

Gallina, Charlene

Subject: FW: Winery Visitation and modifying factors
Attachments: Winery Project Analysis Matrix 2015-09-07.xlsx

Planning Commission Mtg.

SEP 16 2015

Agenda Item # 10B

From: Dave Moffitt [<mailto:dave.moffitt@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Friday, September 11, 2015 10:34 AM

To: Morrison, David

Cc: McDowell, John; heather@vinehillranch.com; napacommissioner@yahoo.com; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; tkscottco@aol.com

Subject: Winery Visitation and modifying factors

Dear Director Morrison,

Several recent Planning Commission meetings have examined the issue of winery visitation. The Commission has expressed a desire to resolve two matters:

1. Create a baseline for total annual visitation (including both tasting room and marketing events)
2. Establish a list of modifying factors that the Commission may use in their discretion to adjust the visitation baseline, taking into account any unique locational and/or operational characteristics of the application.

I would like to propose the attached matrix of modifying factors for use in the evaluation of winery proposals (as you referred to it, the "Staff Report Template"). I hope I have successfully captured some of the key issues raised by many parties in meetings over the last several months. Since it's a spreadsheet, there is ample opportunity to add further factors. I have not included CEQA-mandated items as those considerations are already well documented and understood. You will note that the grading of many of the factors remains subjective (e.g. "High", "Modest", "Small"); it is my hope that these could be quantified where possible to move towards a more purely objective analysis. I'm suggesting scores on a 1-5 scale, but any scale could be used. "Factor Weighting" could be adjusted or removed; I just use it to indicate the relative impact of one item versus another. Weights might change from project to project.

Note that my suggestions are not to direct policy considerations, but rather provide a set of guidelines and indicators regarding new development that are intended to inform evaluators of the suitability, appropriateness, and likely sources of concern (and conflict) for a particular proposal. I have not organized the into "locational" and "operational" qualities but they could be.

With respect to the specific issue of visitation, I would like to suggest one additional consideration – that visitation numbers be conditioned on produced wine, not licensed production. A winery does not need to sell wine it does not produce. In order to allow for vintage variation, I would suggest using a three-year rolling average rather than just the previous year's production. This will help manage the scope of proposals where high gallonage requests could be used to drive higher visitation rates.

I plan to attend next Wednesday's Commission meeting and would be happy to discuss these suggestions with you and/or the commissioners. If an individual has been designated to replace ex-Commissioner Pope, I'd appreciate it if you would pass this on to him/her.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dave Moffitt

David R. Moffitt
PO Box 2445
Yountville, CA 94599

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.



	1	3	5	Score	Factor weight	Weighted score
View impact	Highly visible		Not visible		8%	0
Ag Preserve vs. Ag Watershed vs. "in town"	Watershed	Preserve	Town		4%	0
Road accessibility	Terrible		Easy		4%	0
Traffic impacts	Significant	Modest	None		4%	0
Parking capability	Insufficient		Plenty		4%	0
Noise impacts (distance to neighbors)	Major		Indetectable		3%	0
Light impacts (distance to neighbors)	Highly visible		Not visible		3%	0
Grape Sourcing	Offsite		Onsite		6%	0
Winery size for parcel	High	Modest	Small		3%	0
Square footage of entertainment space	High	Modest	Small		3%	0
Requested gallonage vs. typical	Excessive	Comparable	Minimal		7%	0
Requested visitors vs. typical	Excessive	Comparable	Minimal		7%	0
Septic processing	Hold 'n' Haul		Onsite disposal		4%	0
Water sourcing	Insufficient	Questionable	Excess proven		4%	0
Water disposal	Hold 'n' Haul		Onsite disposal		3%	0
Variances	Required	Minor	None		7%	0
Slope of development	Some >50%	5-10%	Flat		3%	0
Grading	Significant	Minor	Pad & roadbed prep		8%	0
Food preparation	Major	Modest	Incidental		3%	0
Events	Excessive	Modest	None		3%	0
Neighbor support	Opposition	Minor	Support		6%	0
Impact to existing vegetation	Major	Modest	Minimal		3%	0
Other					0%	0
Other					0%	0
Other					0%	0
TOTAL					100%	0

