

### RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

# PROPOSED TEMECULA VALLEY WINE COUNTRY POLICY AREA

### PLANNING COMMISSIONERS 2012

1<sup>st</sup> **District** John Roth

**2<sup>nd</sup> District** John Snell *Chairman* 

3<sup>rd</sup> District John Petty Vice Chairman

4th District

5<sup>th</sup> District
Jan Zuppardo

# Planning Director Carolyn Syms Luna

Legal Counsel
Michelle Clack
Deputy County
Counsel

Phone 951 955-3200

Fax 951 955-1811 9:00 A.M.

**SEPTEMBER 26, 2012** 

### **AGENDA**

RIVERSIDE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
• SPECIAL MEETING • TEMECULA CITY HALL •
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
41000 MAIN STREET
TEMECULA, CA 92590

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL SALUTE TO THE FLAG

If you wish to speak, please complete a "SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION FORM" and give it to the Secretary. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow interested parties to express their concerns. Please do not repeat information already given. If you have no additional information, but wish to be on record, simply give your name and address and state that you agree with the previous speaker(s).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if any accommodations are needed, please contact Mary Stark at (951) 955-7436 or E-mail at <a href="mailto:mcstark@rctlma.org">mcstark@rctlma.org</a>. Request should be made at least 48 hours or as soon as possible prior to the scheduled meeting.

- 1.0 CONSENT CALENDAR
  - 1.1 **NONE**
- **2.0** GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT INITIATION PROCEEDINGS: **9:00 a.m.** or as soon as possible thereafter. (Presentation available upon Commissioners' request)
  - 2.1 **NONE**
- **3.0** PUBLIC HEARING: **9:00 a.m.** or as soon as possible thereafter:
  - 3.1 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 1077 (TEMECULA VALLEY WINE COUNTRY POLICY AREA); ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 348.4729; and PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 524. The Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area is generally located in the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the General Plan in the southwestern portion of unincorporated Riverside County. The policy area covers approximately 18,990 acres of land located approximately three miles north of the San Diego County border; east of the City of Temecula; south of Lake Skinner; and northwest of Vail Lake.

PLANNING COMMISSION SEPTEMBER 26, 2012

The individual components include:

1. <u>General Plan Amendment No. 1077</u> amending the existing Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) and certain elements of the County of Riverside General Plan to incorporate the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area.

2. <u>Ordinance No. 348.4729</u> amending Riverside County Ordinance No. 348 to add four new zoning classifications that implements the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area.

Continued from July 25, 2012 and August 22, 2012. (Public Hearing Closed to Further Public Testimony)

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**CONTINUE FOR 60 DAYS** with no discussion to further evaluate options.

Staff Report 3.1

- **4.0** WORKSHOPS:
  - 4.1 **NONE**
- 5.0 ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA
- **6.0** <u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u>
- 7.0 COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Agenda Item: 3.1 Area Plan: Southwest

Zoning Area: Rancho California Supervisorial District: Third/Third

Planning Commission: September 26, 2012

Continued From: July 25, 2012,

and August 22, 2012

WINE COUNTRY COMMUNITY PLAN – General Plan Amendment No. 1077, Ordinance Amendment No. 348.4729,

and Program Environmental

Impact Report No. 524

Applicant: County of Riverside EIR Consultant: RBF Consulting

## COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF REPORT

### WINE COUNTRY COMMUNITY PLAN

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The Temecula Valley Wine Country Community Plan (Project) was initiated by the County Board of Supervisors in 2008 to ensure that the region develops in an orderly manner that preserves Temecula Valley's viticulture potential and enhances its economic contribution to the County over the long term. The purpose of this Project is to provide a blueprint for future growth that ensures that future development activities will enhance, and not impede, the quality of life for existing and future residents, while providing opportunities for continued preservation and expansion of winery and equestrian operations. The Project has been developed to achieve the following four objectives:

- 1. To preserve and enhance viticulture potential, rural lifestyle and equestrian activities;
- 2. To continue to allow for an appropriate level of commercial tourist activities that are incidental to viticulture and equestrian operations;
- 3. To coordinate growth in a manner that avoids future land use conflicts; and
- 4. To ensure timely provision of appropriate public infrastructure and services that keeps up with anticipated growth.

The Project is generally located in the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP) of the General Plan in the southwestern portion of unincorporated Riverside County. The Project covers approximately 18,990 acres of land located approximately three miles north of the San Diego County border, east of the City of Temecula, south of Lake Skinner, and northwest of Vail Lake. The Project includes General Plan Amendment No. 1077, Ordinance Amendment No. 348.4729, and the accompanying Program Environmental Impact Report No. 524 (PEIR No. 524).

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND ISSUES DISCUSSED DURING FIRST TWO PUBLIC HEARINGS:

The Project was discussed before the Planning Commission on July 25, 2012 and August 22, 2012. At the two public hearings, the Commission received an extensive amount of public testimony and letters regarding the Project on a variety of topics. This includes the following:

- · Requirements to regulate noise;
- Implementation of the proposed trails network;
- Application of Ordinance No. 348.4729;
- Allowance of churches and other places of religious worship;

WINE COUNTRY COMMUNITY PLAN – General Plan Amendment No. 1077,
Ordinance Amendment No. 348.4729, and Program Environmental Impact Report No. 524
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT – September 26, 2012
Page 2 of 2

- Allowance of private schools;
- Preservation of vineyards and other agricultural uses;
- Tourism associated with winery and equestrian uses;
- Recognition of other agricultural operations;
- Requests for modification of the proposed Wine Country Community Plan boundaries;
- Proposed development standards;
- Water quality and supply assessment; and
- Farm worker housing.

The majority of the public testimony focused on the inclusion of churches and private schools within the Project. Since the Project description did not include churches and private schools, the PEIR No. 524 did not analyze these types of land uses. It is staff's understanding that the Commission did not feel comfortable moving forward with a recommendation on the Project due to the amount of public testimony to include churches and private schools. Thus, it was the position of the Commission to revise the Project description to include churches which would therefore require a re-circulation of the PEIR No. 524.

Thus, at the conclusion of the August 22, 2012 hearing, the Planning Commission directed staff to develop options that would include churches, and other places of religious worship in the Project description and report back to the Planning Commission. The Commission also directed staff to schedule a meeting with the consultant team and the temporary Ad Hoc Subcommittee consisting of Commissioner Petty and Commissioner Zuppardo to develop the Project options and scope of services required to re-circulate PEIR No. 524. Additionally, the Commission closed the public hearing to further public testimony. The public hearing remained open for all other matters.

Meetings regarding Project options and scope of services were conducted on September 4, 2012 and September 11, 2012. Based on the two meetings, two options were being developed. The first option would include a full re-circulation of the PEIR with the inclusion of churches only in the Project description. The second option would include a full re-circulation of the PEIR with the inclusion of churches and private schools in the Project description.

At this time, staff is still in the process of evaluating the two options, scopes of services, fee schedules and time frames. Thus, staff is recommending a 60 day continuance with no discussion to further evaluate options.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**CONTINUE FOR 60 DAYS** with no discussion to further evaluate options.