

RECEIVED

March 21, 2022

MAR 21 2022

Solano County Board of Supervisors

Solano County
Board of Supervisors

675 Texas Street, Suite 6500

Fairfield, CA 94533

To:

Supervisor John Vasquez, Chair

Supervisor Erin Hannigan

Supervisor Mitch Mashburn

Supervisor Monica Brown

Supervisor Jim Spering

Regarding Appeal of Use Permit U-20-04, Commercial Event Center, 2208 Morrison Lane.

We live on Morrison Lane and want to express our adamant opposition to the granting of Use Permit U-20-04, Turpin Event Center. The Planning Department erred in its decision to grant the Use Permit for the Event Center which triggered the appeal to the Board of Supervisors.

Simply stated the Turpin project is inconsistent with the County General Plan, and with the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan. In previous documents, comments at meetings, and letters submitted to the Planning Department and the Board of Supervisors some inconsistencies have been identified and discussed during the appeal process others have not.

Due to the project's inconsistencies with both the General Plan and the Suisun Valley Strategic Plans, which are the standards for development within Suisun Valley, a full CEQA analysis is required of this project.

Respectfully,

Dr. Robert Russum, DVM

Linda Russum, BSN, CCM

RECEIVED

March 15, 2022

MAR 18 2022

Solano County Board of Supervisors

Solano County
Board of Supervisors

675 Texas Street

Fairfield, Ca

To: Solano County Board of Supervisors

Supervisor John Vasquez, Chair

Supervisor Monica Brown

Supervisor Erin Hannigan

Supervisor Mitch Mashburn

Supervisor Jim Spering

Re: Appeal of Use Permit U-20-04, Commercial Event Center, 2208 Morrison Lane.

We, the residents, property owners of Morrison Lane and concerned citizens of Solano County would like to reiterate our strong opposition of the Planning Departments approval of the Turpin Commercial Wedding Event Center at 2208 Morrison Lane.

The planning Department's evaluation and approval of this permit is based upon inadequate and inaccurate information regarding the fundamental components of this project. We have pointed out many of the inconsistencies and errors in previous letters, public comments at meetings and our appeal document which has been submitted. We wish to present several of the major concerns in this letter for your careful consideration.

- A. There is no agriculture in place for the Turpin Event Center. Only with the presence of agriculture and a related agribusiness can it be determined whether the proposed event center is **INCIDENTIAL AND SECONDARY** to the agriculture as dictated by both the General Plan and the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan. The granting of a 5-year grace period for the development of agriculture is not codified and should not be allowed. Granting permit applicants the grace period appears to be a subjective, arbitrary decision that is made within the Planning Department. The County has a poor track record on monitoring and enforcing compliance in these situations and we feel it is critical that the agribusiness be in place **PRIOR** to the granting of any permits for an event center.
- B. There is a glaring lack of a formal, accurate, cumulative impact study of the traffic on Morrison Lane and the adequacy of the road's infrastructure based on a realistic number of cars utilizing Morrison Lane to access the event center facilities on the Lane simultaneously. These centers are at 2212, the Rosalynd Winery, 2350, the Suisun Creek Winery and 2208, the Turpin Wedding Event Center if the permit stands. It is noteworthy that the Rosalynd Winery and the Turpin Wedding Event Center entrances are approximately 100 feet apart at the very end of Morrison Lane. Implications of this close proximity were not assessed for impacts of traffic and safety. A thorough traffic study is needed to look at how this number of vehicles will be able to safely

leave Morrison Lane in the case of a large number of vehicles traveling on Suisun Valley Road from other event centers that will be ending events at the same time.

- C. A formal safety study needs to be done to look at how event participants can be evacuated in the event of an emergency, along with those who live along Morrison Lane. We feel the recently proposed easement will not be helpful in the emergent evacuation of attendees. How does the applicant propose to communicate to event attendees to utilize an unfamiliar exit route in a time of confusion and panic?
- D. Solano County does not have adequate enforcement in place to ensure compliance of the applicant with the terms of the permit with regards to noise and number of event attendees. While the Planners have stated violations of the conditions of the permit would be cause for the withdrawal of the permit, there are no parameters laid out to state how many violations can occur before this happens. Particularly with regards to noise, neighbors of other event centers who have reported violations are seen as "complainers" and nothing is done to mitigate future violations. To date, we have not seen another permit withdrawn for reported violations. Without this enforcement, in addition to a lack of formal traffic and safety studies, we question how the Planning Department and Board of Supervisors can uphold a negative declaration that states "Subject use will not constitute a nuisance to the health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare of persons residing or working in or passing through the neighborhood." Morrison Lane is an established community of over 50 residents and this project will certainly negatively alter the characteristics of this neighborhood and degrade the quality of life of its residents.

Respectfully,

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
Michael C Frost	2313 Morrison Lane	Michael Frost
Linda M. Russum	2206 Morrison Lane	Linda M. Russum
Carlos Amado	2354 Morrison Lane	Carlos Amado
Bendley J. Newman	2350 Morrison Lane	Bendley J. Newman
Kashy Hill	2365 Morrison Lane	Kashy Hill
FRANK HILL	2365 Morrison Lane	Frank Hill

March 14, 2022

Letter to the Solano County Board of Supervisors

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

James McKeever 2387 Morrison Lane J McKeever

BARBARA A. PATE 2387 Morrison Lane Barbara A. Pate

Lisa Carter 2395 Morrison Lane Lisa Carter

Annie Jensen 2421 Morrison Ln. Annie Jensen

Sheila M Sessler 2433 Morrison Ln. FF 94534

DAGMAR CLAUER 2429 MORRISON LN FF 94534

Lane Morrison 2438 Morrison Ln 94534

Robert D. Russum 2306 Morrison Ln Robert D. Russum

Edy H. Mack 2379 Morrison Ln. J. Russum
signed by direction on 3/15/2022 via cell phone.

Thomas Mack 2379 Morrison Ln. J. Russum
signed by direction on 3/15/2022 via cell phone.

Gerald J. Beaudoin 2186 Twin Sisters Rd

Susan Charters 2186 Twin Sisters Rd

leave Morrison Lane in the case of a large number of vehicles traveling on Suisun Valley Road from other event centers that will be ending events at the same time.

- C. A formal safety study needs to be done to look at how event participants can be evacuated in the event of an emergency, along with those who live along Morrison Lane. We feel the recently proposed easement will not be helpful in the emergent evacuation of attendees. How does the applicant propose to communicate to event attendees to utilize an unfamiliar exit route in a time of confusion and panic?
- D. Solano County does not have adequate enforcement in place to ensure compliance of the applicant with the terms of the permit with regards to noise and number of event attendees. While the Planners have stated violations of the conditions of the permit would be cause for the withdrawal of the permit, there are no parameters laid out to state how many violations can occur before this happens. Particularly with regards to noise, neighbors of other event centers who have reported violations are seen as "complainers" and nothing is done to mitigate future violations. To date, we have not seen another permit withdrawn for reported violations. Without this enforcement, in addition to a lack of formal traffic and safety studies, we question how the Planning Department and Board of Supervisors can uphold a negative declaration that states "Subject use will not constitute a nuisance to the health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare of persons residing or working in or passing through the neighborhood." Morrison Lane is an established community of over 50 residents and this project will certainly negatively alter the characteristics of this neighborhood and degrade the quality of life of its residents.

Respectfully,

NAME

ADDRESS 2198

SIGNATURE

Rich Larson Morrison Ln.

18



Jodelle LARSON WILLOTTA DRIVE

Jodelle Larson

Richard E Larson 18 Wilotta Dr.

Fairfield
CA
94534

Lorilee Cummins 18 Wilotta Drive, Fairfield

Cummins

Doug Cummins 18 Wilotta Drive, Fairfield

Doug Cummins

Mary Aiu 5269 Clayton Rd Fairfield CA

Mary Hochstetler 513 Suisun Valley Rd, Fairfield, CA

Mary C Hochstetler

NOVER

leave Morrison Lane in the case of a large number of vehicles traveling on Suisun Valley Road from other event centers that will be ending events at the same time.

- C. A formal safety study needs to be done to look at how event participants can be evacuated in the event of an emergency, along with those who live along Morrison Lane. We feel the recently proposed easement will not be helpful in the emergent evacuation of attendees. How does the applicant propose to communicate to event attendees to utilize an unfamiliar exit route in a time of confusion and panic?
- D. Solano County does not have adequate enforcement in place to ensure compliance of the applicant with the terms of the permit with regards to noise and number of event attendees. While the Planners have stated violations of the conditions of the permit would be cause for the withdrawal of the permit, there are no parameters laid out to state how many violations can occur before this happens. Particularly with regards to noise, neighbors of other event centers who have reported violations are seen as "complainers" and nothing is done to mitigate future violations. To date, we have not seen another permit withdrawn for reported violations. Without this enforcement, in addition to a lack of formal traffic and safety studies, we question how the Planning Department and Board of Supervisors can uphold a negative declaration that states "Subject use will not constitute a nuisance to the health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare of persons residing or working in or passing through the neighborhood." Morrison Lane is an established community of over 50 residents and this project will certainly negatively alter the characteristics of this neighborhood and degrade the quality of life of its residents.

Respectfully,

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
Duane Dembski	2875 Carmel way	Fairfield
JENNIFER ARMSTRONG	7220 LEISURE TOWN RD,	VACAVILLE CA
Daniel Armstrong	681 Hillside Dr	Fairfield ca
Mike Dost	206 Via Del Sol	Vacaville, CA 95687
Chuck Wilder	1221 Ruby DR	VACAVILLE CA, 95687
Mike Juice	210 North Orchard AVE	VACAVILLE CA 95688

March 14, 2022

Letter to the Solano County Board of Supervisors

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

Jill K. Strickland 2421 Morrison Ln.

*signed by dilation of
Jill Strickland 3/17/2021
D. Kussman
Jill K Strickland*

Mike Retherford 2421 Morrison Ln. Mike Retherford

APR.

Jennifer Simonsen 2295 Morrison Ln



Kristin Herman 2204 Morrison



JIM JONES 2204 MORRISON LN.



leave Morrison Lane in the case of a large number of vehicles traveling on Suisun Valley Road from other event centers that will be ending events at the same time.

- C. A formal safety study needs to be done to look at how event participants can be evacuated in the event of an emergency, along with those who live along Morrison Lane. We feel the recently proposed easement will not be helpful in the emergent evacuation of attendees. How does the applicant propose to communicate to event attendees to utilize an unfamiliar exit route in a time of confusion and panic?
- D. Solano County does not have adequate enforcement in place to ensure compliance of the applicant with the terms of the permit with regards to noise and number of event attendees. While the Planners have stated violations of the conditions of the permit would be cause for the withdrawal of the permit, there are no parameters laid out to state how many violations can occur before this happens. Particularly with regards to noise, neighbors of other event centers who have reported violations are seen as "complainers" and nothing is done to mitigate future violations. To date, we have not seen another permit withdrawn for reported violations. Without this enforcement, in addition to a lack of formal traffic and safety studies, we question how the Planning Department and Board of Supervisors can uphold a negative declaration that states "Subject use will not constitute a nuisance to the health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare of persons residing or working in or passing through the neighborhood." Morrison Lane is an established community of over 50 residents and this project will certainly negatively alter the characteristics of this neighborhood and degrade the quality of life of its residents.

Respectfully,

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
STEWART BOWEN	2304 MORRISON	[Signature]

RUTH MAAS	2302 MORRISON LN	[Signature]
-----------	------------------	-------------

ALBERT MAAS	2302 MORRISON LN	[Signature]
-------------	------------------	-------------

John Mangels	2294 Morrison Ln	[Signature]
--------------	------------------	-------------

Mary Katy Mangels	2294 Morrison Ln	[Signature]
-------------------	------------------	-------------

Jennifer Aguilar	2357 Morrison Lane	[Signature]
------------------	--------------------	-------------


March 14, 2022


Letter to the Solano County Board of Supervisors


PRINT NAME


ADDRESS


SIGNATURE

Antonio Aguilar 2357 Morrison Ln 


Gary Mangels 2294 Morrison Lane 

Paul Herman 2204 MORRISON LN 

Bernice Herman 2204 Morrison 

Kristin Ostrat 2361 Morrison Ln 

Ashley Chadbourne 2422 Morrison Lane 

Brandon Chadbourne 2422 Morrison Ln 

Carla Budge 2411 Morrison Lane

Carla Budge 2411 Morrison Lane 

Lake, Veronica A.

From: Kristin Herman M.D. <dr.kid@wineandwalkerranch.com>
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2022 12:39 PM
To: CAO-Clerk
Subject: Fw: Opposition to U-20-04 (Turpin)

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kristin Herman M.D. <dr.kid@wineandwalkerranch.com>
To: ehannigan@solanocounty.com <ehannigan@solanocounty.com>; mlwilson@solanocounty.com <mlwilson@solanocounty.com>; jmlacey@solanocounty.com <jmlacey@solanocounty.com>; Monica E. Brown <mebrown@solanocounty.com>; awinston@solanocounty.com <awinston@solanocounty.com>; slhallett@solanocounty.com <slhallett@solanocounty.com>; Mitchell H. Mashburn <mhmashburn@solanocounty.com>; Amy D. Sharp <adsharp@solanocounty.com>; dimercado@solanocounty.com <dimercado@solanocounty.com>; jmvasquez@solanocounty.com <jmvasquez@solanocounty.com>; jlhamilton@solanocounty.com <jlhamilton@solanocounty.com>; rlchalk@solanocounty.com <rlchalk@solanocounty.com>; Jim P. Spering <jpspering@solanocounty.com>; Catherine M. Cook <cmcook@solanocounty.com>; Teresa L. Schow2 <tlschow2@solanocounty.com>
Cc: Paul Herman <pgherm@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2022, 12:13:26 PM PDT
Subject: Opposition to U-20-04 (Turpin)

Board of Supervisors

Something is not right!

First, not even a "hello I'm your new neighbor" was made to adjacent land owners.

Then the first notice given regarding this project was the permit comment period of Dec.1 to Dec.15 right between two major holidays and during a pandemic.

Now after over a month, we get a large packet of the changes with 2 (two) business days prior to the Board Meeting for a comment period. It doesn't even allow time for professional representation to be found.

The new proposals consist mainly of promises with no backing and has little new material that addresses all the conflicting parts of the plan. This project must be canceled outright and if not, in the very least, must go through a re-permit process and a new CEQA and FULL EIR due to all the inconsistencies with the two General Plans and all the changes that were made after the December comment period and permitting. Also the re-permitting process should be done by someone in Solano County, not by a temporary planner from the 'foot hills' as this one was done---- This is a far too important precedent changing situation to be taken lightly.

Also if this is to be continued, I propose to give Planning Services 15 days to find anywhere in the State of California that a winery facility for special events was approved and/or built prior to one grapevine planted and a winery established!!

Respectfully submitted

Paul G. Herman
Adjacent land owner since 1994
Former member of the SVFC
founding member SVVGA
member SVFGA

On Thursday, March 17, 2022, 12:07:10 PM PDT, Kristin Herman M.D. <dr.kid@wineandwalkerranch.com> wrote:

My father, Paul Herman, requested I email this to you. Please seen below.

SUPERVISORS

In prior emails, "incidental to" agriculture and this project was covered but may not have been fully understood. To further expand, Chapter 3 of the Suisun Valley Plan and even the Planner's Attachment E supports our position of not permitting this project.

Ag Land Use-Protect areas from intrusion by non-ag uses and other uses that do not DIRECTLY support the economic viability of agriculture. A-SV-20 provides for ag production, ag processing facilities, facilities to support sale of produce and tourist services that are ANCILLARY to ag production!

definition: Ancillary to--providing necessary support to the Primary activities of operation of an organization or industry
See example

	Principle ag use	ag Value added	ag product Marketing
Wooden Valley	vineyard	wine	events
Il Fiorello	olive grove	olive oil, soaps, etc	events
Event Center	"hobby vineyard"	none	none

The entire General Plans are filled with agriculture v. non agriculture and keeping it that way. The need to be ' Incidental to' is used in multiple areas. I'd like to add a FIND from LU-4 of the SV Strategic Plan-----Project Description. ATC's (Ag Tour Centers) Special Events- allowed uses WITHOUT requiring them to be incidental to primary agricultural uses. This reversed indicates special events not incidental are prohibited!!! This is why we came up with the ATC's.

Please call, email, or text me with any questions or comments at 707-694-5342.

PAUL G. HERMAN
owner 2204 Morrison Lane

[EXTERNAL Email Notice!] External communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Lake, Veronica A.

From: Nancy Nelson <nnelson@oagarchitects.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2022 4:45 PM
To: Hannigan, Erin; CAO-Clerk; Brown, Monica E.; Spering, Jim P.; Vasquez, John M.; Mashburn, Mitchell H.
Subject: Turpin Special Events Facility - Use Permit Application No. U-20-04
Attachments: BOS Letter Turpin SEF Use Permit 22_0317.pdf

Members of the Board,

Please find the attached Public Comment letter regarding Item #24 on the March 22, 2022 BOS Meeting Agenda.

Yours truly,

Nancy Nelson
Architect



938 Tyler Street, #101
Benicia, California 94510
(707) 361-5209 direct
www.oagarchitects.com

[EXTERNAL Email Notice!] External communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Solano County Board of Supervisors Meeting
March 22, 2022
Item: Use Permit Application No. U-20-04, Turpin Special Events Facility

Dear Members of the Board,

The future of Suisun Valley hinges on the successful implementation of the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan (SVSP). It is crucial that County of Solano officials and staff ensure that all proposed development is consistent with the vision and standards established in the Plan. That is most certainly NOT the case with the Turpin Special Events Facility.

The proposed project is comprised of an 8,200 square foot structure (the Staff Report erroneously lists the size as 4,738 SF – see attached snip from Drawing Sheet A-3) and a 75-car parking lot, designed to host weddings and other community events on a parcel within the AS-V zone. Though this use clearly does not directly support agriculture - a development standard of Agriculture zoning - the Staff Report inexplicably labels the project as consistent with the General Plan and the SVSP. Staff makes mockery of the requirement that non-agricultural uses be “incidental to the principal agricultural use on the property” by proposing that the Board simply require that some agricultural uses be established on the property within five years in order to meet that standard.

There is no interpretation of the term “incidental to the principal agricultural use on the property” that could allow the strict limitations of the A-SV zone to be overcome by eventually planting some token crops on a fraction of the property. The SVSP standards are clear that commercial buildings whose main purpose is housing parties and weddings in the Suisun Valley, if allowed at all, be limited to the Agriculture Tourist Center Districts (ATC).

The SVSP recognizes that agricultural tourism is an important component to the economic success and long term viability of agricultural production. Accordingly, two Agricultural Tourist Center (ATC) zoning districts were established, intended to be the primary locations for promoting visitor enjoyment within the Valley. While the intention of the ATC’s is to provide businesses & services that support agricultural tourism, the uses are NOT required to be ancillary to agriculture. This is the major distinction between the AS-V district and the ATC districts.

The Land Use Plan (and General Plan Land Use Diagram) identifies eight locations for future use as Neighborhood Agricultural Tourist Centers (ATC) – **all located along major roadways** (i.e., Mankas Corner ATC, Gomer School ATC, and Rockville Corner ATC), **with roadway “spot improvements” planned to accommodate the more intensive traffic at these key locations**. Only these eight properties are allowed non-agricultural primary uses. Neither the General Plan nor the SVSP make any accommodation for “Special Events Facilities” on A-SV designated properties along Morrison Lane – nor any other narrow rural lanes – and they were most certainly not analyzed or factored into the “Land Use Assumptions”, “Transportation Impact Fee Calculation” or “Future Water Supply” Appendices of the SVSP.

One of the most important purposes of zoning law is protecting value and enjoyment of properties by separating incompatible uses and minimizing the potentially negative impacts upon each other. The professional Planners that devised the SVSP intentionally located the more “active”, commercial ATC’s along the major roadways and away from the smaller rural lanes precisely to avoid the negative impacts that the Turpin project would impose on the residents of Morrison Lane - fire safety, trespass, loss of privacy & security, and, most notably, traffic safety and noise.

Approval of a Use Permit for this project, besides violating the County’s own General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, would set a precedent for allowing almost any use in the A-SV Zone that a creative developer can claim somehow relates to agriculture. It would be tantamount to throwing out the carefully crafted Suisun Valley Strategic Plan, and result in projects like this popping up all over the Valley. I am hopeful the Board of Supervisors will uphold the agriculturally based vision and zoning for Suisun Valley memorialized in the SVSP, ensuring that this “gem” of a place is properly developed to achieve its greatest potential.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Nelson
1800 Cravea Lane
Fairfield, CA 94534

AREA TABULATION
4,738 SQ FT ENCLOSED SPACE
3,473 SQ FT COVERED PORCH
8,211 SQ FT UNDER THE ROOF

Lake, Veronica A.

From: Linda and Bob Russum <BolinRussum@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 11:13 AM
To: CAO-Clerk
Subject: Turpin Use Permit U-20-04
Attachments: May 12, 2021 Steward Bowen Letter to the Board of Supervisors.pdf

To: All members of the Solano County Board of Supervisors

I have been asked to submit this letter by Mr. Steward E. Bowen to the Board Members. He was unable to submit this letter in May 2021 when the application for a use permit was filed. He has the same concerns now as when he wrote the letter in May and wants his concerns to be heard.

Sincerely,
Linda Russum

[EXTERNAL Email Notice!] External communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

**Stewart E. Bowen
2304 Morrison Ln
Fairfield, CA 94534**

12 May 2021

**Supervisor Jim Spering
District 3, Solano County**

**Subject: Use Permit Application U-20-04, Special
Events Site on Morrison Lane, Suisun Valley**

Supervisor Spering,

I am a 42-year resident of Morrison Lane and I have concerns about the subject proposed Special Events Site at the end our our quiet, ag/residential cul-de-sac. In addition to the obvious issues about increased traffic and noise, I worry that this may lead to the further commercialization of our peaceful, off-the-highway, beautiful neighborhood.

As the prevailing wind blows, I live downwind. I fear I may get "full benefit" of any noise associated with special events. I frequently walk on Morrison Lane for the fresh air and exercise. Having low hearing and even lower vision, I appreciate the present low traffic which I do my best to avoid. I often pick up trash along the roadside as I walk. I can imagine an increase in trash as more visitors come in from outside the area. I understand there are already a half dozen venues for special events in the valley. I question the need for another.

I hope you and the Planning Commission will take these concerns into account in the decision-making process.

Sincerely,

Stewart E. Bowen

Lake, Veronica A.

From: Kristin Herman M.D. <dr.kid@wineandwalkerranch.com>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 12:42 PM
To: Hannigan, Erin; Wilson, Michael L.; Lacey, Josette M.; Brown, Monica E.; Winston, Alexandra; Hallett, Stephen L.; Mashburn, Mitchell H.; Sharp, Amy D.; Mercado, Danette I.; Vasquez, John M.; Hamilton, Jennifer; Chalk, Ryan L.; Spering, Jim P.; Cook, Catherine M.; Schow2, Teresa L.; CAO-Clerk
Cc: Paul Herman; Linda and Bob Russum
Subject: Opposition to U-20-04 (Turpin)

To the Board of Supervisors:

My husband, Jim Jones, and I live at 2204 Morrison Lane. We are two of the appellants and continue our opposition to the granting of Use Permit U-20-04.

- 1) The use permit should not be considered until until 1) agriculture has been planted and is producing and 2) an appropriate related agribusiness has been established. It is then and only then that it can be determined whether the proposed event center is secondary and incidental to the agriculture. Wineries are required to have producing vineyards before they are considered. Why is an exception being made in this case? The 5 year grace period is not codified and should not be allowed. We do not have confidence in the County Planners to follow up on this and will have less confidence that the permit would be pulled if she does not complete the requirements.
- 2) The County Planners and on some on the Board of Supervisors have held the attitude that since event centers are listed in the General Plan as being a use for an Ag-20 property, that this project must go forward. I will remind the board that the General Plan says that event centers are an allowed use by permit. They are not granted by right. The permitting process is in place to make sure the event center is appropriate for the location and the community that resides there. 28.106 of the Solano County Zoning Code states "The purpose of the use permit is to provide for public review of certain land uses that may be compatible with other allowed and permitted land uses within a zoning district, but due to their type or intensity require consideration of location, site design, adjacent land uses, availability of public infrastructure and services, and environmental impacts." The permitting process is in place to make sure a project is appropriate for the location and to protect the existing community. It is in this regard that the County Planners have completely failed to do their job.
- 3) Morrison Lane is not designed to handle the traffic that will occur with the proposed event center in addition to the other two wineries that are on Morrison. We strongly disagree with the Public Works' assessment that traffic and safety studies are not needed. It is because of the lower daily traffic that a cumulative traffic study is necessary. The large influx of cars coming to and leaving one or more events along Morrison would significantly alter the normal traffic patterns along the road. As previously mentioned, there are two blind curves and an S curve on Morrison, along with homes that are built relatively close to the road in those areas. There have been no plans submitted in the use permit to try to mitigate the traffic danger that exists at those points, particularly to drivers who are not familiar with the area and may be at least partially under the influence of alcohol. It is well known that people can be intoxicated without showing obvious signs. And more importantly, even sober drivers have crossed over the lines at the Morrison Lane curves and come close to vehicle accidents.
- 4) We also disagree with the assessment that a safety study is not needed for the case of an emergency. It is easy to cancel an event when an emergency situation is known. However, emergencies can certainly occur during the time of an event. If the Planners admit that there is the potential for traffic to stack up on Morrison Lane

during the normal exiting of an event, why would it not happen when there is an emergency with not only event participants leaving but also residents who live along Morrison? Even if there is an emergency access through the neighboring property, there is nothing in place to communicate such emergency plans with event participants. When people are in a panic, they will go out the way they came in. They are not likely to use an unfamiliar route of over 7/10th of a mile that goes through vineyards.

5) The County still does not have enforcements in place for permit violations. There is nothing in the permit that dictates how many violations the applicant is allowed before the permit is withdrawn. Allowing Ms. Turpin to monitor the noise levels of events is a bit like leaving the fox to guard the chicken coup. All she needs to do is tell the DJ to lower the sound, take the reading, and submit that to the County. The County historically has not acted on documented noise violations from other event centers. The County also has no way to independently monitor the number of guests at each event. Given that the project plans are way over building for the number of people allowed by the permit, there is a valid concern that the applicant will allow for events that exceed those numbers.

6) The permit still allows for the violation of rental ordinance 2018-1798 and the Solano County Zoning regulation chapter 28.8 by continuing allowing the guest house at the event center site with overnight rental. A guest house must be accessory to the primary dwelling and located on the same building site. A guest house also cannot be rented, let, or leased separate from the primary dwelling.

Sincerely,

Kristin Herman MD
James Jones

[EXTERNAL Email Notice!] External communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Lake, Veronica A.

From: Linda and Bob Russum <BolinRussum@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 12:47 PM
To: CAO-Clerk; Linda and Bob Russum; Paul Herman; Kris Herman
Subject: Turpin Event Center
Attachments: Letter To Solano County Board of Supervisors, March 21, 2022.pdf

To: Solano County Board Members.
Regarding Use Permit U-20-04 Turpin Special Events Facility.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert & Linda Russum

[EXTERNAL Email Notice!] External communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

March 21, 2022

Solano County Board of Supervisors

675 Texas Street, Suite 6500

Fairfield, CA 94533

To:

Supervisor John Vasquez, Chair

Supervisor Erin Hannigan

Supervisor Mitch Mashburn

Supervisor Monica Brown

Supervisor Jim Spering

Regarding Appeal of Use Permit U-20-04, Commercial Event Center, 2208 Morrison Lane.

We live on Morrison Lane and want to express our adamant opposition to the granting of Use Permit U-20-04, Turpin Event Center. The Planning Department erred in its decision to grant the Use Permit for the Event Center which triggered the appeal to the Board of Supervisors.

Simply stated the Turpin project is inconsistent with the County General Plan, and with the Suisun Valley Strategic Plan. In previous documents, comments at meetings, and letters submitted to the Planning Department and the Board of Supervisors some inconsistencies have been identified and discussed during the appeal process others have not.

Due to the project's inconsistencies with both the General Plan and the Suisun Valley Strategic Plans, which are the standards for development within Suisun Valley, a full CEQA analysis is required of this project.

Respectfully,

Dr. Robert Russum, DVM

Linda Russum, BSN, CCM