

Comment Letter No. 23

County of Riverside Planning Department
P.O. Box 1409
4080 Lemon St. 12th Floor
Riverside, CA 92502
Attn: Mitra Meta-Cooper

January 9, 2012

Subject Wine Country Community Plan Program EIR No. 524

I have three issues with the above referenced plan:

- 1). Allowing wineries with sampling rooms in the residential zone.
- 2). Safety of De Portola Road not fully addressed.
- 3.) The county's inability to enforce compliance with their conditions of approval, ordinances and permits.

23.1

These issues have been previously discussed with no real resolution. We know that the "sampling rooms" are in many cases bars with the attendant noise, amplified music and rowdy clientele. The idea that there could be as many as 11 of these bars in residential neighborhoods, along with limousines and buses on narrow residential roads does not comply with Policy LU 23.6. or good planning practices in general.

23.2

I have asked Olivia Barnes several times to explain to me why every winery on De Portola Road has been conditioned for acceleration/deceleration lanes, yet none exist. She has never answered my question. Obviously with the 55 mph speed limit on DePortola and the visitors slowing down to find a winery, the deceleration lanes would provide a measure of safety for all users. The county apparently saw the need, why don't they enforce the conditions of approval?

23.3

I know my views will fall on deaf ears so I am not going to spend much effort in reiterating them.

23.4

I'll save that for the public hearings. Perhaps they will be more receptive.

Susan Clay
Susan Clay

Temecula

Response No. 23

Susan Clay

23.1 Refer to responses below regarding allowing wineries with sampling rooms in residential areas (see Response No. 23.2) and safety on De Portola Road (Response No. 23.3). With respect to the County's ability to enforce conditions of approval, ordinances and permits, the public comments and Ad Hoc Advisory Committee meetings document this concern. The County has provided careful consideration to those issues and provided solutions through the Development Standards of the proposed zones. Decision makers will consider this issue as part of Project deliberations.

With respect to enforcement of Final PEIR mitigation measures, these will be incorporated into a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) which will be adopted as part of Project approval. Subsequent implementing projects will be required to comply with applicable measures in the MMRP. Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.

23.2 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. (*Browning-Ferris Indust. of California, Inc. v. City Council of the City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852 (where a general comment is made, a general response is sufficient).) This comment has been duly noted and is presented in this Comments and Responses document for decision makers to evaluate as part of their Project deliberations. The Draft PEIR has addressed associated issues, including noise, traffic and aesthetics. In addition to the Mitigation Measures of this Draft PEIR, any implementing project would be required to comply with Land Use Policy 23.6, which requires that commercial projects abutting residential properties protect the residential use from the impacts of noise, light, fumes, odors, vehicular traffic, parking, and operational hazards and is applicable to development of small wineries that may occur in residential land uses. In addition, there are other policies, regulations, ordinances, and measures that also must be complied with and would regulate the implementing project(s) allowed uses in residential areas. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to *environmental* comments).) Refer to Attachment A: *Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan Planning Commission Final Recommendations and PEIR No. 524 Determination*.

- 23.3 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues, but rather focuses on implementation of conditions of approval for existing properties. Refer to Response No. 23.1 above for a discussion of County enforcement of mitigation and conditions of approval. The Draft PEIR addresses subregional infrastructure and improvements needed to accommodate Wine Country buildout as part of the proposed Project. It does not address site-specific access improvements required for implementing projects, which will be addressed as part of subsequent site-specific development proposals, as noted in LU-1 and TRF-1 through TRF-4. In addition, the required Wine Country traffic fee program identified in TRF-3 will provide an additional funding source to implement local roadway improvements.
- 23.4 With respect to the last comment, the views and concerns presented in these comment letters are, and will be, all reviewed and considered by decision makers as part of Project deliberations. Although CEQA only requires a written response to Draft PEIR comments dealing with significant environmental issues, comments expressing personal opinion, recommendations or concerns are still a part of the Project's environmental record, and will be considered during Project deliberations. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to *environmental* comments.).)