

Comment Letter No. 28

7:30 AM 2/2/2012 7:30 AM

From: Lee, Josh
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2012 5:28 PM
To: Nanthavongdouangsy, Phayvanh
Cc: Early, Kristina
Subject: FW: Wine Country Public Comment
Attachments: Wine Country Public Comment.docx

From: Janie Rigsby [<mailto:janierigsby11@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2012 5:23 PM
To: Lee, Josh
Subject: Wine Country Public Comment

Here is my letter. Please post. Thank you.

} 28.1

Janie Rigsby
45861 Classic Way
Temecula, CA 92592
951-764-9724

January 31, 2012

To whom it may concern;

My name is Janie Rigsby. I am the owner of approx. 6.5 acres off of Linda Via and Linda Rosea. Parcel Number 951-240-009. I am opposed to the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP). } 28.2

This land split is the last glimmer of hope for me. I have lost everything in the pursuit of this dream due to the ever-increasing cost of the split. I have incurred an enormous expense for several grading plans, topography map, Transportation, Geology, Planning, Archaeology, Change of Zone, Utilities, Engineering, Drafting, Hydrology Studies, Geotechnical Feasibility, Boundary Survey, Fire Fee, Street Signal Fee, Fish and Game, Monument fees and Tentative Parcel Map. This project has not yet been finalized! If the SWAP passes as written, I will lose everything I have invested. } 28.3

If the land split is allowed, I plan to build a home with a small residence for my mother and mother-in-law to live. They are aging and they get along so well...it is a perfect plan. I will not be allowed to have a second residence if the SWAP passes. On the second parcel, I planned to contact Hospice of the Valley and spearhead a joint venture to aid hospice patients by building a Comfort Care Home. Presently, if the family of a hospice patient is unable to accommodate the passing of their loved one in their own home, their choices for placement are minimal. Choice #1: a skilled care facility. Choice #2: the hospital. Choice #3: a board and care home. The aforementioned serve a valuable purpose but our loved ones and those in mourning deserve a facility that is dedicated to helping them in their time of need. If the SWAP passes, none of this will be possible. } 28.4

I am in favor of the preservation of land for the Wine Country. I am not in favor of the Wine Country taking over the Valle De Los Caballos Policy Area, or any other area for that matter. Property owners with under 10 acres are limited to one residence and only allowed 200 hundred square feet of outside storage (not to exceed three feet high). Would this include recreational vehicles? These restrictions severely devalue my parcel. If the property owner has over 10 acres, the land must be farmed in order to have an additional residence. Only the owner or employee of the farm may live in that residence! Really? } 28.5

I am distraught knowing that the people who already have their dream can so easily put a pen to paper and be allowed to extinguish my dream. How dare anyone deprive me of the right to provide an independent, private home for my mother to live out her life. I have lived in Temecula since 1979 and these restrictions do not represent the values of the Temecula I know and love. } 28.6

Sincerely,

Janie Rigsby, R.N.

Response No. 28

Janie Rigsby

- 28.1 Responses to specific comments are provided below. The commenter's opposition to the Project is noted. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to *environmental* comments.).)
- 28.2 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. 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. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.).)
- 28.3 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. 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. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.).)
- 28.4 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. 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. 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*.
- 28.5 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. 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. No further response is required. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.).)
- 28.6 This comment does not identify any specific concern with the adequacy of the Draft PEIR or any environmental issues. 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. No further response is required.

(State CEQA Guidelines § 15088(a) (CEQA requires that a lead agency respond to environmental comments.))