

PD Properties LLC  
995 Vintage Avenue  
St. Helena, California 94574

**RECEIVED**

APR 25 2013

April 25, 2013

Napa County Planning, Building  
& Environmental Services

Linda St. Claire, project planner  
Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services  
County of Napa  
1195 Third Street, room 210  
Napa, California 94559

Re: Project Status Report--Flynnville Wine Company, 1184 Maple Lane Calistoga,

Dear Ms. St. Claire:

This letter responds to the issues that we discussed on March 22, 2013 with you, Jeanette Doss, Kim Withrow and John McDowell:

1. Plan for existing wastewater system retention and removal;
2. Setback from City of Calistoga water line
3. Differential in estimated storm water runoff;
4. Impact of continued use of the south driveway and parking area on existing trees;
5. Proposed visitation levels
6. Project-specific traffic management/cumulative traffic

#### **Environmental Health/Public Works Comments**

Attached please find a revised site plan prepared by Summit Engineering that shows a 25-foot setback from the centerline of the City of Calistoga water line. Also enclosed is a letter from Christina Nicholson clarifying the differential in pre- and post-project storm water runoff. This response also identifies our proposal for removing and retaining existing wastewater systems commensurate with the proposed winery phasing.

#### **Planning Issues**

- **Existing Trees/South Parking Area.** The area along the south property line is presently used as a driveway and parking area much as it will be used following completion of our project. The existing trees along the south property line planted over 50 years ago and are in excellent health, as you will observe when you visit the site. We don't expect that the continued use of the driveway and parking area will jeopardize the health of the trees. As the most recent plan indicates we are not adding pavement beneath the drip line but retaining it as pervious materials. Finally, it is not uncommon for

existing and newly planted trees to co-exist in close proximity to paved areas. The parking lot outside of the county administration building has trees planted between a concrete sidewalk and the parking area. We can provide pictures of other areas in the City of Napa where street trees co-exist between sidewalks and paved areas. A comment was also made at the meeting that the south parking area looked very 'industrial' on the site plan. We beg to differ. In fact, that area is well screened to the traveling public by the existing 50 year old mature vegetation that we will supplement with additional plantings. We are not willing to revise the design of this area.

- Proposed Visitation Levels. We think that comparing our proposed visitation levels with wineries of similar size should not be the only metric to use in gauging the appropriateness of our project. We think a better judge is potential impacts of visitation levels on infrastructure such as parking, water usage, wastewater and local traffic conditions. The visitation levels that we propose have been thoroughly vetted by our design and traffic professionals who have concluded that impacts on infrastructure (water use, wastewater generation and disposal and impacts on local street networks and intersections) are less than significant. In fact, as our December 15, 2012 traffic report points out, current uses of the site generate 96 trips per day. When additional trips that could be developed by permitted uses of the property are factored in (7 existing parcels x 2 residences/ parcel x 10 trips per residence) the baseline traffic generated by status quo conditions is 236 daily trips (96 + 140). The traffic report we submitted notes that daily trip generation from the proposed Flynnville Wine Company is 328 trips on a typical weekday and 418 trips on a typical Saturday. Thus, arguably we are increasing baseline, reasonable foreseeable daily trips by 92 on a typical weekday and 182 trips on a typical Saturday, over the eight (8) hours that the winery is open under non-harvest conditions. The traffic report assumed that all winery trips are new trips on the network even though many of our guests will already be traveling on the road network and could reasonably be viewed as diverted trips into our proposed facility. Even so, the local street network and affected intersections are well within the level of service standard of 'D' in the general plan.

That said John McDowell raised very legitimate issues about cumulative traffic impacts. These are best addressed on a countywide as well as a regional level. The adopted general plan proposes some measures that individual projects could include as mitigation measures when or if the county adopts and applies them to individual wineries.

Based upon our discussion on March 22<sup>nd</sup> and at prior meetings, it is clear that your office currently does not support our proposed visitation program. We have discussed this among ourselves and with our project team. Based upon this discussion, we propose the following changes to our project. We believe that these changes along with the operational parameters already

included in our project will reduce both current and cumulative traffic impacts:

1. We will reduce our weekly maximum from 3500 to 2750; maximum daily visitors of 350 on weekdays, 500 on Saturday and Sunday;
  2. Our proposed closing time - will ensure that visitors avoid the afternoon peak hour;
  3. We will provide bicycle parking to encourage and accommodate non-vehicular visitors
  4. We will provide access to shuttle services for marketing events with attendance greater than 250 persons. These events will be scheduled only during off-peak periods;
  5. We will close the winery to daily visitors for events with attendance greater than 250 persons
  6. Our facility is well screened from the direct view from St. Helena Highway with entry gates. These features together with our by-appointment facility will preclude the casual drop in visitor;
  7. Our new website will encourage our guests to maximize use of alternative means of travel to visit us such as local lodging facilities shuttles and also local group travel operator
  8. We will provide site management at all times that utilize efficiencies of common pickup and delivery schedules to minimize unnecessary peak period travel
  9. We will focus and promote our winery visitation program in Calistoga and St. Helena hotels and resort to maximize up valley guests participation. We will provide incentives for up valley concierges to recommend that hotel guests visit our facility
  10. We will provide access to shuttle service to pick up and return visitors from Calistoga and St. Helena hotels
  11. We will provide concierge services to help minimize unnecessary travel on the roadways by lost or misguided travelers leaving our facility to visit our neighbors
  12. We will participate in a future traffic improvement fund to pay our fair share of county-wide traffic improvements fund (TIF) identified in DEIR Table 4.4-20 when developed and is approved by the Board of Supervisors and required of all new or expanding wineries
- The Whole is Less than the Sum of the parts. Or Why Staff Should Support our Project?

Our project satisfies a niche presently unfulfilled in the local wine industry. Our facility provides opportunities for local vintners who would like more control over the winemaking process than a custom crush facility provides but cannot afford to develop a winery of their own due to high land and improvements costs. Co-locating several production facilities on a single parcel rather than building multiple wineries equally on multiple parcels

throughout the county will incrementally preserve the county's agricultural land. And by locating such a facility on this parcel, no existing agricultural land is impacted! This site has been historically used for commercial and industrial uses and is covered with buildings and impervious surfacing. A new winery on a single 10-acre parcel would involve the coverage of up to 2.5 acres (over 100,000 square feet) of land not including land area devoted to wastewater disposal systems. A 20,000-gallon winery represents a typical size winery that might locate on a 10-acre parcel. Our facility then would supplant as many as 15 of wineries of this size. Developing 15 wineries on individual parcels would result in up to 1.6 million square feet of coverage or 74+ acres as compared to the 113,000 (2.6 acre) of coverage that our facility would utilize! In addition to the cumulative loss of agricultural land, greater coverage leads to greater potential for water quality, wildlife and other impacts. Beyond the obvious benefit to the county's agricultural resource, county oversight of - multiple wine producers located on a single site with single ownership rather than oversight on multiple parcels preserves staff resources for more important tasks.

Reuse of this site has other benefits beyond the preservation of agricultural land. 'Flynnville' is composed of a number of non-conforming uses the oversight of which has been troublesome for the county in the past. The opportunity to transform this nonconforming use over time into a conforming land, with attractive well-designed buildings developed in a consistent style should not be overlooked. Finally, the consolidation of seven (7) small parcels of record into a single agricultural parcel and ownership is a long-term goal of the county.

Redeveloping an existing site hereto - not used for - agriculture into a site that could house multiple - wine producing tenants is an excellent land use for the county, is consistent with the general plan goals of preserving agricultural land and reducing impacts to our natural resources.

We believe that with these revisions-and the completion of all requested studies, we have addressed concerns raised at our most recent meeting. We would appreciate your scheduling our application for hearing at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

  
Dan Pina

PD Properties LLC

CC: Richard Ross, Summit Engineering  
Tom Faherty, Valley Architects  
Jeffrey Redding AICP