

Trippi, Sean

From: Diane Beltrami [diane@sthelenaca.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2012 4:27 PM
To: Trippi, Sean
Subject: Hall Winery Use Permit Modification

Dear Sean,

I am writing to let you know that Dan and I met with Mike Reynolds at Hall Winery yesterday to discuss our concerns and the concerns of the Inglewood neighbors directly affected by the Hall Winery property. Kelly Wheaton, Rose Taylor, Pam Taylor and Mary Edano also attended the meeting. Mike showed us plans and elevations of current and future buildings and structures. We have concerns regarding elevations because we have seen that what is in plans that we are shown, and we agree to, is often changed after we see the plans and we wanted to make sure our concerns were understood regarding the height of buildings and future structures. For example, Mike showed us plans for elevations for the historical winery site and the production building that was built a couple of years ago and I saw that on those drawings, the cupolas that have now been built on the winery. **I didn't remember seeing those in the past, when we were shown drawings or elevations.** Mike insisted to me that the cupolas had been on previous plans that we had been shown. **I looked back at plans that we had from the Memorandum of Understanding, and the cupolas are NOT there.** The historical winery site plans/drawing shows only the roof without the cupolas. Mike and the Halls knew that we didn't want our view of Mt. St. Helena to be blocked (we were already agreeing to compromise to a partial view block) and they led us to believe that all was well with that issue because the production building was only 24 ft. high. Now Mike is acting like he was totally upfront and honest and had shown us plans including the cupolas and that we should have known they were coming down the pike. Well, as I explained to Mike, (many time in the past) I am just a lay person who doesn't really completely understand how something is going to look in real life, just by looking at drawings and architectural plans. I rely on him to be upfront and honest and I would rather he had told me, yes, we will keep the production facility height to 24ft, but you need to know that the cupolas will be coming down the pike and will completely block your view. Instead, I came home from work one day about a week ago and the view I had was gone! And in addition, I don't believe that we were ever shown the plans that included the cupolas. All we ask is for the Halls to be considerate of their neighbors and not leave out information they think we might not like, just to get their plans approved.

Dan and I, and our neighbors have offered to support the Hall Winery modifications under the following conditions:

1. We need written confirmation that the ingress/egress onto Inglewood Ave cannot be opened up to cars. It is for emergency vehicle and/or agricultural machinery access only. This was part of the 2004 MOU and a previous Use Permit that the Halls inherited from Golden State Vintners. We would also request that if any of their property is donated or sold to another party that this be part of the sale agreement.
2. That the vineyards shown on the original Use Permit and current proposal to the south and east of the evaporation pond be required to be installed as part of Phase Three AND that their PERMANENT maintenance be a condition of the Use Permit.
3. That it be further codified IN WRITING that no buildings shall be constructed in the areas to the south and east of the existing Waste water pond including but not limited to any residences, farm worker or affordable housing, whether or not the Halls keep this property or convey to another.

The Halls are already in danger of exceeding the ratio of industrial to agricultural Use of their property, i.e. the amt. in vineyards. What is that ratio supposed to be and what would the proposed changes make the ratio?

With the future plans of Inglewood Village's 4th building, the Use Permit modification request by Hall Winery and their 4th phase buildings coming closer to our property, and the possibility of Farm Worker housing coming in the future, the Taylors, Ms. Edano and we are in danger of being totally blocked in by commercial and agricultural buildings and our property value will be significantly diminished. We respectfully request that the county take all these projects, present and future, into consideration before approving anything. Otherwise, we and our neighbors are the losers, one project at a time. Our property was sold to us as "country property" and we are in danger of losing that. In addition, even considering placing farm worker housing on a flood retention basin that is known to have flooding and septic issues would be irresponsible for all parties concerned, especially the future farm workers would might live there.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration.

Diane and Dan Beltrami
1362 Inglewood Ave
St. Helena, Ca 94574

Diane L. Morris

1777 Inglewood Avenue • St. Helena, California 94574 • Phone: 707.963.4548 • Fax: 707.963.3177
E-Mail: diane@morrisgmt.com

March 1, 2012

Mr. John McDowell
Zoning Administrator
Napa County
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

SUBJECT: MINOR MOD REQUEST FOR HALL WINERY

Dear Mr. McDowell:

I am one of the neighbors to the Hall Winery on Inglewood Avenue in St. Helena and am concerned about the new construction at the winery being processed in an administrative action rather than there being a public hearing before the Planning Commission. The Inglewood neighborhood has been involved with many non-residential projects along Highway 29 in proximity to our residential street, including several wineries and the Inglewood Village office park located on the corner of Inglewood Avenue and Highway 29. In each instance, the neighborhood had a chance to work with the applicants in order to understand their projects and we had the chance for our County Planning Commission to evaluate those projects. In fact, the Inglewood Village project recently proposed a new 4,000-sq. ft. building and the County required that applicant to undergo public hearing.

It seems from the intent letter that there are some significant new structures proposed in the request for Hall Winery, including over 16,000 sq. ft. of new structures and an additional 25 parking spaces. Frankly, this does not look consistent with there being no increase in employees and visitors. It looks like a significant intensification in use. The Planning Commission should evaluate the application and consider this.

The neighborhood is concerned specifically with the protection of a condition of approval related to a legal access between the Hall Winery and Inglewood Avenue. This condition dates back to the Golden State Vintners ownership of the property and carried forward in the subsequent Hall Winery modification, limiting access to agricultural equipment and emergency vehicles, with no winery (or any other) access onto Inglewood Avenue. See enclosed letter from previous use permit mod. Please take note of the importance of maintaining this condition as the staff and Planning Commission evaluates this project.

Please add me to the list of persons who wish to be noticed about this project. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane L. Morris

cc: Sean Trippe, Dept. of Conservation, Development & Planning

RECEIVED

MAR 05 2012

**NAPA CO. CONSERVATION
DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.**

December 15, 2005

Mr. Sean Trippe
Dept. of Conservation, Development & Planning
Napa County
1195 Third Street, Room 210
Napa, CA 94559

SUBJECT: HALL WINERY WINERY USE PERMIT – ENTRY GATES

Dear Mr. Trippe:

As you know, members of the Inglewood Avenue neighborhood have entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Halls relative to their proposed winery use permit. We are hopeful that the County will incorporate this agreement into the use permit materials, since all involved parties spent a considerable amount of time and effort in reaching consensus on those issues.

More importantly, we have a specific concern about the wording in the notice, which identifies the Inglewood Avenue access as an “entrance gate.” When Golden State Vintners did the use permit for this property, the one request the neighborhood had in return for their support was that this access was to be used exclusively for agricultural equipment and possibly emergency fire access. The current Hall Winery plans do not require the Inglewood Avenue access for emergency fire access. Consequently, we would like the wording in the use permit to be clarified so that it is not called an “entrance gate.” Our concern, as it was with Golden State Vintners, is that this access should not be used for construction activities or for winery visitors. This was our agreement with Golden State Vintners, which is a specific condition of approval in their use permit. We want to make sure that this situation has not been changed in the Hall Winery permit modification. Please make this point at the hearing and in the wording contained in the use permit.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, which is now the one outstanding, yet longstanding issue that the Inglewood neighborhood has expressed concern about. We appreciate the County’s efforts at balancing the needs of the neighbors with those of the winery.

Respectfully,

Diane L. Morris

cc: Craig Hall, Hall Winery

Trippi, Sean

From: Diane Beltrami [diane@sthelenaca.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 8:50 PM
To: Trippi, Sean; McDowell, John
Cc: Mike Reynolds
Subject: Hall Winery Use Permit File P11-00452-Mod

Dear Sean,

We are writing to state our concerns regarding the use permit modification requested by Hall Winery. We are very concerned that this is being fast tracked without a Public Hearing which given the intensity of the project and all the changes in the neighborhood---a Public Hearing should be mandatory. And that's without even mentioning the possibility of affordable housing in our back yard! We have heard rumors that the Halls have met with someone discussing the possibility that the access to the affordable housing would be via Inglewood and therefore immediately adjacent our house. We are adamantly opposed to the use of the parcel next to our house as an entrance/exit to the Hall property or any potential farmworker housing. The Halls agreed in a Memorandum of Understanding in 2004 that it would only be used as access for emergency vehicles. It is also limited in a 1998 Use Permit #97365-MOD that this access is to be permanently restricted to a fire road and no public, truck or commercial access will be permitted via Inglewood. We have previously expressed our concern about the possibility of buildings being located in the retention basin on the Hall property which was constructed to prevent flooding on our property and that of our neighbors.

We received the Notice of Intent just days ago and have not had an opportunity to review the file or see any information on elevations which is a big concern to us. We respectfully request more time to examine this and request a hearing before the planning commission. Additionally, we cannot support any changes to the Hall Winery project until the county has decided whether this is a viable spot for the farmworker housing and has taken the possibility of the Inglewood ingress/egress off the table. We would need this in writing.

This neighborhood has been inundated with construction projects which has escalated over the past 10 yrs. to the point where it's affecting quality of life and property values. There are three residential projects and at least 4 commercial enterprises on Inglewood Ave. When is enough, enough??? All we want is peace around here.

Diane and Dan Beltrami
1362 Inglewood Ave
St. Helena, Ca 94574

Trippi, Sean

From: Kelly Wheaton [a4est42@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 4:54 PM
To: Trippi, Sean
Cc: McDowell, John
Subject: Re: Hall Winery #P11-00452-MOD

Sean,

We cannot support the project if the POSSIBILITY of Farm worker or other housing is still an option with this approval. Past experience has proven that open ended---in the future this, that or the other thing being left open is NOT good for our Neighborhood. SO given this information we are opposed to approval without a full public hearing. And we request that vineyard installation and maintainace be a requirement of approval.

We have been told that the Halls have discussed opening up the ingress/egress onto Inglewood for the possibility of accessing the proposed housing. This is absolutely unacceptable.

Sincerely,
Michael and Kelly Wheaton

On Thu, Mar 1, 2012 at 4:23 PM, Trippi, Sean <Sean.Trippi@countyofnapa.org> wrote:

Hi Kelly –

Thanks for your comments. The heights of the new structures will not exceed the heights of the previously approve buildings. The previous conditions of approval will be carried over to this request which address building height, installation of vines, among other topics.

To date, we haven't received an application to modify past project approvals regarding farm labor units. Should an application be submitted to us, it would go through the public review and hearing process during which all issues would be discussed.

Let me know if you have any additional questions of comments.

Thanks again,

Sean

From: Kelly Wheaton [mailto:a4est42@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 29, 2012 10:54 AM
To: Trippi, Sean
Cc: Mike Reynolds; McDowell, John
Subject: Re: Hall Winery #P11-00452-MOD

Dear Sean,

We are delighted to see the progress on the renovation of the historic Bergfeld Building at the Hall Winery as per their Use Permit and we are in support of the changes to the Production Building 2.2 and construction of a new hospitality building and new office building as long as their height does not exceed that of the previously approved buildings---and does not adversely effect the view shed of my Inglewood neighbors.

We would request that a condition of approval be the installation and maintenance of vineyard to the south and east of the waste water pond as shown on the current site plan and earlier approved plans. We are aware that the Halls have proposed this one to two acre site as potential Farm Worker housing. We are adamantly opposed to further construction in the installed retention basin which was designed to provide flood protection for us and our neighbors. This would be a breach of the Memorandum of Understanding which does not allow construction that interferes with the view of vineyards from Inglewood Ave. residents. We are also concerned that should that parcel be subdivided the ratio of vineyard to buildings/parking lots might exceeded.

We would appreciate that these items are addressed appropriately before giving our full support to the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Michael and Kelly Wheaton
1335 Inglewood Ave.
St. Helena, CA 94574

--
Kelly Wheaton
a4est42@gmail.com

[Wheaton Surname Resources](#)