

## Gallina, Charlene

---

**From:** Bill Dyer <info@dyerwine.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 11, 2015 9:09 AM  
**To:** Gallina, Charlene  
**Cc:** napacommissioner@yahoo.com; heather@vinehillranch.com; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; tkscottco@aol.com; mattpope384@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Use Permit Modification for Reverie Winery, APN 020-440-005

I am heartened by the Staff Recommendations for the Use Permit Modification. Specifically I like that they recognize the appropriateness of sizing wine production to accommodate the grapes grown on the estate property. Diamond Mountain Rd. is very narrow in some places, including a one-lane bridge, proceeded by very tight (almost blind) turns. Having the grapes all processed on site, matching wine production to vineyard production, should minimize truck traffic on the road during harvest, limiting both the export and the import of grapes. I am also glad to see Staff expressing concern about the impacts of increased visitation, especially those associated with events. The large vehicles often utilized during special events and by commercial tours can dramatically impact the safety of traffic on this road. I am especially concerned that the increased visitation request precedes acquisition of this parcel by the entity developing the adjacent resort, and worry that this may be a prelude to directly connecting the resort with Reverie and Von Strasser wineries, such that activities in the municipal development would direct traffic onto Diamond Mountain Road. I would like to see restrictions to prevent future linkage of the resort to the wineries to the extent it impacts traffic on the County road.

Bill Dyer  
1501 Diamond Mountain Rd.  
Calistoga

George Caloyannidis  
2202 Diamond Mountain Road  
Calistoga, CA 94515  
[gecalo@comcast.net](mailto:gecalo@comcast.net)

June 9, 2015

TO: Napa County Planning Commissioners  
RE: Reverie Winery Major Use-Permit Modification

Dear Commissioners:

In addition to my previously submitted extensive comments and in response to some of the subsequent comments on record and to some of the ones expressed by some of you during the last hearing, I would like to add the following:

Some of the comments and letters of support argued that the Modification should be granted because the applicant's character and behavior as a neighbor are exemplary. I believe that addressing the case on these terms would be immaterial and misguided.

- 1) At issue here is not the character of the applicant. It is whether it is appropriate for the County to reward an operation which has shown disregard for the conditions of its use permit, the numerous grading and building permit code and environmental violations in relation to streams, sewer disposal and water quality while accepting visitors (the detailed list is contained in my previously submitted comments).
- 2) If use permits – the most important instrument available to the County for regulating its economic and environmental vitality and quality of life - are granted in terms of character, then criteria on how to evaluate them ought to be codified standards applied universally. But at this point in time such criteria and standards are not an approved part of the process.

The letters in support by *Solage* or from vendors and practitioners doing business with Reverie must be considered in recognition that these entities will continue to do business with it if they choose to do so regardless of subsequent owners. The issue of increased use permit levels might have had some merit if there was a shortage of wineries. However, at a time when APAC is trying to develop conditions placing limits on the number of potential wineries, this is clearly not the case.

One more letter by *Calistoga Hills* who by all intents and purposes is the prospective buyer of Reverie does not even deserve comment.

The letter by the Reverie attorneys comparing the Reverie post modification size to other operations might have been well taken if a new winery's application was being considered, a metric often applied in many cases in the past. But in view of cumulative effects – as the ones currently reviewed by APAC – indicates that more careful approval standards may be needed at this point in time.

I also agree with the comment by one of you that small wineries deserve the County's support. Sadly, small wineries are a disappearing species. However, this just not warrant the indiscriminate support and the granting of immunity from egregious and consistent disregard of an entire body of regulation.

In addition, you must realize that denying Mr. Kiken the Modification would not preclude his vendors and supporters from continuing doing business with that winery.

However, as Mr. Kiken has reluctantly admitted, he is in the process of selling his winery. The only reason he is seeking the modification is for him to justify an increased sales price. After that, he is not going to be around for all his supporters.

**In effect, approval of this modification is an instrument by which the County will literally be writing a check to Mr. Kiken for several million additional dollars in increased value (twofold production – sixty fivefold visitations) as a direct monetary reward for disregarding the discretionary use the County and the public entrusted him with. This has nothing to do with support of small wineries.**

The serious issue regarding the County's ability to monitor visitation and sales of the winery in view that it will have 1 direct secondary access to the adjoining resort which is within the City of Calistoga jurisdiction needs to be addressed whether the Modification is granted or denied. Sales to visiting customers can be recorded at the resort rather at the winery - all without violating any laws - making monitoring and enforcement by the County structurally impossible.

You as Planning Commissioners are the guardians of the integrity of the use permit process. The granting of any part of this Modification and especially, any failure to impose severe sanctions instead would be a direct disregard of the powers entrusted in you.

The public is mobilizing in serious ways.

Sincerely,

George Caloyannidis

## Gallina, Charlene

---

**From:** McDowell, John  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 11, 2015 12:33 PM  
**To:** Gallina, Charlene  
**Subject:** FW: REVERIE WINERY  
**Attachments:** REVERIE 2nd COMMENTS.docx

---

**From:** CALTI [<mailto:calti@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2015 12:20 PM  
**To:** PC/ Anne Cottrell; PC/ Heather Phillips; PC/ Matt Pope; PC/ Michael Basayne; PC/ Terry Scott  
**Cc:** C/ 2050 Dan Mufson; McDowell, John  
**Subject:** REVERIE WINERY

Dear County Planning Commissioners,  
Attached, please find my additional comments for your consideration.  
George Caloyannidis

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of the message, please contact the sender immediately and delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.