PITTSBURGH (AP) — Shots fired at a house party in Pittsburgh early Sunday killed two 17-year-olds and wounded at least eight other people, police said.

Hundreds of people — the “vast majority” of them...
Two male gunshot victims died at the hospital. The Allegheny County Medical Examiner's Office identified them as Jaiden Brown and Mathew Steffy-Ross, both 17.

Eight people were also being treated for gunshot wounds, and others were injured trying to escape, Schubert said.

Two minors — had gathered at a short-term rental property when some kind of altercation occurred and shots were fired at around 12:30 a.m., Pittsburgh Police Chief Scott Schubert said at a midday news conference.

Schubert said there was gunfire both inside and outside the rental home, “and potentially back and forth.” Bullet casings found at the scene indicating handguns and one rifle were used, he said, and police
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windows. One victim was injured after a car was “shot up,” Schubert said.

George Stevens said he was outside a bar next door to the rental property smoking a cigarette when he heard what he thought were fireworks, then saw kids fleeing.

**BUSINESS**

On Tax Day, an extension may be better than rushing a return.

Biden to require US-made steel, iron for infrastructure.

Twitter says poison pill makes German bosses, unions jointly oppose.
Stevens told The Associated Press he let three girls hide in his vehicle and call their parents as bullets flew by. He said he saw someone inside the rental property holding a gun, as young people ran screaming and crying away from the building.

“It happened so quick,” he said. “It was just crazy. Kids were running everywhere.”

ShotSpotter indicated more than 90 rounds were fired, and Schubert said “we know there was a lot more than that between inside the structure and outside.” Police were processing evidence at as many as eight separate crime scenes spanning a few blocks around the rental home. Arriving officers found a “very chaotic” scene with injured victims,
foot and in vehicles, he said.

No arrests were immediately reported but Schubert said “it is our top priority to find out who did this and get them off the street.” He said he couldn’t comment on a possible motive, but he decried the number of illegal guns and too many people with access to them as well as the potent mixture of alcohol, drugs and guns.

“It’s heartbreaking; here we are at Easter and we have multiple families, two that won’t see a loved one,” Schubert said.

“Others that are going to be — how can you even have a holiday when your child was involved in something traumatic like this?”

Allegheny General Health reported that seven people were treated at Allegheny General
wounds or other injuries, but officials declined to release their conditions or other information.

Pittsburgh Public Schools will impose a limited lockdown Monday “out of an abundance of

Superintendent Wayne Walters said in a statement, meaning only people with scheduled appointments will be allowed into the district’s buildings.

Neighbor Mitchell Wilston, 30, told the AP that he and his wife weren’t at home during the shooting but before leaving saw the neighborhood
down the street and a line outside the rented home.

“It was so obvious that there was going to be a problem — there was a line of 14-year-old kids trying to get into this place,” he said. The house has been rented for bachelorette parties or other events before, or for families of baseball players due to its proximity to the stadium, but no problems had occurred, he said.

In the morning, Wilston said he found his wife’s white car smeared with blood, possibly from someone trying to hide behind the vehicle.

Airbnb spokesperson Ben Breit confirmed the house was rented through the company. He said the booker, who would have had to be 18 or older per Airbnb rules, has
party was thrown without the knowledge of the host, whose listing banned parties and advertised an overnight noise curfew. Breit said Airbnb was cooperating with authorities.

Pittsburgh Mayor Ed Gainey condemned the violence, which he attributed in part to a failure to get guns off the streets and provide adequate resources to communities. He said the city would call a meeting with a citywide approach to public safety.

“The time is now for us to move with a sense of urgency to bring justice to the victims and peace to our city,” Gainey, who is in isolation because of a recent COVID-19 exposure, said in a statement.
Philadelphia and Rebecca Reynolds in Louisville, Kentucky, contributed to this report.
2 minors dead, 8 wounded in shooting at Pittsburgh party | AP News
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Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street – 12th Floor
Riverside, Calif. 92502-1629

Dear Planners and District Supervisors:

This letter is in reference to the Short Term Rental Draft Ordinance 927.1. Our home is in the Riverside County Equestrian area of Temecula. I am concerned about Short Term Rentals in the Equestrian Area for the following reasons:

1. Many of the homes in this area have been developed as ranches and have various types of livestock and farm animals that are negatively impacted by excessive noise, heavy traffic, and wandering tourists.
2. Homes in our area are single family residences with septic systems that were designed and permitted to accommodate single family dwellings. Overuse can cause the septic systems to fail and pose health concerns.
3. There is no public water in this area. Homes have individual water wells. Some with limited water. Water consumption must be monitored.
4. Many of the homes in our area are remote and located on unmaintained or privately maintained dirt roads which cannot safely tolerate high traffic.
5. Remote properties can be exploited as unpermitted venues that can bring large numbers of unsupervised people into an area such as ours.

We had many problems with a STR/Event house next to our home. District Supervisor Washington, Planning Director Hildebrand, and Manny Acueto from Code Enforcement were very responsive and helped resolve our STR concerns. I sincerely hope that the new 927.1 Ordinance provides clear guidelines for STRS and protects homeowners.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Armstrong
37100 Eagle View Place
Temecula, Ca. 92592
I failed to attach this page with my letter (copied and stapled to this comment) 54045 in R3-A and not a commercial use with a residential dwelling - rather it is a commercial residence. It certainly alters the "resort nature" of the surroundings. Since I wrote last week, 54045 Pine Cir has run out of parking place. The past few days cars are parked along the road adjacent to my property (54042 PC).

Limit STR - expand long term rental opportunities - stop the internal industry hemorrhage - make Idyllwild once again a tourist destination rather than a town of tourists. D. Arey

Another point of view

DEAR EDITOR:

I would like to add another perspective on the current debate over short-term rentals (STRs).

The original ordinance regulating STRs was "introduced" Nov. 17, 2015, then passed, with changes, and without another reading, in January 2016. The revisions not read allowed street parking and waiving of occupancy limits, giving free rein to large groups using these homes. Our own Supervisor Chuck Washington signed the ordinance.

I find the justification the supervisors offered for the original 2016 Ordinance 927 questionable: "Regulation is more advantageous than an outright ban because short-term rentals support tourism and promote economic activity and can generate transient occupancy tax (TOT) revenue." It continues with "a short term rental qualifies as a hotel," that the tax will go to the General Fund, and "cannot be earmarked and dedicated to enforcing the proposed ordinance." So, the county saw this as an opportunity to justify an illegal activity so that it could collect tax revenue for its own discretionary use.

The activity was illegal because our R-1A zoning (which covers all homes in Idyllwild outside the central village core of R3-A and C-P-S) does not permit hotels. Hotels are permitted with planning review in both R3-A and C-P-S zones, which is where currently most, if not all, of our motels, hotel rooms and cabins are appropriately located.

Even the R3-A zone is protective of our tranquil environment. It was established, per the county, "to allow residents in mountainous resort areas...to combine limited commercial uses with a residential dwelling. It is the intent of the Board of Supervisors...that these limited commercial uses shall not alter or disturb the residential or resort nature of the premises or its surroundings."

It is shocking that the county, once concerned about R3-A mixed use "disturbing" the residential neighborhoods, now freely admits it is permissible to do so, by admitting in its proposed new STR ordinance that STRs have "adverse impacts on surrounding neighborhoods and properties including unpermitted large-scale events, excessive noise, disorderly conduct, traffic congestion, illegal vehicle parking and accumulation of refuse."

Since the county wants to "facilitate economic growth", the supervisors have turned all of Idyllwild into an R3-A or commercial zone so that investors from off the Hill can reap their financial rewards operating "hotels" absolutely anywhere, while local residents pay for that with their tranquility, as well as damaged property values.

Buyers are now asking if there are STRs adjacent to, or near, a home they are considering buying, and if so, they decline to buy. In appraisal, we call that external obsolescence, a decline in value caused by an outside influence over which one has no control.

I recommend rescission of the ordinance and demanding that the county maintain the relied-upon zoning protections which existed when we all bought our homes. Many nearby cities have done this, for example Cathedral City, La Quinta, Rancho Mirage and Palm Desert.

The planner handling it is asking for input from the community. He is Steve Jones, sjones@rivco.org.

PENELIPE SMEZ, MAI
REAL ESTATE APPRAISER
IDYLLWILD
Formerly a single-family home w/ adjacent detached garage w/ office or living space above.
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon St. 12th Floor
PO Box 1409
Riverside CA 92502-1409

To whom it may concern:

The current proposal and revisions for STR regulations has NO TEETH. While collecting the million+ dollars of TOT, the county ignores the impact on the community of Idyllwild. The community is fragile. Idyllwild was once a tourist destination, but sadly, it is disintegrating into a tourist town. All tourists, no townspeople. Restaurants and local businesses are understaffed. Locals who rent can no longer afford to live here and are experiencing evictions as real estate prices soar. STR properties have become a major industry rather than ancillary and secondary use of residential properties. To successfully minimize the impact of STR rentals in a neighborhood, the number of STR rentals must be limited and capped.

Please address the population density associated with STR properties in Idyllwild, California. I have an example: the property next door @ 54050 Pine Crest Avenue is one bedroom with a loft. Each have a queen bed. The garage was converted into another bedroom. It has a queen bed. A week ago, 5 cars were parked in the drive. At least 4 preteens were playing in the yard. This equates to a minimum of 9 people when the listing on VRBO specifies only 6 guests. This property has been a vacation rental since 2014 but just recently has the address appeared on the county short term rental list due to a complaint I made to Cindy Gosselin. Therefore, all infractions (loud parties, open fires on the wooden deck, etc) were not previously reported to the county hotline. This has been an ongoing issue for my neighbors and me. All STR properties must be available on the county list with county hotline available.
Due to the excess of STR properties, long term rentals are extremely hard to find. Directly across the street from 54050 Pine Crest on the corner of Pine Crest and Riverside County Playground Road (I cannot provide the house number as the sign was removed along with a dead tree) is a property that was once a single family dwelling with a detached garage. The garage had an apartment space above. When that property sold to a local realtor/developer, he made it into rental units. The main house now has at least 3 units, the garage converted to two apartments, and the upper garage apartments now number two. I took the attached photos early in the morning as these units house blue collar and service industry employees, many with children. Because long term rentals are few, obviously these units are shared by many. There are typically 16 cars/trucks parked overnight. Therefore, the single family residence now houses at least 16 adults plus a minimum of 3 children seen there regularly.

Please preserve the character of our neighborhoods. Please limit the number of STR properties. Increase penalties for operating a STR without a county application and approval. Create an ordinance with teeth. Make our community matter... before it ceases to be a community.

Sincerely,

Diane D'Arcy

PS: I have been a resident since 1972. Kay Ceniceros, former supervisor who was also a resident, would urge you to protect our beloved community of Idyllwild. Think beyond revenue. Think preservation.
Location

20731 Rio Linda Road
Temecula, CA 92590

Guest entrance on Tortuga Road

Our farm is just a beautiful twenty minute drive from Historic Old Town Temecula, or fifteen minutes from Bear Creek Golf Course.
Vacation Home Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect!
Temecula, 92590, United States of America – Great location - show map.
★★★★★ Rating: 8/10 · 3 reviews

How many bedrooms does have Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect! have?

How many guests can sleep at Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect!?

You visited this page on 2/6/22.

Contact - Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm

Location. 20731 Rio Linda Road Temecula, CA 92590. Guest entrance on Tortuga Road. Our farm is just a beautiful twenty minute drive from Historic Old Town ...

Our History - Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm

Heavenly Oaks was established on the truth of God's love and the joy that comes from blessing others. Our farm is nestled near the beautiful Santa Rosa Plateau ...

Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect! - Airbnb

Experience the tranquil hills of Temecula at this recently updated 4-bed, 2.5-bath farmhouse, located just under 11 miles from downtown.

You visited this page on 2/6/22.

Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect! - Evolve ...

Experience the tranquil hills of Temecula at this recently updated 4-bed, 2.5-bath farmhouse, located just under 11 miles from downtown.

★★★★★ 30 reviews

Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect!, Temecula

About the Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm - Picture Perfect! Location Temecula, CA 92590. Property Features. This vacation home ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL PERILS</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY PREMIUM for Section I and Section II Coverages Above</td>
<td>$20,034.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDITS AND DISCOUNTS (Included in policy premium above.)</td>
<td>$9,965.44 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details on the following page. (If applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER COVERAGE AND ENDORSEMENTS</td>
<td>$21.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms and Endorsements are printed on the following page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SURCHARGES AND TAXES (Shown below if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POLICY PREMIUM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Credits, Discounts, Optional Coverages, Endorsements, State Surcharges and Taxes</td>
<td>$20,055.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREMIUM DUE AT INCEPTION. THIS IS NOT A BILL. STATEMENT TO FOLLOW.

In witness whereof, this policy is signed on 07/01/21

James D Syring
President, USAA Reciprocal Attorney-in-Fact, Inc.

REFER TO YOUR POLICY FOR OTHER COVERAGES, LIMITS AND EXCLUSIONS.

ATTACH THIS DECLARATION TO PREVIOUS POLICY

HOCA-D1 (07-20)
Heavenly Oaks Flower Farm

Website  Directions  Save

1.0 ★  1 Google review
Wedding venue in Riverside County, California

Address: 44660 Tortuga Rd, Temecula, CA 92590

Phone: (951) 329-4338

Suggest an edit · Own this business?
From: Planning  
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 8:32 AM  
To: Hildebrand, John; Jones, Steven  
Subject: FW: Police: 2 Dead, Several Injured in Pittsburgh Party Shooting – NBC Los Angeles

Comments below.

Kind Regards,

TLMA-Planning Department  
P.O. Box 1409/4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, CA 92501-1409  
Ph: 951-955-3200 Mail Stop #1070  
Website: https://planning.rctlma.org  
Map My County: https://enterprisegis.rivcoca.org/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC  
Zone Descriptions: https://planning.rctlma.org/General-Plan-Zoning/Zone-Descriptions-Requirement  
Click on General Plan & Zoning link. You do not need to log into the system Frequently Asked Questions: https://planning.rctlma.org/General-Information/Frequently-Asked-Questions

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark Dean <mark.idyllwild@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Sunday, April 17, 2022 4:04 PM  
To: Planning <Planning@RIVCO.ORG>  
Cc: Becky Clark <becky@towncrier.com>; Woody Henderson <captainwoody@gmail.com>  
Subject: Police: 2 Dead, Several Injured in Pittsburgh Party Shooting – NBC Los Angeles

CAUTION: This email originated externally from the Riverside County email system. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This happened today, Easter Sunday, at a short term rental. Is the planning commission going to put their fingers in their ears, hands over your eyes, and say “it can’t happen here”? (In Idyllwild!) please keep STR’s out of our R1A residential neighborhoods. It is your responsibility to protect us from this mayhem.  
Please protect us.

Mark Dean  
PO Box 1621  
Idyllwild CA. 92549  
(619)952-4772

https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://apnews.com/1e2c7890500b729ca76610b47d8e5769__;!!JTyGX330HN5x6KoIAfMEz9kg9B9-TRkl-AzF0Oif842dK7-etZQPX__URL-TWXx1ubiUP-QTiq6umIAEtUvKI5lNeKwpw_uoHqx8-lf8$
Sent from my iPhone
April 7, 2022
Via Electronic Mail

Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon St., 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501
planning@rivco.org

Re: Comments on Proposed Amendment to RivCo Ordinance 348

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to provide comments in regard to the above referenced Riverside County Ordinance, a draft revision of which has been circulated for comment (hereinafter “Draft”), and is to be heard on April 20, 2022.

In sum, the proposed draft is grossly deficient, completely undercuts and is inconsistent with existing Ordinances such as Ord. 847, will completely destroy the peace and tranquility of the County’s rural areas, and will be the fodder for litigation (including by the undersigned) if not scrapped and reworked. It smacks of greed and support from inter alia, Airbnb and similar entities, wholly looking to maximize cash flow to the County at the expense of the health and safety of its taxpayers/residents.

COMMENTS:

1. **Section 19.51. Purpose and Intent** – the sentence “These adverse impacts include...” should include “light pollution”, as this is a regular cohort with temporary events (e.g., high intensity lighting). See, *inter alia*, *Tower v. Courtyard XVIII, LLC*, et al, Case No. MCC 1801073, Superior Court of Riverside County, Southwest Division, of which the undersigned is a Plaintiff, wherein high intensity lighting was a basis of an injunction issued by the RivCo Superior Court1.

2. **General Comment** – The use or lack of use of defined term capitalization in the document is confusing. See, e.g., *Section K. – “Seasonal Temporary Event. A temporary event...”* (Emphasis added). So, is the “temporary event” referenced in this clause a “Temporary

---

1 A Riverside County Superior Court injunction was issued by Judge Benitez on November 27, 2018 against the owners of a “party house,” barring them from violations of Riverside County Ordinances 927, 847, and 348, as well as of the Homeowners Association Declaration governing the neighborhood in which this property is located (a copy included herewith).
3. **Section 19.52 Definitions, subsection I** – The definition of “Commercial Temporary Event” should be modified as follows:

“A temporary event at any location intended for, or which otherwise results in, either generate generation of financial gain for the property owner or temporary event sponsor or to advertise advertisement of services…”

The intent of the event sponsor is moot and wholly immaterial to the question of whether harms are being visited on the community; the germane inquiry is instead whether such harms actually result.

4. **Section 19.52 Definitions, subsections I and L** – The definitions of “Commercial Temporary Event” and “Temporary Event” are wholly inconsistent. For example, how can an automobile sales event, off-road vehicle sales event, etc. not be a “Commercial Temporary Event”? Moreover, a Commercial Temporary Event can, per the Draft, be held at ANY location (Section I.) including private property, and is “Commercial” by its generation of financial gain for the event sponsor. Further, Section L (Temporary Event) says “with or without charge” (emphasis added). **How is charging people for admission not a commercial event?** Wholly specious logic underpins these two definitions. Any party alleged to be holding a “Commercial Temporary Event” can merely assert that they were only holding a “Temporary Event”, thereby escaping from all enforcement under, inter alia, Section 19.53.

5. **Section 19.52 Definitions, subsection L** – The definition of “Temporary Event” is wholly inconsistent with Section I as noted elsewhere herein, but further is in and of itself grossly overreaching in its scope. Is the Draft really advocating that “race events” (e.g., car or motorcycle races!), “rodeos”, “concerts” etc. can occur on residential private property without a permit? If maintained, the definition of “Temporary Event” should be solely limited to non-commercial events solely on private property and solely consistent with, inter alia, existing Ord. 847 and 927. How, rhetorically, could a car race ever possibly comply with Ord. 847 Table 1 discussed infra (e.g., 55 db max.)? It cannot.

6. **Section 19.53. Prohibited Temporary Events** – The personnel attendance numbers listed for A., B., C. and D. are respectfully ludicrous. 100 people on 0.23 acres? 300 people on 1.0 acres? As data points, the undersigned has witnessed “parties” on short term rentals in RA/RR zoned areas of 20-30 people total held in his neighborhood (see again, *Tower v. Courtyard*, supra) which **GROSSLY violated RivCO Ordinance 847**, the provisions of the latter which were explicitly included in the injunction granted by RivCO Superior Court, including, inter alia:

“(1) taking any action or engaging in any conduct that violates Section 4 of Riverside County **Ordinance 847** Section 4 as applicable to Rural Residential
properties which provides that, "No person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>SOUND LEVEL STANDARDS (DB $L_{eq}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</td>
<td>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Estate Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>Very Low density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHR</td>
<td>Medium High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>Very High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHTDR</td>
<td>Highest Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Retail Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Office Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Tourist Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Specific Plan-Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan-Light Commercial Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan-Heavy Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDR</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Rural Mountainous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Rural Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Conservation Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Mineral Resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As proven above by issuance of the injunction in Tower v. Courtyard, even 10-20 people on a five acre property will readily exceed County Ord. 847 limits. So, the proposed categories in Section 19.53 of the Draft are de facto unreasonable and violative of at least the County’s own Ord. 847. The Draft provides no basis for its numbers, but rather merely appears to (erroneously) assume that e.g., 100 people on a 0.23 acre lot, or 600 attendees on a 5 acre lot, will somehow not violate the stringent noise and other standards already codified in Ord. 847.
As such, Section 19.53 should include at very least a further type of prohibited event (e.g., “G.”) as follows:

“19.53. Prohibited Temporary Events

... G. Temporary events which by their nature do exceed or are likely to exceed any sound level or other limits set forth in Riverside County Ordinance 847.”

At very minimum, the preclusion of Section A. E. for Commercial Temporary Events on lots zoned R-R, RA, etc. should be extended to include temporary events/Temporary Events as well. There is simply no possibility that Ord. 847 limits will not be violated by temporary events with e.g., 100 people (or even 50 people).

7. **Section 19.54 – Applications and Limitations** – Again, consistent with the comments *supra*, the exclusions listed in Section 19.54 (i) in no way are tied to any basis for the numbers listed, and (ii) in no way consider that such events will violate, *inter alia*, Ord. 847. As one stark example, a temporary event (Contrast: Commercial Temporary Event) party of 99 people on a 1-acre lot in an RA-zoned area would not require any permit, yet could easily generate well above the maximum 55 db/45 db limits on noise of Ord. 847 in Table 1 *supra* (basically, a loud refrigerator). The Draft basically advocates throwing Ord. 847 in the trash and making it year round “party season” everywhere in the County. Items 2. and 3. In Section 19.54 A. should therefore be stricken in their entirety as having no rational or evidentiary basis in fact.

8. Yet further, Section 19.54A. indicates that no permit will be required for “Weddings, birthday parties, graduation parties...” provided that there are no more than 100 attendees, and they occur no more than 4 times in one year. Again, this provision is completely dismissive of the Ord. 847 limits discussed above, and further completely fails to consider the fact that many weddings are in fact commercial events (i.e., see *Tower v. Courtyard*, *supra*, wherein many weddings were held by short term renters for monetary consideration to the property owner. This provision 6. of Section 19.54 A. should be stricken as well.

9. Yet further, Section 19.54B. indicates that temporary events may occur for as long four consecutive days. This is again ridiculous – rhetorically, how would members of the Planning Commission like it if a wedding were held across from their house for four straight days? This provision 1. of Section 19.54 B. should be stricken as well.

10. Yet further, Section 19.54B. indicates that seasonal temporary events may occur for as long sixty (60) consecutive days. This is again ridiculous – rhetorically, how would members of the Planning Commission like it if an event were held across from their house for 60 straight days? This provision 3. of Section 19.54 B. should be stricken as well.

11. Yet further, Section 19.54C. completely fails to explicitly list relevant Ordinances which would clearly be at play; e.g., Ord. 847 and 927. The generalized statement in the current draft only adds ambiguity as to what is or isn’t subsumed in the listed categories.
12. Section 19.57 Approval Requirements – Section 2. Indicates that “there is no pending ....and County has not received five separate substantiated for {sic} the subject location within the last twelve months...” This criteria (presumably five (5) separate substantiated complaints) is wholly ineffective and ridiculous; one could throw a blowout party which violates multiple Ordinances, rules, etc., and receive 20 complaints for the same event, yet this would not count against subsequent grants of permit (i.e., it would count as only one separate event). ONE substantiated violation within 12 months is in fact the correct criterion; are you seriously asking surrounding impacted residents of the County to bear the burden of having to live with, and document via law enforcement visits, FIVE separate violations before permits are not granted? Not only is this an unreasonable burden on law enforcement, but also on the surrounding impacted residents. The burden should be on the party seeking the permit to show that they have not had any valid complaints against them in the last 12 months.

13. The Draft in no way considers that its permits may violate existing HOA CC&Rs, Equitable Servitudes, or other encumbrances on real property. For example, as in Tower v. Courtyard., the entirety of the Santa Rosa Highlands is covered by a Declaration which explicitly prohibits e.g., “Overnight Stays” including the presence of any vehicles on streets or driveways, tents, temporary structures, etc. (Section 19.59 of Draft), “Annoyances to the neighborhood” (the Draft in its entirety). Persons complying with the Draft seemingly can run completely afoul of HOA CC&Rs, Declarations, etc. all with the County’s seeming blessing. Numerous HOAs and neighborhoods covered by Declarations or similar exist in the unincorporated areas of the County, yet this Draft completely ignores them and the wellbeing of their residents.

Please contact the undersigned at the address/number listed above if there are any questions.

Sincerely,
GAZDZINSKI & ASSOCIATES, PC

[Signature]

Robert F. Gazdzinski, Esq.

Enclosure
Cc: Litigation Counsel
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE—SOUTHWEST DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER TOWER and ROBERT E. CELIO, JR., individuals

v.

COURTYARD XVIII, LLC, a California limited liability company; LINDSAY HO, an individual; PO LEI aka POFUNG LEI, an individual; MAXINE LAU, an individual; MICHELLE LAU, an individual, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: MCC 1801073
Assigned for all purposes to:
Hon. Angel M. Bermudez

(Plaintiff's Proposed) ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' APPLICATION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Date: November 21, 2018
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtm S302

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the application of Plaintiffs Christopher Tower and Robert Celio, Jr. for a preliminary injunction came on for hearing before this court on November 21, 2018 at 8:30 a.m. Plaintiffs appeared through their attorney the Litigation and Business Law Group, Inc. by Michael W. Kinney and Defendants appeared through their counsel P.K. Schrieffer LLP by Wayne H. Hammack.

Based on the moving, opposition, and reply papers and the evidence presented therein, and after hearing oral argument the court orders and finds as follows.

1. Plaintiffs' application for a preliminary injunction is granted.
2. The court finds that Plaintiffs have produced evidence showing that unless the injunction is issued they will suffer irreparable harm and injury. The court finds that Plaintiffs have produced evidence showing a probability of success on their claims.

3. The court finds that the equities weigh in favor of granting the injunction.

4. A preliminary injunction shall issue enjoining Defendants Courtyard XVIII, LLC, ("Courtyard"), Lindsay Ho ("Ho"), Po Lei aka Pofung Lei ("Lei") (collectively "Defendants") and anyone directly or indirectly acting in concert with them, including without limitation any individuals or entities renting the property located at 44200 Sunset Terrace, Temecula, California ("Property"), from:

   (a) taking any action or engaging in any conduct that violates Riverside County Ordinance 847, or renting the Property to any person or entity that takes any action or engages in any conduct including but not limited to:

      (1) taking any action or engaging in any conduct that violates Section 4 of Riverside County Ordinance 847 Section 4 as applicable to Rural Residential properties which provides that, "No person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set forth in Table 1", a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A;

      (2) taking any action or engaging in any conduct that violates Section 6c of Riverside County Ordinance 847 which provides that, "No person shall operate any audio equipment, whether portable or not, between the hours of 10 PM and 8 AM such that the equipment is audible to the human ear inside an inhabited dwelling other than a dwelling in which the equipment may be located. No person shall operate any audio equipment whether portable or not at any other time such that the equipment is audible to the human ear at a distance greater than 100 feet from the equipment."

      (3) taking any action or engaging in any conduct that violates Section 6(a)(2) of Riverside County Ordinance 847 which provides that "No person shall operate a motor vehicle sound system, whether affixed to the vehicle or not, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. such that the sound system is audible to the human ear inside any inhabited dwelling. No person shall operate a motor vehicle sound system, whether affixed to the vehicle or not, at any other time such that the sound system is audible to the human ear at a distance greater than one hundred (100) feet from the vehicle.
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(4) taking any action or engaging in any conduct that violates Section 6(a)(2) of Riverside County Ordinance 847 which provides that, “No person shall install, use or operate sound amplifying equipment, or perform, or allow to be performed, live music unless such activities comply with the following requirements. To the extent that these requirements conflict with any conditions of approval attached to an underlying land use permit, these requirements shall control. 1. Sound amplifying equipment or live music is prohibited between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. 2. Sound emanating from sound amplifying equipment or live music at any other time shall not be audible to the human ear at a distance greater than two hundred (200) feet from the equipment or music.

(b) renting out Defendants Property for use as a wedding venue, concert, or commercial events such as without limitation trade event, fair, swap meet or flea market. This restriction will not apply where persons renting the Property on a short-term basis host an event for the guests staying at the Property, other than those events listed above, so long as no other restricted activity or conduct set forth herein is undertaken.

(c) engaging in any activity or conduct on or in proximity to the Property, or allowing any person to engage in any activity or conduct that violates the Declaration of Restrictions and Reservation of Easements for Santa Rosa Highlands (“Declaration”), including but not limited to Section 2.1.4 which provides that, “no noxious or offensive activity shall be carried on upon any of the lots, nor shall anything be done there on which may be or may become an annoyance or nuisance to the neighborhood”, Riverside County Ordinance 348, Riverside County Ordinance 847, and Riverside County Ordinance 927.

(d) taking any action or engaging in any conduct or renting the Property to any person or entity that takes any action or engages in any conduct that violates Riverside County Ordinance 927, including without limitation:

(1) taking any action, engaging in any conduct, or failing to engage in conduct that violates Section 8(A) of Riverside County Ordinance 927 which provides that, “The operator shall ensure that the short term rental is used in a manner that complies with all applicable laws, rules and regulations pertaining to the use and occupancy of a short term rental.”

(2) taking any action, engaging in any conduct, or failing to engage in conduct that violates Section 8(D) of Riverside County Ordinance 927 which provides that, “Guests of the short term rental
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shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 847 Regulating Noise, including quiet hours between the hours of 10 PM and 7 AM.

(3) taking any action, engaging in any conduct, or failing to engage in conduct that violates Section 8(F) of Riverside County Ordinance 927 which provides that, "While a short term rental is rented, the operator or local contact person shall be available twenty-four hours per day, seven days a week for the purpose of responding within sixty (60) minutes to complaints regarding the condition, operation or guests' conduct of the short term rental."

(4) taking any action, engaging in any conduct, or failing to engage in conduct that violates Section 8(H) of Riverside County Ordinance 927 which provides that "The owner, operator or local contact person shall respond within sixty (60) minutes of being notified that the responsible person or guest of the short term rental created unreasonable noise, engaged in disorderly conduct or committed violations of any applicable law, rule or regulation and halt or prevent the recurrence of such conduct."

(5) taking any action, engaging in any conduct, or failing to engage in conduct that violates Section 8(H) of Riverside County Ordinance 927 which provides that "Trash and refuse shall not be left stored within public view, except in proper containers for purposes of collection by the County's authorized waste hauler.

(e) taking any action or engaging in any conduct or renting the Property to any person or entity that takes any action or engages in any conduct that violates quiet hours as defined in Riverside County Ordinances 927 which are defined as from "10 PM. to 7 AM."

(f) entering on, driving on, and/or walking on Plaintiffs' property or the property of any other owners of the lots in "Engelmann Oaks" in a rural area of Temecula, California (the Community) and/or dumping, disposing of, or allowing the accumulation of any debris, trash or any materials thereon, other than in trash collection receptacles on the Property, on the property of any other owners of the lots in the Community, or in the roads and streets of the Community.

(g) Parking cars or any other motorized vehicle ("Vehicles"), or allowing Vehicles to be parked on any street or roads in the Community, or parking or allowing to be parked more than three (3) vehicles in the driveway of the Property other than for the immediate unloading of passengers and/or parking or operating Vehicles in violation of the Declaration
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(h) taking any action or undertaking any course of conduct that invades or tends to invade Plaintiffs, or other owners of Lots in the Community’s privacy and quiet and peaceful enjoyment of their property including but not limited to the use of drones outside the property lines of the Property.

(i) the use of any outdoor lighting that directly or indirectly impinges on Plaintiffs’ peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their Property and inhabited structures. This order does not apply to the reasonable use of standard household lighting (i.e. interior lights, landscaping, patio lights, or similar fixtures), but rather prohibits the use of raised high intensity lighting used to light the outside of the Property, photos of which are attached to the Supplemental Declaration of Robert Gazdzinski filed in support of Plaintiffs’ Application for a Preliminary Injunction.

(j) lighting any unsafe outdoor fires, including but not limited to any fires other than in the fire pit and outside fireplace on the Property. This paragraph does not prohibit the use of the outside gas grill or outside fireplace on the Property as long as they comply with the restrictions of this paragraph.

Defendants and all renters shall observe all applicable safety codes with respect to fire safety.

5. Plaintiffs shall post a bond in the amount of $75,000.00.

6. Defendants shall include a copy of this Order into their rental terms and conditions, and provide a copy to all renters and all persons staying at the Property upon check in.

7. Plaintiffs may request modification of the terms and conditions of this injunction upon a showing satisfactory to the Court, that the terms and restrictions of this injunction are insufficient to curtail and stop the conduct which formed the basis for issuance of this injunction without the need to show a material change in circumstances or facts or that the ends of justice would be served by the modification. However, such showing may be challenged by Defendants based on competing factual and/or physical evidence.

Dated: November 26, 2018

Angel Bermudez

Hon. Angel M. Bermudez
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL PLAN FOUNDATION COMPONENT</th>
<th>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION</th>
<th>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION NAME</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DECIBEL LEVEL 7am-10pm</th>
<th>10pm-7am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Estate Density Residential</td>
<td>2 AC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential</td>
<td>1 AC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>1/2 AC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHDR</td>
<td>Medium High Density Residential</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VHDR</td>
<td>Very High Density Residential</td>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTDR</td>
<td>Highest Density Residential</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Retail Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Office Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Tourist Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Specific Plan-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan-Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan-Light Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Plan-Heavy Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Estate Density Residential</td>
<td>2 ac</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential</td>
<td>1 ac</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>1/2 ac</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rura l</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>5 ac</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Rural Mountainous</td>
<td>10 ac</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Rural Desert</td>
<td>10 ac</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10 AC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Conservation Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUR</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Watershed</td>
<td>20 AC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nowhere is safe from fires, and Californians have learned this lesson the hard way. However, some areas are especially prone to dangerous, even deadly, wildfires.

Our data journalism team created an interactive map with data from the California Public Utilities Commission that shows areas the agency has deemed especially at risk for wildfires. There are two categories: elevated threat in orange and extreme threat in red.

The orange and red areas on the map above are found to have an "elevated hazard for the ignition and rapid spread of powerline fires due to strong winds, abundant dry vegetation, and other environmental conditions," according to the CPUC website.
April 18, 2022

To: Planning Director and Commissioners
From: Terilee Hammett, GlenOak Hills Community
RE: Change of Zone 2100000 to amend Ord. 927, Item 4.2

As a longtime resident of the GlenOak Hills Community in Wine Country, I moved here expecting a rural community and not a transient vacation hot spot. I am cognizant of the STR appeal for people to make money, but this is a situation that will get out of control without some sound **enforcement and oversight**. I am in favor of the proposed amendments to the Short-term Rental ordinance, with some specific thoughts:

1. Code Enforcement MUST be expanded to later hours and weekend coverage. This has been a longstanding issue as Wine Country has grown.

2. The Good Neighbor brochure should include very specific rules re: fireworks and fines. Wine Country is in a high fire zone and out of town visitors may not be aware of our fire hazard. The brochure needs to make clear no fireworks are allowed and ramifications if they occur.

3. Many homes here are on septic systems. A septic system check should be required before a STR permit is granted.

4. The number of parking spaces for the home should determine how many quests can be accommodated, not the number of bedrooms.

5. Research needs to be conducted to determine what STR saturation percentage is appropriate for each neighborhood before permits are issued.

6. The age of the responsible renter contact must be increased to at least 21 years old, and 25 years old would be more appropriate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Short Term Rentals are Advertising More Bedrooms Than They Have 04-12-2022

Dear Planners and District Supervisors:

The following information shows that Short-Term Rentals (STRs) in Wine Country are out of control, and many of them are advertising more bedrooms than the Riverside County Records show. In addition, some of these STRs are putting as many as six (6) beds in a single bedroom in order to drive up their occupancies.

Here are a few examples representing a partial list of STRs where I was able to verify the address and match it with the tax rolls in order to show the inflated bedroom counts and/or inflated occupancy and bed capacities:

1. 33120 Vino Way, Temecula (Chateau Vino) is a new Wine Country Residential District STR that advertises that they have eight (8) bedrooms, but the Riverside County records show only five (5) bedrooms, six baths. Their advertisement states that they have 15 beds and they sleep 18. The comments state that Chateau Vino was freshly renovated in 2022 with the intention of entertaining large groups. “The high ceilings, wide sweeping floor plan and oversized bedrooms make it ideal for hosting large groups, multiple families, corporate retreats, and other special occasions”. Here is the link to their VRBO advertisement: https://www.vrbo.com/2726212?noDates=true&unitld=3297054

2. 39625 Calle Cabernet, Temecula (Villa Cabernet) is a Wine Country Residential District STR that advertises that it has eight (8) bedrooms, 14 beds, and sleeps 28. Riverside County records show seven (7) legal bedrooms. The advertisement states that it is “perfect for large groups”. Here is the link for their VRBO advertisement: https://www.vrbo.com/2415729?noDates=true&unitld=2983430

3. 32789 Avenida Lestonnac Temecula (Love at First Syrah) is a wine Country Residential District that has only four (4) legal bedrooms according to Riverside County Records, but they advertise that they have seven (7) bedrooms, 2 casitas, 14 beds, and “There are three pull out sofas with queen sized beds in the home, including one in the main casita, one in the entry bedroom, and one in the family room. We also offer four twin rollaways for extra guests if needed.” Their VRBO internet advertisement states that they sleep twenty four (24) people and they provide “Hotel Style Accommodations”. Here is the link for their VRBO advertisement: https://www.vrbo.com/9236488ha?noDates=true&unitld=8252483

4. 40284 Calle Caleta, Temecula (Hidden Vineyard Estate) is a Wine Country Residential District STR that advertises that it has five (5) bedrooms and “we can accommodate parties up to 24 guests. For Parties that are larger than 20 or for parties that want need additional private rooms we can offer our Guest Home located over our 4 car workshop/garage.” Riverside County Records show that the home has five (5) bedrooms, however 24 guests for a five bedroom single-family home appears to be excessive. Here is the link for their VRBO advertisement: https://www.vrbo.com/739864?noDates=true&unitld=1287802

5. 39890 Calle Del Vinedos, Temecula (the Rancho Villa) is a Wine Country Residential District STR that advertises it has four (4) bedrooms, 9 beds, and they sleep sixteen (16). The Riverside County Records show only three (3) bedrooms, two baths, and their claimed occupancy of 16 appears to be excessive for a 3 bedroom home. Here is the link for their VRBO advertisement: https://www.vrbo.com/328533ha?noDates=true&unitld=3090599
6. 39570 Colleen Way, Temecula (Sunset Manor), is a Wine Country Residential District STR that advertises it has 5 bedrooms, 8 beds and it sleeps 16. Riverside County Records show only four (4) bedrooms. Here is the link for their VRBO advertisement: [https://www.vrbo.com/2128894?noDates=true&unitld=2693428](https://www.vrbo.com/2128894?noDates=true&unitld=2693428)

The information presented above is important because it underscores the need for the following items to be added to Draft Ordinance 927.1 regarding STRs:

A. STRs should be banned entirely from Wine Country Residential District (WC-R) because they function as Hotels, and they are not compatible with our single-family homes or our families. Our children should be able to go out in their own back yard without being frightened by strangers or distasteful music coming from a large crowd at the STR next door.

B. STRs located in Wine Country (WC-W or WC-WE) need to have onsite annual inspections to verify bedroom counts, and in order to ensure that there are adequate fire extinguishers and fire safety precautions in place including functioning smoke alarms, carbon monoxide alarms, emergency exiting plans.

C. The total number of occupants on each STR must be capped: Seven (7) Occupants maximum for a non-hosted STR (host does not live on-site), and eleven (11) Occupants maximum for an STR where the host lives on-site.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bedroom with six (6) beds at 39625 Calle Cabernet, Temecula (Villa Cabernet), Sleeps 28
Bedroom with six (6) beds at La Barrique, Temecula. Sleeps 25

Bedroom with six (6) beds at Owl's Nest, Temecula. Sleeps 24
### OWNER AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

**Primary Owner:**
VILLA MIRAGE LLC,
Site Address:
33120 VINO WAY, TEMECULA, CA 92591-5061

**APN:**
943-160-017

**Legal Description:**
LOT: 1 2.16 ACRES NET IN PAR 1 PM 071/057 PM 13733

**Legal Brief Description:**
LOT: 1 2.16 ACRES NET IN PAR 1 PM 071/057 PM 13733

**Secondary Owner:**

**Mall Address:**
1440 COLUMBIA ST, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3408

**Lot Number:**
1

### PROPERTY DETAILS

**Bedrooms:** 5

**Bathrooms:** 5.25

**Total Rooms:**

**Zoning:** RR

**Year Built:** 2008

**Square Feet:** 5,952

**Garage:** Detached 3

**Lot Size:** 2.16 AC

**Fireplace:** 1

**Number of Units:** 0

**Pool:**

**Use Code:** Single Family Residential

### SALE INFORMATION

**Transfer Date:** 09/20/2021

**Transfer Value:** $2,200,000.00

**Cost/Sq Feet:**

**Seller:** MARR, JUDITH S; MARR FAMILY TRUST,

**Document #:** 2021-0560118

### ASSESSMENT AND TAXES

**Assessed Value:** $1,311,145.00

**Land Value:** $393,961.00

**Improvement Value:** $917,184.00

**Market Improvement Value:**

**Market Value:**

**Percent Improvement:** 69.96%

**Homeowner Exemption:**

**Tax Amount:** $15,059.50

**Tax Status:** Current

**Market Land Value:**

**Tax Rate Area:** 94-146

**Tax Account ID:** 943160017

**Tax Year:** 2021

**County/Tax Site URL:**
https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx
# CHICAGO TITLE

## PROPERTY PROFILE

### PROPERTY OVERVIEW

**39625 CALLE CABERNET, TEMECULA, CA 92591-4011**

### Owner and Geographic Information

**Primary Owner:**
COSTIGAN, WILLIAM MICHAEL; COSTIGAN, APRIL B

**Site Address:**
39625 CALLE CABERNET, TEMECULA, CA 92591-4011

**APN:**
943-270-002

**Housing Tract Number:**
26050

**Legal Description:**
Lot Code: 2
Subdivision: RANCHO PAUBA
Tract Number: 26050
Legal Brief Description: LOT:2 SUBD:RANCHO PAUBA TR#:26050 2.51 ACRES NET IN LOT 2 MB 322/034 TR 26050

**Secondary Owner:**

**Mail Address:**
39625 CALLE CABERNET, TEMECULA, CA 92591-4011

**Lot Number:**
2

### Property Details

**Bedrooms:**
7

**Year Built:**
2006

**Square Feet:**
8,464

**Bathrooms:**
8.5

**Garage:**
Attached 8

**Lot Size:**
2.51 AC

**Total Rooms:**
1

**Fireplace:**
P

**Number of Units:**
0

**Pool:**

**Use Code:**
Single Family Residential

**Zoning:**
RR

### Sale Information

**Transfer Date:**
06/03/2021

**Transfer Value:**
$3,000,000.00

**Cost/Sq Feet:**

**Seller:**
DONDEL, DALE J; DONDEL, DENISE M

**Document#:**
2021-0339836

### Assessment and Taxes

**Assessed Value:**
$1,941,220.00

**Percent Improvement:**
85.92%

**Homeowner Exemption:**
H

**Tax Amount:**
$21,179.40

**Tax Rate Area:**
94-146

**Tax Status:**

**Tax Account ID:**
943270002

**Market Land Value:**
$273,411.00

**Market Value:**
$1,667,809.00

**Market Improvement Value:**

**Market Value:**

**County Tax Site URL:**
Owner and Geographic Information

Primary Owner: STEEVES DAVID JOHN LAWRENCE REVOCABLE TRUST (UDT) DATE; STEEVES DAVID JOHN LAWRENCE

Site Address: 32789 AVENIDA LESTONNAC, TEMECULA, CA 92592-9467

Secondary Owner: 

Mail Address: 20492 CHIANTI CT, YORBA LINDA, CA 92886-8603

APN: 951-030-010

Lot Number: 7

Housing Tract Number: 10429

Legal Description: LOT:7 TR#:10429 2.31 ACRES NET IN LOT 7 MB 119/056 TR 10429

Property Details

Bedrooms: 4

Bathrooms: 4.5

Total Rooms: 

Zoning: R1

Year Built: 2018

Square Feet: 4,523

Garage: Attached 2

Lot Size: 2.31 AC

Fireplace: 1

Number of Units: 0

Pool: P

Use Code: Single Family Residential

Sale Information

Transfer Date: 12/04/2019

Transfer Value: $0.00

Seller: STEEVES, DAVID J L

Document#: 2019-0497963

Assessment and Taxes

Assessed Value: $1,188,162.00

Percent Improvement: 79.51%

Homeowner Exemption: 

Land Value: $243,496.00

Tax Amount: $13,147.80

Tax Rate Area: 94-008

Improvement Value: $844,666.00

Tax Status: Current

Tax Account ID: 951030010

Market Improvement Value: Market Land Value:

Market Value:

County Tax Site URL: https://ca-riverside-tlc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx
# CHICAGO TITLE

## PROPERTY PROFILE

### PROPERTY OVERVIEW

**40284 CALLE CALETA, TEMECULA, CA 92591-5035**

#### Owner and Geographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Owner:</th>
<th>Secondary Owner:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEN JIMMY SHOUNAN; CHEN SUSAN</td>
<td>Mail Address: 4942 FIESTA AVE, TEMPLE CITY, CA 91780-3816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address:</th>
<th>APN: 040-000-000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40284 CALLE CALETA, TEMECULA, CA 92591-5035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Tract Number:</th>
<th>Lot Code:</th>
<th>Legal Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot: 4</td>
<td>4.95 ACRES NET IN PAR 4 PM 077/061 PM 140/41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Legal Brief Description: | |
|--------------------------| |
| LOT: 4 4.95 ACRES NET IN PAR 4 PM 077/061 PM 140/41 |

#### Property Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms:</th>
<th>Bathrooms:</th>
<th>Total Rooms:</th>
<th>Zoning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>Square Feet:</th>
<th>Garage:</th>
<th>Lot Size:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5,875</td>
<td>Attached 2</td>
<td>4.95 AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fireplace:</th>
<th>Number of Units:</th>
<th>Pool:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Use Code: | |
|-----------| |
| Single Family Residential |

#### Sale Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Date:</th>
<th>Transfer Value:</th>
<th>Seller:</th>
<th>Document#:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/20/2016</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>CHEN, JIMMY SHOUNAN; CHEN, SUSAN</td>
<td>2016-0251046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment and Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Value:</th>
<th>Percent Improvement:</th>
<th>Homeowner Exemption:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,859,930.00</td>
<td>80.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Value:</th>
<th>Tax Amount:</th>
<th>Tax Rate Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$329,763.00</td>
<td>$18,515.60</td>
<td>94-146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Value:</th>
<th>Tax Status:</th>
<th>Tax Rate Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,330,167.00</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Improvement Value:</th>
<th>Market Land Value:</th>
<th>Tax Account ID:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>943280008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Value:</th>
<th>County Tax Site URL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx">https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year:</th>
<th>County Tax Site URL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td><a href="https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx">https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Property Profile

**Property Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>39890 CALLE DE VINEDOS, TEMECULA, CA 92591-5099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td><strong>BRAINARD FRANK B, BRAINARD ROSALYN J</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td><strong>39890 CALLE DE VINEDOS, TEMECULA, CA 92591-5099</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>943-200-029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Number</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Brief Description</td>
<td><strong>LOT:1 3.21 ACRES GRS IN PAR 1 PM 225/098 PM 32305</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rooms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Attached 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>3.21 AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Code</td>
<td>Multi-Family Dwellings (Generic, any combination 2+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Owner and Geographic Information

- **Primary Owner:** BRAINARD FRANK B, BRAINARD ROSALYN J
- **Site Address:** 39890 CALLE DE VINEDOS, TEMECULA, CA 92591-5099
- **APN:** 943-200-029
- **Lot Number:** 1
- **Legal Brief Description:** LOT:1 3.21 ACRES GRS IN PAR 1 PM 225/098 PM 32305

## Property Details

- **Bedrooms:** 3
- **Bathrooms:** 2
- **Total Rooms:** 6
- **Year Built:** 1989
- **Garage:** Attached 4
- **Fireplace:** 1
- **Pool:** N/A
- **Square Feet:** 2,236
- **Lot Size:** 3.21 AC
- **Number of Units:** 2
- **Use Code:** Multi-Family Dwellings (Generic, any combination 2+)

## Sale Information

- **Transfer Date:** 06/00/2008
- **Transfer Value:** $0.00
- **Cost/Sq Feet:**
- **Seller:** N/A
- **Document#:** 2008-0313222

## Assessment and Taxes

- **Assessed Value:** $375,407.00
- **Land Value:** $63,444.00
- **Improvement Value:** $311,963.00
- **Market Improvement Value:**
- **Market Value:**
- **Percent Improvement:** 83.10%
- **Tax Amount:** $4,263.02
- **Tax Status:** Current
- **Market Land Value:**
- **Tax Rate Area:** 94-146
- **Tax Account ID:** 943200029
- **Tax Year:** 2021
- **Homeowner Exemption:** H
- **Tax Site URL:** [https://ca-riverside-tfc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx](https://ca-riverside-tfc.publicaccessnow.com/Search/PropertyAddressSearch.aspx)
**PROPERTY PROFILE**

**PROPERTY OVERVIEW**

39570 COLLEEN WAY, TEMECULA, CA 92592-8042

### Owner and Geographic Information

- **Primary Owner:** CHUN, STEPANO Y; CHUN, NANCY D
- **Site Address:** 39570 COLLEEN WAY, TEMECULA, CA 92592-8042
- **APN:** 942-060-033
- **Lot Number:** 1
- **Mail Address:** 34192 PAUBA RD, TEMECULA, CA 92592-9179
- **Lot Code:** LOT: 1 4.22 ACRES M/L IN FOR PAR 1 PM 100/025 PM 15558
- **Legal Description:** LOT 1 4.22 ACRES M/L IN FOR PAR 1 PM 100/025 PM 15558

### Property Details

- **Bedrooms:** 4
- **Bathrooms:** 4
- **Square Feet:** 6,610
- **Year Built:** 2005
- **Lot Size:** 4.22 AC
- **Fireplace:** 1
- **Number of Units:** 0
- **Pool:** P
- **Use Code:** Single Family Residential

### Sale Information

- **Transfer Date:** 02/17/2021
- **Transfer Value:** $0.00
- **Seller:** CHUN, STEPANO YOUNGIL; CHUN, NANCY D
- **Document #:** 2021-0101267

### Assessment and Taxes

- **Assessed Value:** $1,598,369.00
- **Percent Improvement:** 77.88%
- **Homeowner Exemption:**
- **Land Value:** $353,626.00
- **Tax Amount:** $17,934.80
- **Tax Rate Area:** 94-147
- **Improvement Value:** $1,244,763.00
- **Tax Status:** Current
- **Tax Account ID:** 942080033
- **Market Improvement Value:**
- **Tax Year:** 2021
- **Market Value:**

**County Tax Site URL:** [https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/SearchPropertyAddressSearch.aspx](https://ca-riverside-ttc.publicaccessnow.com/SearchPropertyAddressSearch.aspx)
Steven Jones, Commissioner Thornhill and Planning Commissioners,
I am looking forward to seeing you all at the meeting on Wednesday.

I watched a planning meeting and learned that some of you (and Commissioner Thornhill) know Idyllwild, and appreciate how Idy is a unique and special town in the Rivco crown. Just as we, the residents of Idyllwild, appreciate being under the wing of Rivco. We believe that the people of Riverside County are best served by preserving Idyllwild’s most precious resource, the peace and serenity of Rivco’s own forest town.

I am a full time resident, we’ve had our cabin since the 70’s. I work at Pine Cove Water District and do tech on the side for businesses and residents. I am on the board of the Fire Safe Council. I snow plow most of the non-county roads in north Pine Cove. I participate in 3 local STR solution groups.

I’ll get to the point :). I believe the full fix to the lion’s share of issues that STRs are causing while preserving what makes Idyllwild unique and amazing and preserving most of the business bump, is to phase unsupervised STRs out of R1 zoning. I believe there are great safety gains as well. See below. We support our Inns and businesses in R3 and commercial zones. We support supervised STRs everywhere.

If the Planning Commission finds R1 phaseout beyond its scope or capability, I am in favor of the 927.1 improvements that the town solution groups have come up with ...
1) A ban on outdoor amplified noise and outdoor fires.
2) Local enforcement. An in-town STR enforcement office that can oversee the inspections, document issues and be available to act on problems like noise, outdoor fires and parking, 24/7.
3) A cap on the number of STRs at 10% of housing units. This is approximately 350 which is near the current number of certified properties.
4) STR phaseout on non-county roads. Many of our roads are single-lane, steep roads with sharp turns that the county does not maintain. These tiny roads aggregate the bulk of dangerous situations created by STRs.

85 People died in the Paradise Fire, many died in their cars trying to evacuate. Paradise is a mountain town like Idyllwild. Less visitors deep in our tricky residential areas will be safer for visitors, residents and first responders.

To give you all a headsup, the STR lobbying firm Vron, has released their talking points. We are not in favor of cutting out any of these improvements you have made to 927.1:
1) Occupancy: They are pushing for the occupancy numbers to be increased and not tied to bedrooms or parking.
2) Signage: They are pushing to get rid of the mandatory signs that will help visitors find their cabin and help neighbors identify who to call.
3) Inspections: They are pushing to get rid of the new required safety inspections.
4) Complaint reporting: They are pushing to get rid of the requirement of reporting all complaints to the county.
5) Events: They are pushing to allow STR events to have a larger number of non-renter guests. Again, with no owner present.

Note that over 1000 people signed our petition to limit STRs. 29 signed the petition in support of STRs. Links below.
Thank you!

Woody Henderson
53250 Pina Vista Dr
Idyllwild, CA 92549

---

Some non-county road background if you're interested :) ...
You all are familiar with non-county roads. In our mountain community, non-county roads are a mix of dirt and asphalt, one lane, often steep with tight turns. Our 6 wheel drive firetrucks practice navigating them in the summer. Residents are responsible for all maintenance, snow plowing etc. The county gives no funding or help with either. The county is making TOT on unsupervised businesses creating safety issues for residents on these roads. It does not feel just.

I snow plow most of the non-county roads in north Pine Cove. For every storm a portion of my day is dedicated to extricating short term renter vehicles that are blocking these roads. Our local tow truck often refuses to help a vehicles stuck on non-county roads. About once a storm we find a short term renter that arrived at night, got stuck and walked in to their rental. Leaving dozens of unknowing residents without emergency services or even the ability to drive themselves out for the entire night. Residents don't get stuck as they have AWDs and know how to drive in snow. The only solve for this and other safety issues is a non-county road phase-out.

Petition to limit STRs: [https://chnng.it/mtxMSwRXFq](https://chnng.it/mtxMSwRXFq). Plus over 200 signatures collected at our post office. I can forward.