

Date: April 27, 2021

From: Nick Pappani, Vice President, Raney Planning & Management, Inc.

To: Dana Ayers, Interim Community Development Director, City of Clayton

**Subject: Clayton Community Church - Responses to Additional Comment Letters Submitted During Extended Public Review Period of CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration**

This memorandum was prepared by Raney Planning & Management in response to additional public comment letters submitted to the City during the extended public review period (ending on April 27, 2021, 2:00 PM) on the Clayton Community Church Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and implementing Guidelines, the City of Clayton, as the “lead agency”, is not required to respond to comments on a mitigated negative declaration. Nevertheless, in order to ensure that public questions and concerns regarding environmental issues are addressed, general responses are provided.

This memorandum demonstrates that all environmental-related concerns raised in these letters have already been identified in the letters submitted during the first public review period, for which the City provided responses. These responses to comments are included as Appendix H to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report.

With respect to the additional letters, the following section includes the name of the author, and general responses.

**Kevin T Zimmer (March 2, 2021)**

This form letter was provided by several members of the public, a few of which (Letters 2 and 12) were included in the original Responses to Comments document prepared by the City (Attachment H to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report). Regarding traffic concerns, please see Response to Comment 1-7. Regarding maintenance of the property, please see Response to Comment 1-16.

**Nicholas Petersen (March 6, 2021)**

The letter expresses general concerns regarding traffic, noise, views, and small town feel, which are already addressed in Attachment H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. For example, regarding traffic concerns, please see Response to Comment 1-7. In short, TJKM determined that project-generated traffic would not exacerbate any existing operational problems along roadways in the project vicinity, nor result in conflicts with City level of service policies at nearby intersections, including during the Sunday PM peak hour, which is anticipated to be the time in which the proposed project’s typical operations generate the highest traffic volumes. Regarding noise concerns, please see Response to Comment 5-6. Regarding views, please see Response to Comment 4-8. Regarding small town feel, please see Response to Comment 1-2.

**Neil Egbert (April 17, 2021)**

The comment expresses general traffic concerns. Please see Response to Comment 1-7 in Appendix H (Responses to Comments) of the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. In short, TJKM determined that project-generated traffic would not exacerbate any existing operational problems along roadways in the project vicinity, nor result in conflicts with City level of service policies at nearby intersections, including during the Sunday PM peak hour, which is anticipated to be the time in which the proposed project's typical operations generate the highest traffic volumes.

Small town feel is a social concern outside of the purview of CEQA, as discussed in Response to Comment 1-2 of Appendix H.

**Kevin Christiansen (April 19, 2021)**

The letter generally addresses topics for which responses have been provided in Appendix H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. For example, regarding traffic concerns, please see Response to Comment 1-7. In short, TJKM determined that project-generated traffic would not exacerbate any existing operational problems along roadways in the project vicinity, nor result in conflicts with City level of service policies at nearby intersections, including during the Sunday PM peak hour, which is anticipated to be the time in which the proposed project's typical operations generate the highest traffic volumes.

Regarding noise concerns, please see Response to Comment 5-6. Regarding light concerns, please see Response to Comment 4-8. Regarding safety concerns, as noted in Response to Comment 5-7, it is important to remember that the church would generate low traffic volumes on the surrounding road network during the majority of the week. Average peak operations would occur on Sundays, during which time all nearby intersections would continue to operate acceptably with project traffic.

**Max Cook (April 19, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Melissa Costa (April 25, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**Joseph Knapp (April 19, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Michael L. Mann and Tara M. Mann (April 19, 2021)**

This letter is substantively similar to Letter 4 of Appendix H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. Please refer thereto.

**Rocco Aicale (April 20, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Marissa Doppe (April 20, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Shelly Gwynn (April 20, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Anne Marie Mills (April 20, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Patricia Mensaco and Rocco Aicale (April 21, 2021)**

This letter is substantively similar to Letter 1 of Appendix H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. Please refer thereto. Regarding the Aesthetics comment and concerns regarding views, as discussed in the Final IS/MND (pg. 34), as the project site is located in the urbanized area of the General Plan planning area, in accordance with CEQA Checklist question 1.c., the relevant threshold is whether the project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, rather than whether the project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. The Final IS/MND provides substantial evidence that the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality.

**Richard Mann (April 23, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Brannan Gray (April 24, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**Deborah Ray (April 24, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Matthew Weisbrod (April 24, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Sandy Codington (April 25, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**Mary Ann Gannon-McCooey (April 25, 2021)**

The letter expresses general traffic concerns for which responses have been provided in Appendix H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. For example, please see Response to Comment 1-7. In short, TJKM determined that project-generated traffic would not exacerbate any existing operational problems along roadways in the project vicinity, nor result in conflicts with City level of service policies at nearby intersections, including during the Sunday PM peak hour, which

is anticipated to be the time in which the proposed project's typical operations generate the highest traffic volumes.

**Pam Hall (April 25, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the original church proposal in downtown Clayton and does not address the adequacy of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

**Nick LaSpada (April 25, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Marcia Mason (April 25, 2021)**

The letter expresses traffic concerns for which responses have been provided in Appendix H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. For example, please see Response to Comment 1-7.

Quality of life is a social concern outside of the purview of CEQA, as discussed in Response to Comment 1-2 of Appendix H.

**Wendy Mores (April 25, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**Yvette Saybe (April 25, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Donald and Geraldine Terry (April 25, 2021)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Melody Benway (April 26, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**John Bromley (April 26, 2021)**

The letter expresses concerns for which responses have been provided in Appendix H (Responses to Comments) to the April 27, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report. For example, please see Response to Comment 1-11 regarding parking. While traffic in the area would increase, CEQA requires a lead agency to use thresholds of significance to determine whether traffic increases would be considered significant. None of the City's traffic thresholds would be exceeded by the project. Please see Response to Comment 1-7 for further discussion.

**Mark and Patti Cederwall (April 26, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**Darrel Dubovsky (April 26, 2021)**

The commenter states that he has concerns, but does not identify what the concerns are. Thus, a specific response cannot be provided.

**Marc Felker and Dianne Felker (no date)**

This form letter has been provided by several commenters, including Commenter Christiansen. Please refer to above.

**Jaime Lisle (April 26, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.

**Doug and Lori (Thompson) Sweet**

The commenters express support for the project.

**Geraldine Hackett (April 26, 2021)**

The commenter expresses support for the project.