Planning Commission Mig.

APR **1 9** 2017 Agenda Item #\_\_\_\_\_\_A\_\_\_

### PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING – APRIL 19, 2017 MODIFIED RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

### The Caves at Soda Canyon Application Number P16-00106 2275 Soda Canyon Road APN 039-640-013

### Part II - Operational Characteristics of the Project

4.20.a – The Bay Area Air Quality Management District permit for use of the stationary generator required in COA 6.15 shall remain valid and in effect until such time that the generator is no longer in use as a permanent power supply for the Winery.

4.20.b – The permittee shall maintain use of the sound attenuating product required to resolve CE14-00094 until such time that the generator is no longer in use as a permanent power supply for the Winery.

### Part III – Permit Prerequisites

6.15.a.

a. The building permit application for the conversion of the private residential patio to a winery visitation and marketing area shall include all outdoor areas approved for visitation/marketing. All outdoor assembly areas used for visitation/marketing shall comply with California Building Code Accessibility requirements. Staff will review required improvements to the outdoor assembly areas to confirm continued compliance with the Viewshed Ordinance. Use of these areas shall not commence until a Final Certificate of Occupancy has been granted.

### 6.15.b.:

The permittee shall be required to obtain a (Name of Permit) for use of the stationary generator from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District within 30 days of the date of this approval. A copy of the authorized permit shall be submitted to the PBES Department. The PBES Director or his designee may extend either timeline specified in this COA 6.15, upon showing of good cause by the permittee. Any request for extension of time must be submitted in writing by the permittee and received by the PBES Director before the end of the timelines specified herein, as those timelines may be extended by the PBES Director.

Napa Custom Crush Comments

Introduction and Hello and Thank You

Project Highlights:

We have no desire to be redundant. The staff presentation and support documents are thorough and clear. We do appreciate staff's recommendation to you of approval of this application.

This application is principally about increasing The Caves At Soda Canyon's production level to 60,000 gallons a year, which is about 25,000 cases of wine, within existing caves that just need to be finished.

The facility will continue to focus on being a working custom crush winery for its four winemaking families. And it will continue to be a low profile winemaking asset to the Napa Valley.

For all the attention that this winery has drawn, This isn't a winery focused on architecture or entertainment. If you didn't know the address, you couldn't find it. There is no sign on the road. Nothing to draw attention, to say "visit me." And that is by design.

This isn't an Italianate villa jutting out into the viewshed begging for attention in Architectural Digest.

Being honest with you, your approval of this application will allow the winery's business fundamentals to generate the needed capital to complete the septic system and some of the other necessary improvements, which would end the Hold and Haul program that the commission previously permitted. That is just the business reality for this winery.

Per your Commission's instructions, the cave portal to the patio was walled up. Now we'd like your permission to open it and use it and the patio as part of the winery's visitation program for the existing levels of visitors and marketing. This would be a great asset to the winery, a one of a kind feature really, and yet, in keeping with the style of the winery, the patio and portal are actually restrained and invisible to the neighbors and the valley floor. There are many ostentatious structures on this ridgeline, and none of them are winery related.

Despite complaints about traffic on Soda Canyon Road, there still are no studied numbers stating that there are traffic issues on Soda Canyon Road. And it has been studied a great deal in the last 5 years or so. This application's traffic effects are minimal.

I have to emphasize that the environmental impacts of this application are minimal, such that the applicant and the County agreed that an addendum to the existing CEQA documentation was reasonable and sufficient.

We appreciate the support we have here today from the local community as well as the numerous written comments of support submitted to you by email and letter.

This support says a great deal about the Caves at Soda Canyon and this application.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter. We believe Option 1 before you is heavily supported by the merits. And again, we appreciate the hard work that staff has put in with us over the last two years or so, including Director Morrison's personal selection of the portal wall building grade. If you have any questions they can answer, we are ready.

This energy efficient winery is run on by a stationary generator. A PGE hookup is not required. This winery has fully and properly permitted by every relevant county agency, including the Fire Marshall. A comment

from Mr. Chilton came in on Monday regarding a temporary generator and a 12 month temporary permit from the BAAQCB. This was investigated by staff and by my office, and although the generator is not temporary, it turns out that a ministerial permit is required from the BAAQCB. This requirement was news to everyone, including County staff. I assure you, an application for that permit began being developed yesterday and will be submitted the BAAQCB in short order. We support a condition of approval requiring this in order to get a final certificate of occupancy.

Solar installations have been considered, but just are not economically feasible yet.

Further, the applicant has the right, without a use permit, to put a day care center on the property that would generate 3 times the traffic that we initially requested—let alone our compromise request. I wonder if the less than a handful of neighbors that are in opposition to this application because of their fear of traffic have ever considered that.

## Comments on Arger Letter

Misinterprets county code and makes requirements that don't exist in the conditions of approval. Mistates the facts and draws innuendo and supposition.

Wrong on cumulative impacts. Wrong on CEQA every which way.

Poorly researched at best. Winery has all applicable permits from the county.

No requirement in code for hook up to PGE.

Generator has been operating for 10 years with a minor incident that was addressed. See St. Claire.

Generator is now baseline for operations, so addendum remains appropriate and BAAQCB thresholds remain far away, even with generator.

Stulls received letter from St.Claire, no mention in this letter.

No requirement to cover generator entirely and neighbor can't see it from residence or most of property, only near property line. Where are the photos from the house.

## The Caves at Soda Canyon major modification application

23

i.

Planning Commission Mtg.

APR **1 9 2017** Agenda Item #\_\_\_\_\_A

The Caves seeks to double its annual production from 30,000 to 60,000 gallons.

This will add a significant number of commercial traffic on Soda Canyon Road.

By commercial traffic: I specifically mean grape transport trucks during harvest. The Caves does NOT have one single vine on the premises. ALL processed grapes must be transported to the Caves.

AND importantly, because of the very steep and narrow configuration of The Caves driveway, it is unlikely that double loaders or semi's could negotiate the driveway, therefore necessitating the use of smaller and MORE transport trucks.

<u>Because of the dead-end nature of Soda Canyon Road</u>, the proposed increase in commercial traffic cannot be viewed as a stand-alone. MUST be viewed as one of 8 existing wineries on SC Road, 2 more recently approved by the Planning Commission and 2 more pending.

<u>Must also consider, the</u> 2 producing wineries at <u>intersection</u> Silverado Trail/SC Rd and additional 4 wineries pending approval at intersection as they effect access and egress to Soda Canyon Road.

Every day at the intersection of SCRd and Silv Trail there are <u>long queues of</u> <u>vineyard workers</u>, <u>winery visitors</u>, <u>winery personnel and resident traffic</u>. I have personally counted over 100 vineyard worker cars alone driving off the hill between 3:30-4:00 in the afternoon.

The figures in the charts use 1999 as a baseline.

That is because in 1999, the ABC denied all wine tasting and retail sales on-site to Astrale e Terra Winery as a result of evidence establishing <u>'That increased traffic on Soda Canyon Road would aggravate a traffic problem on a problematic roadway....</u>"

<u>If all the wineries on Soda Canyon and at the intersection with Silverado Trail are</u> <u>approved it will result in a 207% increase in winery related traffic on SC Road!</u>

If the ABC found the traffic in 1999 problematic enough to deny a permit, then I ask you to NOT APPROVE THE CAVES' MAJOR MODIFICATION...IT WILL ONLY MAKE an already bad situation WORSE....

which in turn will adversely impact the public safety and welfare of residents and visitors alike.

I ask you to please deny The Caves at Soda Canyon major modification application.

19 April 2017

**Diane Shepp** 

I believe Michael Basayne has a serious conflict of interest regarding The Caves at Soda Canyon use permit major modification before you today.

He should recuse himself from the proceedings.

Mr. Basayne is Director of Strategic Planning and Project Management for Platypus Wine Tours.

The Caves at Soda Canyon is one of the 'top' wineries that Platypus Tours does business (as indicated on their website).

Mr. Basayne holds fiduciary responsibility for Platypus Wine Tours and it is incumbent upon him to promote positive relations with The Caves.

<u>As a Planning Commissioner, any land use vote he makes against a winery use</u> permit runs the risk of having a negative effect on his business [Platypus].

He should recuse himself.

0

ranks our Napa Wine Tours (/napa-wine-tours.php) as top-rated activities in the region. Make a Platypus Wine Tour reservation (/reservations.php) online now or call (707) 253-2723. Listed below are some of our top Napa Valley Wineries (updated 07/31/2016):

# Alpha Omega

Alpha Omega is located in legendary Rutherford in the heart of Napa Valley and is one of Napa's newest boutique wineries. (707) 963-9999 1155 Mee Lane at Hwy 29, Rutherford, CA 95473 www.aowinery.com (http://www.aowinery.com)

## Andretti Winery

Artesa Winery

Baldacci Family Vineyards

**Beaulieu Vineyard** 

**Black Stallion Winery** 

**Bouchaine Vineyards** 

# Caves at Soda Canyon

The Caves at Soda Canyon provides the ultimate winery experience with wines from multiple wineries. (707) 861-8100 2275 Soda Canyon Road, Napa, CA 95458 www.thecavesatsodacanyon.com (http://www.thecavesatsodacanyon.com)

# **Bourassa Vineyards**

One of Napa Valley's most distinguished wineries. Bourassa Vineyards skillfully produces rich, complex blends and world class varietals from the finest, selfmaintained vineyards in the Napa Valley. (800) 499-2366 190 Camino Oruga Ste 5., Napa, CA 95458 www.bourassavineyards.com (http://www.bourassavineyards.com)

# **Chimney Rock Winery**

Chimney Rock's vision and mission is to produce wines of exceptional quality that are capable of standing shoulder to should arwith the second standing should be to should arwith the second standing should be to should be are capable of standing should be to should be are capable of standing should be to should be are capable of standing should be to should be are capable of standing should be are capable of st

Name	Status	County Approval Date	Has Cave	Cave Size (sf)	Production (Gallons)	Type of Tours, Tastings	Daily Visitation (Ppl/Day)	Daily Visitation (Ppl/Week)	Daily Visitation (Ppl/Year)	Marketing Visitation (Events/Year)	Marketing Visitation (Ppl/Year)	TOTAL Annual Visitation
Producing Wineries: ACCESSED BY SODA CANYON RD				Sec. And								
ANTICA NAPA VALLEY 3700 Soda Canyon Road	PROD	1987		26.000	450.000	nor the second s	20	100	5 200	_		5.000
ASTRALE E TERRA/MEADOWROCK WINERY	PROD	1987	x	36,000	450,000	PVT	20	100	5,200	· · ·	· -	5,200
3148 Soda Canyon Road	PROD	1988		-	20.000	TST APPT	-	1	52	-	-	52
LA VALLETTE WINERY	_											
Soda Canyon Road	UNKNWN	1988		-	20,000	TST APPT	-	·	-	-		-
ROY ESTATE VINEYARDS												
1220 Soda Canyon Road THE CAVES AT SODA CANYON	APVD	2002	x	6,500	12,000	APPT	10	40	2,080	12	630	2,710
2275 Soda Canyon Road	PROD	2006	×	16,000	30,000	APPT	20	70	2.540	10	1 000	
V-12 WINERY	FROD	2000	×	10,000	30,000		20	70	3,640	18	1,320	4,960
2001 Soda Canyon Road	APVD	2009	x	7,000	22,500	APPT	16	36	1,872	5	300	2,172
WHITE ROCK VINEYARDS				.,,	22,000		10		1,072		500	2,172
1115 Loma Vista Drive	PROD	1987	x	6,000	20,000	TST APPT	2	10	520	_	-	520
RELIC WINERY												
(County Approved, but still Pending ABC Approval)					100000000000000000000000000000000000000							
2400 Soda Canyon Road	APVD	2010	x	2,458	20,000	APPT	20	*	4,180	11	278	4,458
							Total E	xisting Winery	Visitors on/a	ccessed by Soda (	Canyon Road	20,072
Producing Wineries: ON SILV. TR. At Intersct. w/ SCR	States and states					1243022578			- Alexandre Alexandre			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
REYNOLDS FAMILY WINERY (Existing)	1						[					
3266 Silverado Trail	PROD	2000			20,000	APPT	10	- 70	3,640	3	100	3,74
BLACK STALLION WINERY												
4089 Silverado Trail	PROD	1985			100,000	PUB	50	350	18,200	-	-	18,200
						Total Existing	Winery Visito	ors on Silverado	Trail at Inter	section w/ Soda	Canyon Road	21,940
Pending Approval: ACCESSED BY SODA CANYON RD	and the second of	and the particular			(Pacific Contractor							
GRASSI FAMILY WINERY							and an a strategy strategy					
1044 Soda Canyon Road	PEND				25,000	APPT	12	70	3,640	3	155	3,795
MOUNTAIN PEAK WINERY							-		0,010		100	3,733
3265 Soda Canyon Road	PEND		x	33,424	100,000	APPT	60	275	14,300	6	275	14,575
							Total I	Pending Winery	Visitors on/	accessed by Soda	Canyon Road	18,370
Pending Approval: ON SILV. TR. At Intersct. w/ SCR	State States	the second states	and the second second	and the second second	C. C							
BEAU VIGNE WINERY	1 1										Contraction of the second	
4057 Silverado Trail	PEND				14,000	APPT	15	105	5,460	14	360	5,820
CORONA WINERY								105	3,400	14	300	3,820
3165 Silverado Trail	PEND				100,000	APPT	48	336	17,472	80	2,428	16,988
REYNOLDS FAMILY WINERY (Expansion of Existing)												
3260 Silverado Trail	PEND				40,000	APPT	40	280	14,560	10	618	15,178
SAM JASPER WINERY 4059 Silverado Trail												
4059 Silverado Trail	PEND				20,000		25	160	8,320	23	550	8,870
		_			T	otal Pending	Winery Visito	rs on Silverado	Trail at Inter	section w/ Soda C	anyon Road	46,856
					C. Land							
				- F						eradto Tr. & Soda /erado Tr. & Soda		42,012
		ſ	GRANDT	OTAL ANNI	IAI WINERY	VISITORS at I	tersection of	Soda Canver	Silverade T	ail IF ALL PERMIT	Canyon Rd.	65,226
		1	GIUGUED I	C THE MINING	AL VOINERT					All Approved (as a		107,238
					L	Increa	C. HOIR LAISU	"B manie to Pu	are rotal if A	an Approved (as a	percentage)	1559
(ey							k	ey				
APVD:	Approved W	inery, NOT pr	oducing						y appointme	nt only		
									,			
END:	Winery pend	ding approval					N	O: N	o tours, no ta	asting		
END: ROD: JNKNWN:	Winery pend Active winer								o tours, no ta pen to public	asting :, no appointment	necessarv	

, **.** 

Data Compiled by: Amber Manfree, PhD Source: Napa County Winery Database & Napa County Documents

Rede         Sold Carryon fload (Nergend Worker Visits to Firm 20 dates of Vinegend sold Carryon fload (Nergend Worker Visits to Firm 20 dates of Vinegend sold Carryon fload for Visit         Sold Carryon fload				
ers/20 acres)     ers/20 acres)       ers/20 acres)     (1,125 + 731 acres planted since 1998)       (1,956 + 116 acres planted since 2010)     (1,956 + 116 acres planted since 2010)       adit Winery Visitors     Winery Visitors Permitted       (1,956 + 115 acres planted since 2010)     33,442       adit Winery Visitors     Winery Visitors Permitted       (1,956 + 116 acres planted since 2010)     15,614       adit Winery Visitors     15,614       (1,956 + 116 acres planted since 2010)     33,442       bood     13,500       sper     46,856       posed)     68,796       ction of Silverado     Vinery Visitors Permitted       Visitors     13,200       sper     46,856       posed)     68,796       d (as a percentage)     88%		Soda Canyon Road Vineyard Worker Visit Calc	lations	
ers/20 acres) ers/20 acres) ers/20 acres) ers/20 acres) ers/20 acres) ers/20 acres planted since 1998) ers/20 acres planted since 2010) ers/20 acres planted since 2010 ers/20 acres planted since 2010 ers/20 acres premitted e	verage Number of Vineyard	Worker Visits to Farm 20 Acres of Vineyards on Soda Canyon Road Per Year		400
Image: set of the set of th	rerage Number of Vineyar	Worker Visits to Farm 1 Acre of Vineyard on Soda Canyon Road Per Year (400 workers/20 acres)		20
Id: Winery Visitors     (1,125 + 731 acres planted since 1998)       Id: Winery Visitors     (1,125 + 731 acres planted since 2010)       Id: Winery Visitors     Winery Visitors Permitted       S,772     15,614       S,772     15,614       S,772     15,614       S,772     23,828       S,772     38,442       Minery Visitors     38,442       Soda Canyon Road: Winery Visitors     13,200       Per     46,856       posed)     68,796       posed)     68,796       posed     78,994       Visitors     148,678       Visitors     148,678       Minery Visitors     148,678	V			Total Worker Visits
(1,125 + 731 acres planted since 1998)         (1,956 + 116 acres planted since 2010)         (1,956 + 115 acres planted since 2010)         (1,956 + 115 acres planted since 2010)         (1,950 + 116 + 116 acres planted since 2010)         (1,950 + 116 acres planted since 2010)	1998	No. Acres Existing 1 275		(20 worker visits x No. Acre
ad: Winery Visitors Permitted Since 2010) ad: Winery Visitors Permitted 5,772 Winery Visitors Permitted 5,772 5,772 5,772 5,772 5,772 5,614 5,772 5,614 5,772 5,614 2,5,828 3,442 3,442 3,442 3,442 1,5,614 1,5,614 1,5,614 1,2,002 1,3,00 1,1,00 1,1,00 1,1,00	2010	1,956	(1.125 + 731 acres planted since 1998)	30 120
ad: Winery Visitors	2015	2,072	(1,956 + 116 acres planted since 2010)	41,440
Soda Canyon Road		Accessed hv Soda Canvon Road: Winery Visit		
Soda Canyon Road				
Soda Canyon Road Soda Canyon Road sper posed) ction of Silverado 1 visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		1001	winery visitors Permitted	
Soda Canyon Road sper posed) ction of Silverado 1 visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		6677	5,772	
Soda Canyon Road		2015	15,614	
Soda Canyon Road		Proposed Visitors: Grassi, MPW, & Relic	22,828	
Soda Canyon Road		Total Future/Pending (Existing + Relic, MPV, Grassi Proposed)	38,442	
sper posed) ection of Silverado T visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		Accessed by Silverado Trail at Intersection with Soda Canvon R	ad: Winery Visitors	
sper posed) ection of Silverado T visitors Visitors ad (as a percentage) ad (as a percentage)			Winery Vicitors Dermitted	
sper posed) ection of Silverado 1 visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		1999	18.200	
sper posed) ection of Silverado 1 visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		2015	21.940	
posed) ection of Silverado T Visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		Proposed Visitors: Beau Vigne, Corona, Reynolds Expansion, Sam Jasper	46.856	
ction of Silverado T Visitors Visitors ad (as a percentage)		Total Future/Pending (Existing + BV, Corona, Reynolds, Sam Jasper Proposed)	68,796	
Visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		Combined Vineyard Worker & Winery Visitors at Intersection of Silvera	o Trail & Soda Canyon Road	
Visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		Year	Vineyard Worker Traffic & Winery Visitors	
Visitors Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		1999	48.472	
Visitors ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		2015	78,994	
ed (as a percentage) ed (as a percentage)		Existing Vnyd Workers + Existing Winery Visitors + ALL Proposed Winery Visitors	148,678	
ed (as a percentage)		Increase from 2015 Traffic to Future Total if All Approved (as a percentage)	88%	
e: December 15, 2016 aage & Winery Vistors Complied by: Amber Manfree, PhD rker Vists/Acre/Year Complied by: Anthony Arger, JD, MBA		Increase from 1999 Traffic to Future Total if All Approved (as a percentage)	207%	
eage & Winery Visitors Compiled by: Amber Manfree, PhD rker Visits/Acre/Year Compiled by: Anthony Arger, JD, MBA	e: December 15. 2016			
rker Visits/Acre/Year Compiled by: Anthony Arger, JD, MBA	eage & Winery Visitors Comp	lled by: Amber Manfree, PhD		
	rker Visits/Acre/Year Compil	ed by: Anthony Arger, JD, MBA		

### Hedge, Emily

From: Sent: To: Subject: SodaCanyonRoad.org <bill@sodacanyonroad.org> Wednesday, April 19, 2017 1:27 AM Hedge, Emily Re: The Caves at Soda Canyon APR **1 9** 2017 All 3 4 meti sbregA

Planning Commission Mtg.



# Re: The Caves at Soda Canyon

#### Commissioners,

This winery should never have been built. The property is remote with no vines, no power source, up a driveway unsuitable for trucks or buses, and 3 and a half miles up a problematic, dead-end road. It was placed here solely to provide a scenic view for marketing activities.

The winery predates the 2010 WDO guidance that asks you to consider the "remoteness of location" and "access constraints" in reviewing use permit proposals. Possibly this project spurred the need for such guidence. Hopefully the requested expansion will be viewed in light of it.

This application seeks road exceptions for a driveway too narrow and curvy to meet county standards. It has grades up to 17%. Trucks get stuck on it now, as they will even with improvements. Buses bringing people to its large marketing events will suffer the same fate. The Soda Canyon grade up to the Rector plateau is only 11% - yet we can show examples of buses and trucks becoming stuck there now.



Truck stuck on Caves driveway

Bus stuck on Soda Canyon grade

The character of the driveway is aptly described by a Yelp customer:

The location is a feat to see! The wines were good and the view of the surrounding landscape was magnificent. Public service announcement: don't drink and drive; there's a higher likelihood you will meet a fiery death, Wile E. Coyote style, after driving off a steep embankment on the windy road that leads to this venue.

The applicant asks to double the winery capacity: twice as many grape deliveries, barrel and

bottle deliveries, case shipments on that very unsuitable drive. The rationale is that Napa Custom Crush member families currently produce more grapes and have more grape contracts than can be processed with the current capacity.

Where are the limits in this concept? Will you soon see another expansion request with the same rationale? Will more "member families" wish to join? Will more visitation be requested to promote the industry's direct-to-consumer dogma for the increased production? This expansion will set the precedent. And more expansions will come. This site was not a proper location for a winery in the first place. It is not now a proper location for a factory serving ever expanding custom crush needs countywide. If the applicant wishes to expand his custom crush operations, now is is time to move to an industrial location more appropriate to continued expansion.

A majority of the residents on Soda Canyon Road have already petitioned the county to protect their community from expanding commercial development on the road. Each new building project and expansion increases the threat to the "agricultural lands and the rural character we treasure" envisioned in the General Plan and diminishes the remote, rural quality of life that is our reason to be here. And each approval will also increase the discontent toward a county government always willing to sacrifice the concerns of residents to the desires of entrepreneurs. That discontent has led to resident pushback throughout the county these last three years. Lacking a rebalance of interests, the discontent will continue.

This winery is obviously here to stay. I may be condemned by some here, but there are things in this application that will make the project better and safer with few impacts at this point. Permit the road improvements. Permit the wastewater system. Permit the awning. And only after a clean and silent power supply is in place - permit the bootlegged portal and patio.

But don't permit the expanded capacity. In that metric you have wide discretion and you should use it. Don't reward duplicity with an expansion. Make it clear that this winery, on this very inappropriate site, should live within the capacity and visitation conditions of its original use permit in perpetuity.

Thank you.

Bill Hocker 3460 Soda Canyon Road

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

this email was sent to: David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org, napacommissioner@yahoo.com, anne.cottrell@lucene.com, tkscottco@aol.com, JeriGillPC@outlook.com, joellegPC@gmail.com, emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org, bill@sodacanyonroad.org

### Hedge, Emily

From: Sent: To: Subject:

Follow Up Flag: Flag Status: Friederike Heidger <friederike04@sbcglobal.net> Tuesday, April 18, 2017 6:18 PM Hedge, Emily Protesting application of Napa Custom Crush LLC

Follow up Flagged Planning Commission Mig.

APR 1 9 2017 Agenda Item # 6

#### Hello Ms Hedge

I am writing with concerns about the permit application for an extended wine facility of Napa Custom Crush LLC on Soda Canyon road. Meeting is on Wednesday April 19-2017 1. The location is unsafe for traffic on a long narrow and windy road 2. The applicant illegally expanded their facility before and should be fined for their illegal actions and for ignoring county rules, not granted another expansion 3. There will be noise and pollution from a Diesel generator, which will affect the surrounding properties and the neighborhood.

Please listen to the voices of the people who are already living there and have been there long before this company started their plans and business practices in total disregard of environmental, neighborly and even county concerns and rules.

4. A facility this big should be operating in a commercial area, not a quiet rural setting where it would affect the lives of the people living there.

Please deny a permit for further expansion.

Friederike Heidger

APR **1 9** 2017 Agenda Item #\_\_\_\_\_\_

The Simple Math:

30 # of grapes per case (sonomawine.com)2.378 gallons per case (Cornell University)

60,000 gallons / 2.378 = 25,231 cases

25,231 cases X 30 # = 756,939 # of grapes

Grape Harvest Bin Capacity: 1500 # (Wilson Orchard & Vineyard Supply)

2 Bins per trailer = 3000 #

756,939 / 3000 # = 252 trips up & down the driveway

252 X 10 = 2520 minutes / 60 = 42 hours

Slop: Changing any of these values, plus or minus, any appreciable amount still nets an impossible amount of trips to be accomplished in a finite amount of time http://www.NapaValleyArt.org

Planning Commission Mtg.

APR 19 2017 Agenda Item # 8

From: Bob Pallas [mailto:bobpallas@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 8:27 AM
To: 'brad.wagenknecht@countyofnapa.org'; 'Diane.Dillon@countyofnapa.org'
Subject: Register article: County planners ponder unauthorized winery construction

Hi Brad & Diane,

I'm writing to you to comment on the article that recently appeared in the Napa Valley Register: http://napavalleyregister.com/news/local/county-planners-ponder-unauthorized-winery-construction/article\_cebc05a4-74ba-5331-a443-15166769458b.html

Way before the plans were approved and construction began on the Caves at Soda Canyon, my wife and I were invited to review the proposed project because we, at the time, were owners of two parcels adjacent to the Caves project. The then partners, Ryan Waugh and Gary Houck, invited us to Mr. Houck's home at Silverado Country Club for a presentation of the project and to review the drawings and plans. In that meeting it was very clear that they had intentions of having a valley facing portal even though the plans did not include this. It was a "wink and nod" admission that they were going to submit one set of plans for approval and then dig the additional portal after the fact.

After the project was completed and opened for business, it was powered by large and loud generators which upset us and the surrounding neighbors. Mr. Waugh, once again, gave little regard for the rules and regulations . . . and neighbors. The fact is, Mr. Waugh (and Mr. Houck) specifically told us that power would be brought to the site underground. We found it odd that the road was constructed without trenching for the underground power. Once again, they presented one plan to appease us and executed another.

As you read the comments prompted by the Register's article, I hope you will listen to the people and correct this wrong-doing.

We have since sold both of our parcels so the Caves at Soda Canyon do not directly affect us.

Bob Pallas 707-256-3828