

HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF VARIANCE **SANDPOINT WINERY**

The variance request meets the intent of the 300-ft. setback. The intent of both the 600-ft. and 300-ft. setbacks is to avoid the appearance of a “wall of structures” as viewed from major public roads. Since most development patterns along Inglewood Avenue are clustered nearer to the road, with expanses of vineyard in a north/south configuration, siting wineries on smaller parcels (such as these) at the 300-ft. setback results in more structural “interruptions” along view corridors from Highway 29.

Variance is consistent with measures in the Greenhouse Emissions Checklist. Many of the conservation measures contained in the checklist are met via clustering of the development area closer to Inglewood Avenue. This includes the creation of a more pedestrian-friendly setting, containment of structures in one area for more energy efficient development, and minimizing impervious surfaces on the site.

Rights enjoyed by other wineries on Inglewood Avenue. There are several wineries located on Inglewood Avenue, which is also characterized as a residential area. The Arger-Martucci Winery, located further to the east and also on the south side of Inglewood, is only 105 ft. from Inglewood Road. This is a winery that is currently pursuing an even more intense winery footprint than its originally approved one.

Current siting represents the environmentally superior alternative. Although environmental considerations are not part of the State requirements for variance findings, the County has historically considered such conditions in making decisions about variances, especially those to the 300-ft. setback, which is strict in the extreme for small parcels. Proposed plan will result in the ability to use mature trees for screening, will protect approximately 1.5 acres of vineyard that would otherwise be sacrificed to a winery development envelope, and minimizes the amount of paving required for roads.

Clustering of structures achieves the intent of the ordinance. The applicant’s primary residence and guest house are part of the enclave of structures sited within the setback and represent clustered development area. Since the residential structures are under construction, there will not be another structure siting in the vineyard in the future, so this view of vineyard area will be protected. Also, this development pattern places the owner’s residence closer to the winery than any other residence, which should provide a measure of reassurance to neighbors as far as any potential nuisance factors.

End of road winery siting would incur only a 28-ft. setback. The subject property is almost the last at the far western end of Inglewood Avenue. If the property was actually the last one on Inglewood, the County has historically interpreted the 300-ft. setback is not required and only the standard 28-ft. setback is required. This would translate into a neighboring property enjoying a property right that is not shared by this applicant.

Precedent for variance findings has occurred dozens of times in Napa County. As has been represented on many occasions, the 300-ft. setback for any public or private road serving more than one parcel is extremely arduous in application. The ordinance is arbitrary by virtue of its not even having a stated intent that differentiates it from the 600-ft. setback applied to major arterials in the County. It takes no notice of view corridors for north/south roads and the pattern of development along such roads. The County is cognizant of this, and also of the need to revise the 300-ft. setback so that environmentally superior design alternatives can be approved without necessarily demonstrating a hardship condition. The County's approval of literally dozens of variances to the 300-ft. setback is representative of this need to provide a method of exception rather than variance.

We believe that the characteristics of this project have adequately met the findings required by the State of California for variances, on the basis of precedent, special site considerations, rights afforded other similar properties on Inglewood Avenue, and design standards and environmental considerations.

Neighbors in favor of variance to 300-ft. setback. The neighbors closest to the proposed winery have expressed a very strong desire to see the winery developed closer to Inglewood Road, in order that their views are preserved, the winery is screened effectively by mature trees, and noise is contained closer to the road. Neighbors will provide letters of support or attend to testify for purposes of the hearing.

Please see Project Statement in support of the variance contained elsewhere in the use permit application, for further details.

Also see several exhibits prepared for purposes of the evaluation of this variance request. These include exhibits illustrating the landscape concept as viewed from Inglewood Avenue and a color and materials exhibit prepared by the architect, Taylor Lombardo. In addition, we have prepared an aerial mapping reflecting development patterns along Inglewood Avenue and the view corridors from the vantage point of Highway 29, a major arterial in Napa County.



130 Commercial Street
 Suite 100 San Francisco
 CA 94111
 (415) 433-7777
 (415) 433-7755 fax
www.kayforbaird.com

Young Winery
 1918 Ingleswood Ave.
 SL Helena, CA 94575

View Study
 March 30, 2010

