

From: Kathy Pons <282kpons@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 9:51 AM

To: Hannah Spencer <Hannah.Spencer@sonoma-county.org>

Subject: Re: DRH21-0010 1080 Campagna Lane Kenwood

EXTERNAL

Hanna,

I want to give you a heads up that I think I found an area that needs some clarification in Addendum #2.. It is under #5 Water Use and Supply, a. Water Use Calculations. These numbers seem to have come from the Draft EIR page 5.5-9. There is a revised Exhibit 5.5-4 in the Final EIR, page 9.0-73, which uses reduced numbers for water usage. Addendum #1 also references the revised water estimate in the FEIR under it's water use calculations. Please check this out and correct Addendum #2. Thank you.

Kathy Pons



filed via e-mail

May 30, 2023

Design Review Committee
c/o Hannah Spencer
Permit Sonoma
County of Sonoma

Re: DRH21-0010 Kenwood Ranch Winery--DRC May 31, 2023 Public Meeting

Dear Committee Members,

On April 18, 2023 the Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) submitted comments on the materials now scheduled to be considered at this May 31, 2023 public meeting. During the intervening period VOTMA has received clarification on the form and function of what VOTMA characterized as "Chimneys" on the three front buildings shown in the design renderings. Based on that information, VOTMA withdraws its comments/questions on that issue.

Other than that withdrawal, VOTMA incorporates by reference its April 18, 2023 comments and questions, and extends them here for purposes of this upcoming hearing.

A. CEQA Standard

Although the "Notice of A Sonoma County Design Review Committee Public Meeting" (Notice) issued May 19, 2023 states clearly that "**The Design Review Committee considers design only**" and that the "Committee's review is limited to the design aspects and compliance with related Conditions of Approval for PLP01-0006," it also notes that the Staff is recommending that the DRC "approve Addendum No. 2 to the 2004 Environmental Impact Report." Addendum No. 2 (AD2) clearly addresses issues that go well beyond "design aspects and compliance with related Conditions of Approval." As acknowledged implicitly in the Notice, the DRC has no jurisdiction or authority to approve AD2. The DRC's proper action would be to refer AD2 to the Planning Commission for its independent consideration of the various updated broad environmental impacts addressed in AD2.

B. Issues and Questions

1. Aesthetic/Visual Issues:

As a reference point for assessing visual issues associated with structures such as the Winery being placed in scenic landscape units, it is useful to refer back to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) comments on this issue as set forth in the Resolution adopting approval of PLP01-0006. In section 3.5 (j) of that Resolution the BOS rejected then-PRMD's position that the County code required structures in scenic landscape units be screened "completely" from public view. Instead the Board found that complete screening is not necessary. The Board found that the appropriate standard is "substantially screened."

The level of expected screening post Glass fire is a work in process. On the one hand many trees since 2004 have been lost through death and/or drought. Many more were lost due to the Glass fire in 2020, and many more will die from that fire in the next years or will be removed in conjunction with the development design for the winery and its landscaped grounds. On the other hand, Kenwood Ranch has shown a sensitivity to replanting trees.

KR has taken the position that on balance over time the growth of the new trees will over time substantially screen the Winery from Highway 12 and its neighbors. But KR visual representations supporting its design review request fails to show the most current conditions at the site. They do not appear to reflect recent tree removal both on the site and in the upslope area to the northeast where the Inn/Spa/Restaurant will be located. VOTMA attaches a photo taken on May 28th which reflects the most recent view from Highway 12 approximating the view KR presents in its visual assessment. KR should present a visual projection updated to 2023

VOTMA again requests that story poles be reposted to reflect the current visual impacts. VOTMA also suggest that the DRC question KR's expert on his assessment of the health of very large oak trees that dominate the foreground of the visual assessment along Highway 12. Those trees are quite old and to an untrained eye look potentially prone to falling. In other previous early photos of the large oaks on the overall project site used by the consultant, much was made of how hollowed out the inner trunks of the large fallen oaks had become. If they fall in the next few years in the storms expected to intensify with climate change, what impact would that have on the visual screening of the Winery?

2. Parking for Inn/Spa/Restaurant Employees at the Winery

The Winery project design shows the required 147 parking spaces. KR has indicated that some of that parking is proposed to be used for employees of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The parking for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant, including parking for the employees, is specified in the Conditions of Approval for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The effect of transferring parking at the Winery for employees of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant from the spaces designated for their use in those facilities has the effect of increasing the parking for the potential patrons of

the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The COAs were not drafted with that transfer contemplated. The parking design for the Winery may not be used to avoid the use restrictions implemented to control the capacity usage at the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. Parking at the Winery should have signage restricting use.

3. Wildfire Evacuation Plan and Use of Residential Subdivision Driveway

The wildfire evacuation plan proposed for the Winery and the Inn/Spa/Restaurant is not a Winery Design Review issue. It is an issue that had interrelated traffic, parking, operations, infrastructure, and public impact aspects that span the entire Kenwood Ranch project. The DRC should refer the Kenwood Ranch Wildfire (and other emergencies) Evacuation Plan to the Planning Commission for its review and approval.

As to the plan tendered, VOTMA has a variety of questions relating to the cumulative development in the area, traffic studies underlying the evacuation timing estimates, the projected worst case population to be evacuated, the public impact of the use of the yet to be constructed subdivision road and driveway to handle 40% of the evacuation load, and the feasibility of “early evacuation” at the Inn itself.

At a minimum, the evacuation plan proposal must provide an estimate of the increased evacuation time where the only road ever contemplated for ingress and egress for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant and the Winery--Campagna Lane, remains the only road authorized for evacuation. The residential subdivision driveway Kenwood Ranch now seeks to utilize is less than 300 yards from Campagna Lane, but is outside of the turn lanes zone required by the BOS as a safety measure when the Kenwood Ranch project was approved almost 20 years ago. The residential subdivision roads have not been constructed; nor has the driveway for ingress and egress for the three resident parcels to be served by that driveway. KR should detail the timing of permitting efforts required for that.

Kenwood Ranch should not be allowed to slip this critical winery and Inn/Spa/Restaurant emergency evacuation plan through permitting via a submission to the DRC. The wildfires that Sonoma Valley has experienced since 2017 and the trauma associated are much too important to the public be treated as an afterthought handled by the DRC.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Regards,

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VOTMA Board Member

