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927280021, APN: 927280021
JANET TOBARI, ETAL
1630 W REDONDO BEACH 23
GARDENA CA 90247

ASMT: 927280024, APN: 927280024
DAVID HORVATH
38150 DE PORTOLA
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927280025, APN: 927280025
NICOLAS MAGANA, ETAL
38280 DEPORTOLA RD
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927280026, APN: 927280026
APRIL NOREN, ETAL
38200 DE PORTOLA RD
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927280028, APN: 927280028
ILSE DORE JOSWIG, ETAL
125 HOLLAND TRACE CIR
SIMPSONVILLE SC 29681

ASMT: 927280035, APN: 927280035
TAMMY LAMAGNA, ETAL
15 LITTLE LAKE RUN
OSSINING NY 10562

ASMT: 927280036, APN: 927280036
CHRISTINE FALIK, ETAL
400 S BEVERLY DR STE 214
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90212

ASMT: 927280037, APN: 927280037
HAROLD KEHLER
37000 E BENTON RD
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927280040, APN: 927280040
ADOBE LAND CO
525 PLAZA DEL SID
CHULA VISTA CA 91910



ASMT: 927310002, APN: 927310002
ERIN KINNEY, ETAL
41925 AVENIDA ORTEGA
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927620004, APN: 927620004
LEONESSE CELLARS, ETAL
C/O LEONESSE CELLARS
38311 DE PORTOLA RD
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927620005, APN: 927620005
JACQUELINE MORGAN, ETAL
P O BOX 894060
TEMECULA CA 92589

ASMT: 927620006, APN: 927620006
SUE CLEVELAND, ETAL
28665 TULITA LN
MENIFEE CA 92584

ASMT: 927620007, APN: 927620007
VINEYARDS OF GALWAY
C/O KEN ZIGNORSKI
35820 RANCHO CALIFORNIA
TEMECULA CA 92591

ASMT: 927640003, APN: 927640003
RENZONI VINEYARDS INC
37350 DE PORTOLA RD
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927640004, APN: 927640004
FAZELLI VINEYARD
8645 RESEARCH DR
IRVINE CA 92618

ASMT: 927640009, APN: 927640009
SUMMIT ASSOC LTD
5647 SASHABOW
CLARKSTON MI 48346

ASMT: 927650021, APN: 927650021
MACE FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST 2006
C/O THOMAS J MACE
36745 AVENIDA VERDE
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927660003, APN: 927660003
KARIANNE HAYES, ETAL
36520 VIA VERDE
TEMECULA, CA. 92592

ASMT: 927660005, APN: 927660005
HEATHER TURSKI, ETAL
37970 DE PORTOLA RD
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927660026, APN: 927660026
DENNIS PAULSON
36800 AVENIDA VERDE
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927660027, APN: 927660027
BENG OOI, ETAL
9 KINGS CT
VALLEY COTTAGE NY 10989

ASMT: 927660029, APN: 927660029
RITA ZEPPIERI, ETAL
P O BOX 2046
FALLBROOK CA 92088

ASMT: 927660038, APN: 927660038
BLANCA SAKHAPOUR, ETAL
33381 MORNING VIEW DR
TEMECULA CA 92592

ASMT: 927660039, APN: 927660039
JOHN SCHULER
P O BOX 892218
TEMECULA CA 92589

Centralized Correspondence,
Southern California Gas Company
P.O. Box 3150
San Dimas, CA 91773

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Rd.
P.O. Box 9017
Temecula, CA 92590-4800

ATTN: Phil Bailly
Temecula Agricultural Conservancy
33440 La Serena Way
Temecula, CA 92591

Applicant/Owner:
Christina & Kenneth Falik
669 Fontana Way
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Applicant/Owner:
Christina & Kenneth Falik
669 Fontana Way
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Cultural Resources Committee,
Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission
Indians
P.O. Box 2183
Temecula, CA 92593

ATTN: Michael McCoy
Riverside Transit Agency
1825 3rd St.
P.O. Box 59968
Riverside, CA 92517-1968

Temecula Wine Growers
P.O. Box 1601
Temecula, CA 92593

Eng-Rep:
Hall & Foreman, Inc.
Three Betterworld Circle #200
Temecula, CA 92590

Eng-Rep:
Hall & Foreman, Inc.
Three Betterworld Circle #200
Temecula, CA 92590

Eastern Information Center
Dept. of Anthropology
1334 Watkins Hall, University of
California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521-0418

Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Ave., Rm 312
P.O. Box 600
Rosemead, CA 91770





MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY



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, 12th Floor
 P. O. Box 1409
 Riverside, CA 92502-1409

FOR COUNTY CLERK'S USE ONLY

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

* REPRINTED * R0619854

4080 Lemon Street

Second Floor

Riverside, CA 92502

(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road

Suite A

Murrieta, CA 92563

(951) 600-6100

38686 El Cerrito Road

Palm Desert, CA 92211

(760) 863-8277

Received from: FALIK CHRISTINA

\$64.00

paid by: CK 16413/16479

paid towards: CFG04532 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE

CA FISH AND GAME FOR EA41137

at parcel #: 37750 DE PORTOLA RD TEM

appl type: CFG3

By _____ Nov 02, 2006 11:48
MGARDNER posting date Nov 02, 2006

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST: RECORD FEES	\$64.00

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

Additional info at www.rctlma.org

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
SPECIALIZED DEPARTMENT RECEIPT
Permit Assistance Center

* REPRINTED * R1108368

4080 Lemon Street
Second Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
(951) 955-3200

39493 Los Alamos Road
Suite A
Murrieta, CA 92563
(951) 600-6100

38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, CA 92211
(760) 863-8277

Received from: FALIK CHRISTINA \$2,044.00
paid by: CK 21310
paid towards: CFG04532 CALIF FISH & GAME: DOC FEE
CA FISH AND GAME FOR EA41137
at parcel #: 37750 DE PORTOLA RD TEM
appl type: CFG3

By _____ Aug 29, 2011 13:00
MGARDNER posting date Aug 29, 2011

Account Code	Description	Amount
658353120100208100	CF&G TRUST	\$2,044.00

Overpayments of less than \$5.00 will not be refunded!

Additional info at www.rctlma.org