

From: ZQuat@aol.com
To: [Gitelman, Hillary](#); [St. Claire, Linda](#)
Cc: ZQuat@aol.com
Subject: LPO Letter to the PC for 9.7.11
Date: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 12:04:29 PM

8.30.11

Re: Napa County landmarks Preservation Ordinance [Draft 2] 9.7.11 Hearing

Napa County Planning Commission

As an architect, planner and preservationist with over 50 years of experience, I laud your efforts, those of the Board and the Napa Community in bringing preservation into the General Plan in a substantive way and now shaping an ordinance to reflect that.

For the past 32 years my family has been the custodian of the physical [and spiritual]remnants of a major chapter in California history [our residence there is the only remaining habitable portion of this former spa.] The prospective LPO naturally gives us renewed hope for an improved future for this major resource.

Visitors and members of the community who have any familiarity with Napa Soda Springs recognize that the it is one of the most important "ghost" landmark sites in the state and that it definitely should be preserved and accessible for public appreciation and the enhancement and illumination of California culture and history.

I am absolutely confident that as it is, the site has the power to attract the highest order of talent expertise to the challenging effort required to prevent its alternative fate, and in its transformation, it could become not only a model solution for the protection, stabilization and maintenance of a ruins complex, but could well be an iconic Napa landmark for future generations.

This will require substantial creative abilities and of course, substantial economic resources, both of which have an integral relationship to the ultimate LPO .

My hope that the possibilities of the future of NSS will be enhanced by the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance would be much stronger if the ordinance were more specific regarding the inclusion of landmark sites [as per buildings and structures...] and that the "whichever is less" standard of 18.104.430 D were more proactive, such as "whichever is most likely to support the long term preservation of the landmark in the manner most appropriate to its site and setting" .[thereby reinforcing finding 'A' of that same section]

I further believe that "extensive additions.." defined by a specific area limit would be better served by reliance on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards... In some future cases, ANY visible addition could be disastrous, and in others, the maximum of 500sf could be woefully short of an amount functionally necessary and aesthetically appropriate. [For scale, think CIA or many of our landmark wineries.]

I submit these suggestions respectfully with the hope that you will consider them conscientiously in the interest of achieving the most effective and workable LPO for the County as a whole.

*Thank You
Richard Ehrenberger*