Frost, Melissa

Subject:

FW: The end of the Trail?

Planning Commission Mtg.

SEP **0** 7 2016 Agenda item #______B

From: SodaCanyonRoad.org [mailto:bill@sodacanyonroad.org] Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 11:47 AM To: McDowell, John Subject: The end of the Trail?



The end of the Trail?

on the web at: <u>http://sodacanyonroad.org/forum.php?p=1071</u> Bill Hocker | Sep 2, 2016



black: existing wineries & left turn lanes red: proposed or approved

[Commissioners - This is a slightly updated screed written last year to be submitted for the Reynolds Winery use-permit discussion. It is equally germane to Beau Vigne.]

The Silverado Trail, along the east side of the Napa Valley, is still a great ride (for cars and bicycles) at times other than the afternoon rush hour. Well banked curves and maintained surface allow a meditative, almost zen-like, cruise through the rolling landscape of vine rows and valley vistas. It is the ride that defines the Napa Valley as an Eden, a paradise on earth, for visitors and residents alike. It is a last local vestige of America's great passion for the open road. And it is about to disappear.

Another winery expansion on the Trail is up before the Planning Commission on Sep 7th 2016. It is the Beau Vigne Winery on the Trail just north of the intersection with Soda Canyon Road; the requested increases in production and visitation are modest, but the application does call attention once again to the issue of continued development on this most iconic of Napa's highways.

This particular section of the Trail is becoming quite impacted by proposed wineries. It is a harbinger of the development sprawl happening along the Trail and throughout the county. (As shown here, there are now close to 100 new or expanding wineries you have approved since 2010, most not yet built. There are some 50 more in the planning department awaiting review.) Above is a map of the Soda Canyon intersection. There are now at least 8

1

existing or proposed left turn lumps on the Trail in the 2 minute drive between Hardman Avenue and Black Stallion Winery. Little will remain of the 2-lane Trail. It will now be a section fraught with the driving angst of merging traffic. Will all of these turnouts make it safer? Maybe for those forced to become familiar with the concept of middle lane refuges. For most drivers there will still be the heart attack (and involuntary swerve), as a car dashes out from the left straight at their car and at the last second turns into the refuge lane.

The number of vehicle trips generated by the proposed wineries is adding up. Counting the Mountain Peak project, up Soda Canyon Road next to me, there are now almost 360 more trips/day planned of this bit of the Trail. That's only 3% of the 11,000 daily vehicles that use the Trail at this point. Is the increase significant? Soda Canyon Road is already rated at Level of Service (LOS) F on weekday and Saturday afternoons and traffic signals are already warranted on weekday afternoons. They will shortly be needed on Saturdays as well. It is harrowing to make the left turn into the continuous stream of 55 mph traffic at rush hour. The traffic backs up behind the Soda Canyon stop sign waiting for one's rendezvous with fate. Perhaps all the left turn bumps and merging traffic will slow things enough to make the turn less dangerous? I doubt it.

The Soda Canyon intersection, like many intersections along the Trail and Hwy 29 already requires signalization for safe operation. The cost of those signals are contributed to by mitigations fees added to the use permits. The signals don't get put in, I think, not just because the mitigation fees aren't enough to cover the costs (and the money is needed elsewhere), but because everyone knows what signalization means - a rural place is becoming a suburb. It is the death of the open road.

This map begins to give a sense of the winery strip mall that the rest of the Trail will become in the future. There are still 3 or 4 parcels in this stretch available for wineries. Given the present trajectory, projects will be proposed soon. (The property just north of the Reynolds Winery has recently sold.) It is logical that the lower part of the Trail will reach winery buildout the earliest. Looking up into the <u>valley from Skyline Park</u>, one can sense the urban landscape oozing north. The widening of the Trail, now being done one left turn bulge at a time, reflects that flow.

Is it too late to save the Silverado Trail? The openness of the landscape along its route defines Napa County to the rest of the world. As the area around Soda Canyon Road shows, that iconic image will become screened and diminished by development if more protections are not put in place. It is past time to realize that the Trail is more important to Napa than just an access route to ever more wineries or just traffic relief from Hwy 29. The expansive views from the road are the mental images that everyone retains of this place.

If the present development trend continues, the enjoyment of the Trail as the meditative cruise needed to be at one with the rolling majesty of the valley

and its bounty, a single experience more important than all the winery "experiences" combined in maintaining Napa's image as a premier wine making region, will soon be gone.

Bill Hocker

Another screed on the visual damage to the Trail's landscape, written for a proposed setback encroachment of the Krupp winery just down the road, <u>is here</u>.

If you wish wish to be removed from our email list please let us know here

this email was sent to: <u>David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org</u>. <u>John.McDowell@countyofnapa.org</u>. <u>heather@vinehillranch.com</u>. <u>napacommissioner@yahoo.com</u>. <u>anne.cottrell@lucene.com</u>. <u>tkscottco@aol.com</u>. <u>JeriGillPC@outlook.com</u>

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,

• . . .

Planning Commission Mtg. SEP 0 7 2016 Agenda Item #



The Soda Canyon Cluster

Bill Hocker - Oct 14, 2015 3:35PM Share



Napa's 700 Wineries

Amber Manfree - Aug 11, 2015 6:51PM Share

#939



SEP 0 6 2016 M Napa October Historicage, Statisting & Environmental Services

Planning Commission Mig.

SEP 07 2016 Agenda Item #______

I HAVE at 1022 PETRA DR AND AM ONE OF THE RESIDENCES THAT REPLACED MY WELL IN THE EARLY 2000'S.

AT 4057 SILVERADO TRAIL. MR SNIDER STATES PHERE WILL BE NO INCREASE IN WATER USAGE SO WHY THE NSW WELL

Soncerly MR MRS JOHNSTON

• • •

.

NAPA COUNTY PLANNING	COMMISSION
SEPT. 7 2016	" Geoff Ellsworth
ITEM 9B	/
Beau Vigne WINEry	geoffellsworth @ Vahoo.com

I OPPOSSE THIS PROJECT ON THE GROUNDS THAT WE MUST NOT APPROVE ANY MORE WINERIES IN NAPA COUNTY UNTIL WE HAVE PROPER ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE MECHANISMS IN PLACE TO PROTECT OUR CITIZENS & THEIR RIGHTS. THE HONOR SYSTEM HERE NO LONGER WORKS. OUR INDIVIDUAL WATER SECURITY & ZONING SECURITY FOR OUR CITIZENS DEPEND ON PROPER COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT. IT IS ALSO CLEAR THAT GROUPS OF SMALL WINERIES CAN BE JUST AS IMPACTFUL AS ONE LARGE WINERY AND AS WE'VE OFTER SEEN SMALL WINERIES OFTEN MORPH INTO WARGER ONES. THE IMPACTS AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS INCLUDE AND INCLUDE SUFFERED BY CITIZENS THRE RELATE TO WATERSECURITY, ZONING

SECURITY, SAFETY, TRAFFIC, NOISE, HEALTI ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, ROAD IMPACTS, AND COMPROMISING CEAA. "CHEMICAL - IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO INCLUDE IN THE COMPLIANCE/ENFORCMENT PROGRAM STIPULATIONS THAT THE INTO THE WDO STIPULATIONS REGARDING COST RECORDERY FOR HOSPITALITY AS WELL AS TYING IN TOUR BUS, TIMO, Brayche etc visitor "Delivery" systems. CONTINUED APPROVAL OF WINERIES OFTEN REQUIRES ADDIDONTL WINEYARDS WHICH THREATED OUR WATERSHED WITH DEFORESTATION THAT CAN IMPACT OUR MICROCLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT

I ALSO OBJECT TO THE CONTINUED APPROVAL OF WINERIES BASED ON A FLAMED DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURE & 2010 WDO CHANGES THAT WERE NOT APPROVED BY A MEASURE P VOTE OF THE PEOPLE