

“C”

May 17, 2017 Napa County
Staff Report



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Agenda Date: 5/17/2017

Agenda Placement:

Continued From: 3/1/17

Napa County Planning Commission Board Agenda Letter

TO: Napa County Planning Commission

FROM: David Morrison - Director
Planning, Building and Environmental Services

REPORT BY: Dana Ayers, Planner III - (707) 253-4388

SUBJECT: Palmaz Personal Use Heliport - Use Permit Application #P14-00261 - UP

RECOMMENDATION

AMALIA PALMAZ LIVING TRUST / PALMAZ PERSONAL USE HELIPORT / USE PERMIT #P14-00261 - UP

CEQA Status: Consideration and possible certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR; State Clearinghouse No. 2015122030). According to the FEIR, the proposed Project would not have any significant environmental impacts after implementation of mitigation measures related to potential impacts to: (a) Land Use and Agricultural Resources; (b) Biological Resources; (c) Cultural Resources; and (d) Noise. This proposed Project site is not on any lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5.

Proposed Project (Project): The Amalia Palmaz Living Trust (applicant) requests approval of a Use Permit (P14-00261 - UP) to allow construction and operation of a personal use heliport on approximately 0.5 acres of the 220.4-acre property located at 4031 Hagen Road, Napa (the property). The heliport would include construction of a 60-foot long by 60-foot wide helicopter landing pad (helipad) and an approximately 4,000 square foot hangar and storage building on the property. The heliport is proposed for the private use of the resident owners of the property for up to a maximum of four arrival and four departure flights per week, and it is proposed to be located on a hillside area that is currently occupied by terraced vineyards. Structures and facilities proposed as accessory to the proposed heliport include: (a) a new fire hydrant; (b) a new water line connecting to the existing water line; (c) a stormwater quality bioretention basin; and (d) two 5,000-gallon water tanks for fire suppression. Additionally, the existing, private vineyard road providing access to the proposed heliport would be improved, widened and paved to comply with Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The property at 4031 Hagen Road, Napa, is located approximately two miles east of the City of Napa municipal boundary, has a General Plan land use designation of Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS), and is located in the Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning district (Assessor's Parcel No. 033-110-080).

Staff Recommendation: Accept additional public comments on the Project and adequacy of the FEIR, including any recommendations or comments from the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Close the public hearing and make a tentative decision on certification of the FEIR and Use Permit request. Direct staff to return to a future

meeting with findings consistent with the Planning Commission's tentative decision.

Staff Contact: Dana Ayers, Planner III, phone 707-253-4388 or email dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org

Applicant's Representative: Brian Russell, Abbott & Kindermann, LLP, phone 707-294-2775 or email brussell@aklandlaw.com

ITEM CONTINUED FROM MARCH 1, 2017, REGULAR MEETING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed Actions:

That the Planning Commission:

1. Resume the public hearing on the Project, including any recommendations or comments from the ALUC, and receive additional oral and written comments and on the adequacy of the FEIR;
2. Upon completion of public comment, close the public hearing and provide staff with a tentative decision with respect to adequacy of the FEIR and approval or denial of the Project; and
3. Direct staff to draft findings and final conditions of approval (COAs), if applicable, consistent with the Planning Commission's tentative decision and return at a future meeting with the findings and COAs for adoption by the Commission.

Discussion:

On March 1, 2017, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the request for a Use Permit (P14-00261 – UP) for the Palmaz Personal Use Heliport. The heliport is proposed to consist of a helipad and hangar building on the property located at 4031 Hagen Road, east of the city of Napa municipal boundary, and it is proposed for exclusive use of the resident owners of the property. If approved, operation of the heliport would consist of a maximum of four inbound and four outbound flights per week, with aircraft fueling and maintenance occurring off-site, at destination airports and a maintenance facility in Woodland, California, respectively.

At the March 1, 2017, hearing, the Commission received comments on the use permit request, as well as the adequacy of the FEIR analysis of the proposed project's environmental impacts. Following receipt of testimony, the Commission continued the public hearing to a Special Meeting scheduled to be held on March 22, 2017, at which time the ALUC was also anticipated to convene to review the proposed project and determine whether it was consistent with the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Prior to the March 22 continued meeting date, the applicant requested that the Planning Commission consideration of the matter be postponed from March 22. After reviewing the tentative calendar of agenda items, staff determined that the next available agenda date that could accommodate the continued hearing on this matter was May 17, 2017. Staff advised the Planning Commission and public that the item was to be postponed from March 22 to May 17, at the Commission's March 15 meeting. Following that announcement, staff mailed or emailed a courtesy notice of the rescheduled meeting date to: 1) the applicant; 2) the applicant's representative; 3) individuals and organizations who had expressed an interest in the project and/or requested to be sent notices regarding the use permit request; 4) draft EIR commenters; and 5) owners of property within 2,500 feet of the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust landholdings. Today's hearing represents the second opportunity for interested parties to provide oral or written comment on the proposed Project and the FEIR. It should be noted that this hearing was also noticed as described above, as well as, noticed in the Napa Valley Register.

As noted in the March 1 staff report, staff believes that the FEIR is adequate and that the Commission can make the necessary findings for certification. Staff does not recommend the proposed Project, as described above, due to the potential demand for ongoing staff resources to manage compliance with mitigation measures restricting the applicant's flight path and hours of aircraft operation. By contrast, the Alternative (or Mt. George Alternative), would not result in any significant environmental impacts requiring mitigation monitoring beyond the initial construction phase. Without ongoing monitoring of mitigation measures for identified significant impacts, staff believes the Mt. George Alternative is a better option and provides a better foundation on which to base the necessary findings, should the Commission desire to approve the use permit. The FEIR also found the Mt. George Alternative to be environmentally superior to the Project.

At today's meeting, the Planning Commission is requested to consider the ALUC's determination, accept additional public testimony, close the public hearing, deliberate on the necessary findings and render a tentative decision on the Project and adequacy of the FEIR. Staff would return to the Commission with draft findings of approval or denial and conditions of approval, based on the Planning Commission's direction, at a date to be determined.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Consideration and possible certification of a FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2015122030) and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The March 1 staff report (Attachment E) includes a discussion of the Project and the Mt. George Alternative; the environmental settings and anticipated environmental impacts of each scenario; the local and federal regulations applicable to each scenario; and the procedure for decision-making on the use permit request.

During and prior to the March 1 public hearing, the Commission and staff received several comments and letters expressing opposition or support of the requested use permit. Where objections were raised, commenters expressed concerns about the lack of consistency of the proposed heliport with General Plan policies and zoning definitions; potential biological impacts, including impacts to birds nesting in the vicinity of the proposed heliport; potential impacts to land values of properties in the vicinity of the proposed heliport; and potential noise impacts beyond those discussed in the FEIR; and monitoring compliance.

Discussion Points:

Additional Clarification of Potential Environmental Impacts: The FEIR (viewable online at <http://www.countyofnapa.org/Pages/DepartmentContent.aspx?id=4294985262>) analyzes the potential environmental impacts from the Project and Mt. George Alternative. For the Project, the FEIR found potentially significant environmental impacts in the areas of Land Use and Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Noise. The FEIR also identifies mitigation measures that would reduce the severity of the specific impacts to less than significant levels.

Several speakers and interested parties expressed concern at the March 1 public hearing about the FEIR's analysis of plants and wildlife in the vicinity of the proposed Project and Mt. George Alternative sites. The attached memorandum (Attachment C) from Ascent Environmental, the consulting firm that has assisted County staff in the preparation of the FEIR, responds to those comments, specifically amplifying the FEIR's discussion of potential project impacts to the Mt. George Foote Botanical Preserve and migratory and nesting birds in the vicinity of the Project and Mt. George Alternative sites. The memorandum also addresses the appropriateness of pre-construction surveys for certain plant species with potential to occur in the vicinity of the Mt. George Alternative access road, as well as public safety.

Land Use: Speakers and interested parties at the March 1 public hearing expressed concern that the requested use permit was not consistent with adopted General Plan policy. The DEIR analysis concluded that the Proposed Project and Mt. George Alternatives were consistent with General Plan policies (such as Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-12 and AG/LU-4, both of which promote preservation of agricultural lands for agricultural uses) because, for each of the parcels on which the Proposed Project and Mt. George Alternative, the existing residential and/or agricultural uses of the sites would be retained. If the use permit is approved, the use of either parcel in its entirety would not change from an allowable use (residential, vineyard) to an exclusively non-agricultural use (heliport).

General Plan Policy AG/LU-114 identifies the AW District (within which both the Proposed Project and Mt. George Alternative are located) as consistent with the Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space land use designation of the General Plan. Within the AW District, a variety of uses not typically considered agricultural, including hunting clubs and certain telecommunications facilities, are conditionally permitted but are recreational uses (consistent with Policy ROS-1) or are allowed consistent with other federal regulations limiting jurisdictions' discretion over public utilities. Religious assembly uses are also conditionally permitted uses in all districts of the County (County Code 18.120.B.11); though not specifically agricultural uses, religious assembly is conditionally allowed in agriculturally-designated areas where other assembly uses are conditionally permitted and in accordance with federal law.

A given project need not be in perfect conformity with every policy of a general plan but must be consistent with the plan's overall programs, policies and objectives. In addition to evaluating the Proposed Project and Mt. George Alternative various land use policies, the DEIR identifies 11 land use policies (3.2-10 and 3.2-11), as well as various biological resources, community character and safety policies with which the Proposed Project and Mt. George Alternative are consistent or would be consistent with appropriate mitigation.

While staff interprets the policies of the General Plan as allowing the requested use, ultimately, the decision of General Plan consistency lies with the decision-making body (the Planning Commission, in this case). As noted in the DEIR, the use permit as recommended to be conditioned would be consistent with General Plan policies such as CON-45, CON-48, CON-13, CON-14 and CON-18 that require storm water quality preservation measures and mitigation for potential impacts to biological resources. The proposed Project would be consistent with Policy AG/LU-9 requiring preservation of farmland in an acreage equivalent to the acreage of designated farmland to be converted to heliport use. Though the proposed Project and Mt. George Alternative are consistent with several policies in the General Plan, as noted above, the Supplemental General Plan Consistency Analysis (attached to the March 1 staff report and also attached here as Attachment F) amplifies the analysis of the DEIR to identify those specific General Plan policies with which the requested use permit is substantially, but not necessarily completely, consistent. Most notably, the requested use permit would introduce a land use that, while subordinate to permitted land uses on the Project and Mt. George Alternative sites, is itself a non-agricultural, conditionally-permitted use, which is potentially inconsistent with General Plan policies AG/LU-12 and AG/LU-20.

Definition of Personal Use Heliport: County Code section 18.08.460 defines a personal use airport or heliport as "an airport or heliport limited to the noncommercial activities of an individual owner or family and occasional invited guests." Speakers and interested parties at the March 1 public hearing expressed concern that the requested use permit did not fall within the parameters of the zoning code definition because the record owner of the heliport is a

trust, and the heliport would be used by multiple families, as “family” is defined in County Code section 18.08.280 (“Family” means one or more persons living together under a single management conducted by one or more of the persons in the group.)

The County Code definition of personal use airport or heliport mimics the wording used in state law at California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 21, section 3527 (subsection o). In addition to defining personal use airport or heliport, CCR Title 21, section 3527, includes definitions for “commercial activities” and “owner,” and as a point of contrast, a “public use airport:”

- l (d) Commercial Activities: Those activities which may offer a facility, service or commodity for sale, hire, profit, or any other business purpose. Examples of commodities for sale are: food, lodging, entertainment, real estate, petroleum products, parts and equipment. Examples of services are: flight training, charter flights, maintenance, aircraft storage and tie-down. Examples of a facility used for a business purpose are: facility used for the transport of persons for a corporate business purpose and a facility used to transport persons for compensation or hire.
- l (n) Owner: The person with the authority to possess the facility, which may be in “fee simple” or a leasehold for a period of at least one year.
- l (q) Public-Use Airport: An airport that is open for aircraft operations to the general public and is listed in the current edition of the Airport/Facility Directory that is published by the National Ocean Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The use permit request, as proposed, is consistent with the state and local definitions of personal use airport or heliport. As proposed by the applicant, the heliport would be for the exclusive use of the permittee, who is also the property owner identified in Assessor’s records as the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust. State law is not so precise as to define “owner” to the exclusion of multiple parties within a trust, or even lessees who hold no title to the property on which the airport or heliport is operated. Rather, personal use airports are operated, in contrast to public-use airports, for the sole use of one party and not by the general public. This aspect of the proposal is consistent with state and local regulations.

In addition to proposing to use the heliport for a single facility owner/operator, the applicant is proposing to use the aircraft for transportation of family members and guests of the operator. This aspect of the proposal is also consistent with state and local regulations. Use of the heliport for commercial activities, defined in state law as transportation for hire or in exchange for compensation, would fall outside of the applicant’s proposal, in addition to requiring additional insurance and licensing obligations of the permittee. (See FEIR response to comment I35-9.) Recommended condition of approval (COA) No. 2.3 attached to this and the March 1 staff report would preclude commercial use of the helipad.

Use of the heliport in emergency response situations would be permitted without a use permit under the zoning code (County Code section 18.120.010.A.9). To clarify further that use of the facility would be limited solely to the permit holder, staff has revised recommended COA No. 1.2 to more explicitly state that non-emergency use of the facility by other aircraft not owned by the permittee, including aircraft used in training exercises of public and contracted safety agencies, would be precluded.

Use Permit Compliance and Monitoring: Speakers and interested parties at the March 1 public hearing expressed concern about the permittee’s compliance with the requirements of the use permit, if approved. Recommended conditions attached to the March 1 staff report included a condition (COA No. 2.2) that addressed ongoing monitoring for compliance with use permit conditions. The condition requires the permittee’s compliance with the designated “No-Fly Zone,” an area to the west and northwest of the Project site that is characterized by large-lot single-family residential development of the highest densities within the general vicinity of the Project site. Flights below 1,000 feet within the “No-Fly Zone” would be avoided, with the limited exception of emergencies threatening the safety of the aircraft or its occupants. The minimum altitude of 1,000 feet was selected by the applicant

because it is the cruising altitude at which most helicopters fly, and therefore reflects the existing scenario without the Project.

COA No. 2.2 also incorporated by reference the applicant's voluntary compliance tracking program, and identified the Planning Director as the person responsible for determining use permit compliance or noncompliance in the event of receipt of a complaint about the project. To amplify the terms of the COA and the permittee's obligations to cooperate in the County's investigation of potential complaints of use permit violations, recommended COA No. 2.2 has been revised to require that the applicant comply with the following:

1. Identify a point of contact to whom members of the public may submit complaints about the heliport operation (this individual could be the permittee or an agent of the permittee, and a member of the public wishing to file a complaint would notify this individual in addition to County staff);
2. Take measures to preserve recorded flight data immediately upon receiving notice from County staff or a member of the public of an allegation of use permit violation; and
3. Retain such data for no fewer than 14 days after the Planning Director has made final determination of use permit compliance or noncompliance, or until a final decision of compliance is made by the Board of Supervisors if the Planning Director's determination is appealed.

As revised, recommended conditions of approval would allow County staff to request flight data from the permittee as part of a program of random auditing for use permit compliance.

The recommended conditions would also define a single violation of the No-Fly Zone or flight path restrictions as a material breach of the use permit, for which revocation could be initiated immediately upon confirmed evidence of a use permit violation. The process for use permit revocation is established in County Code Section 18.124.120 and requires a Planning Commission public hearing. After receiving testimony, the Commission may revoke or suspend a use permit or modify the conditions thereof, if it makes one or more of the following findings that:

1. Approval of the use permit was obtained by fraud or misrepresentations; or
2. A person making use of the permit is violated or has violated any conditions thereof; or
3. The use for which the use permit was granted is being, or has been, exercised contrary to the terms or conditions of such approval;
4. The use for which the approval was granted is so exercised as to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare;
5. The use for which the approval was granted is being exercised in such a manner as to constitute a nuisance; or
6. The use for which approval was granted has ceased for a period of five years or more.

Like use permit approvals, Planning Commission decisions on revocations of use permits are appealable to the Board of Supervisors. Following the revocation of a use permit, no application for a use permit for the same or substantially the same use and design or use of the same or substantially the same site shall be filed within one year from the date of denial or revocation. In its research, staff has found records of 17 land use permits for which the County has initiated revocation proceedings for uses that included wineries, private recreational facilities, auto dismantlers and contractors. The earliest found record of initiation of revocation proceedings was from 1968. Of these 17 permits for which revocation proceedings were initiated, four permits were formally revoked after the permit holder failed to achieve full compliance with the conditions of approval of the applicable permit.

The recommended COA described above would be in addition to COA 9.0, attached to the March 1 staff report, that also defines excessive groundwater use as a material breach of permit for which revocation also could be initiated.

Other Revisions to Recommended COA: Other minor revisions to the recommended conditions would clarify that no flights from the heliport could occur until after all project improvements are completed and approved by the County in accordance with all applicable regulations (COA No. 18.0). Additionally, while the FEIR does not conclude that either of the flight paths (northeasterly or northwesterly, see DEIR Exhibit 6-5) proposed for the Mt. George Alternative would have significant environmental impacts, staff recommends that a new condition be added to require the applicant to adhere to those flight paths and to notify the County within five business days of submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for airspace analysis determinations for any new or different flight path. While the FAA's determination would be necessary to confirm the airspace safety of any new flight path, the County should also be notified to allow for review of the new flight paths for any new noise impacts or potential conflicts with the use permit, if approved. In such an instance, amendment of the use permit and an appropriate level of corresponding environmental analysis would likely be required.

Public Comments: Public comments that were submitted after commencement of the public hearing on March 1 are attached to this staff report as Attachment D. As noted in the paragraph above, staff has recommended clarifications to the previously recommended conditions of approval in response to comments. The memorandum from Ascent (Attachment C) also provides responses to the environmental comments that were submitted to the County on and since March 1.

Decision-Making Options:

Use Permit Findings: County Code Section 18.120.010.B allows personal use airports and heliports in any zoning district upon grant of a use permit in each case. Pursuant to County Code Section 18.124.070, grant or denial of a use permit must be based on the following findings supported by substantial evidence:

- (a) That the commission or board has the power to issue a use permit under the zoning regulations in effect as applied to the property;
- (b) That the procedural requirements set forth in County Code Chapter 18.124 have been met;
- (c) That grant of the use permit, as conditioned, will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare of the county;
- (d) That the proposed use complies with the applicable provisions of County Code and is consistent with the policies and standards of the general plan and any applicable specific plan;
- (e) That, in the case of groundwater basins identified as "groundwater deficient areas" under Section 13.15.010, the proposed use would not require a new water system or improvement, or utilize an existing water system or improvement causing significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on said groundwater basins in Napa County, unless that use would satisfy any of the other criteria specified for approval or waiver of a groundwater permit under Section 13.15.070 or 13.15.080 of County Code; and
- (f) That, in the case of other groundwater basins, or areas which do not overlay an identified groundwater basin, substantial evidence has not been presented which demonstrates that the new water system or improvement might cause a significant adverse effect on any underlying groundwater basin, unless that use would satisfy any of the other criteria specified for approval or waiver of a groundwater permit under Section 13.15.070 or 13.15.080 of County Code.

Because use permits are approved or denied based on the specific circumstances of each individual request, the statements of findings should not be overly broad, and the Commission's ability or inability to make the findings above must speak to the details of the request currently before it. All of the findings listed above would need to be made in order to approve the request; if any one or more of the above findings cannot be met, the Commission

would need to deny the request.

Upon consideration of the ALUC's consistency determination and consideration of additional public comment and close of the public hearing, the Commission may take one of the following actions:

Option 1: Approve Applicant's Proposal / the Project.

This option would find that the FEIR adequately analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the Project and would approve the Project. The heliport would be constructed on the vineyard site proximate to the applicant's residence and for the applicant's personal use. The applicant would be subject to requirements with respect to the aircraft stage (noise generation) standards, the number of flights per week, and the limitations on hours of operation and flight path. The applicant would also be subject to compliance with the voluntary reporting and monitoring program described above. Each of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR would be adopted as conditions of approval of the Project.

Action Required – Take a tentative action to certify the FEIR and approve the Project, and direct staff to prepare findings and conditions of approval that encompass FEIR mitigation measures, as well as other standard County conditions of approval and any other conditions identified by the Commission. Staff would return at a future meeting date with the final approval documents for the Commission to formally adopt.

Option 2: Approve the Mt. George Alternative to the Project (Staff recommended option).

This option would find that the FEIR adequately analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the Project and Mt. George Alternative, and would approve construction of the proposed heliport on the Alternative site. Voluntary and imposed elements of the Project would continue to apply to the Mt. George Alternative scenario, including the limitation on the number of weekly flights, requirements of the aircraft stage standards, avoidance of the "No-Fly Zone" below cruising altitude, and the compliance with the applicant's proposed reporting and monitoring program. While construction-related mitigations of the Project would also apply to the Mt. George Alternative (such as those requiring mitigation for potential impacts to sensitive plant species and cultural resources), recommended measures that would limit noise impacts of the heliport would not be applicable, as the Alternative scenario (unlike the Project) would not have a significant impact on sensitive receptors. Similarly, mitigation requiring preservation of farmland would not be required as no farmland would be converted under the Mt. George Alternative.

Staff recommends approval of the Mt. George Alternative, subject to the revised COA in Attachment A, because it places the heliport in a more remote location with less significant noise impacts compared to the proposed Project site. With the recommended additional clarifications to the Conditions of Approval (COA) as summarized above, flights to and from the heliport by any other than the applicant's aircraft would be prohibited, thereby precluding any additional flights (above the eight per week proposed) as part of training exercises for emergency response personnel. The recommended COA, as revised, would also more precisely define material breaches of the use permit, providing a single determination of violation of the No-Fly Zone, flight paths, or water usage as potential bases for initiation of revocation and thereby reducing the time needed to identify a pattern of violations on which to commence the revocation process. With fewer potential significant impacts, and with the absence of necessary ongoing mitigation monitoring related to approach/departure paths or hours of operations, staff believes the Mt. George Alternative is a better option and provides a better foundation on which to base the necessary findings to approve a use permit, as compared to the Project. The FEIR also concluded that the Mt. George Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Project.

Action Required – Take action to certify the FEIR and approve the Mt. George Alternative, and the conditions of approval that encompass appropriate and applicable FEIR mitigation measures, as well as other standard County conditions of approval. Approval documents reflecting staff's recommendation would be included in the

Commission's packet for adoption at a future meeting.

Option 3: Deny the Requested Use Permit.

This action would result in no change to existing conditions. Existing vineyards on the Project site would be retained, no heliport would be built on the property, and the applicant would continue to use the Napa County Airport for storage and operation of their helicopter. Similarly, no changes would be made to the Mt. George Alternative site or its related off-site access roads. No restrictions on the applicant's operation of their helicopter, including flight paths or the number of flights per week, and the "No-Fly Zone" would be imposed or enforceable by the County.

Additionally, denial of the use permit would introduce no new environmental impacts. Construction of the heliport would not occur, and noise impacts would be the same as what residents in the area experience currently. The aircraft would take off from and land at the Napa County Airport in the south County industrial area, as it currently does, and the applicant would travel by car to the residence.

Action Required – Take a tentative action to deny the use permit request and direct staff to draft the necessary findings for denial. If the Commission determines that it cannot make the required findings for grant of the requested use permit, or that the Project is inconsistent with the General Plan, Commissioners must articulate the basis for the findings, such as General Plan inconsistency or an adverse effect to public health, safety and welfare. The Commission would then make a tentative motion to deny the proposal and remand the matter to staff to draft the required findings of denial, based on the Commissioners' statements. Staff would return to the Commission with draft findings of denial for adoption at a future meeting date. If the Commission moves to deny the use permit request, then it need not take any action to certify the FEIR.

Option 4: Continuance Option.

The Commission may continue an item to a future hearing date, at its discretion.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- A . Revised Recommended Conditions of Approval and Final Agency Approval Memos
- B . Environmental Impact Report
- C . Response to Final EIR Comments Received on March 1, 2017
- D . Public Comments Received After Commencement of March 1, 2017, Hearing
- E . March 1, 2017, Planning Commission Staff Report
- F . Supplemental General Plan Consistency Analysis, February 27, 2017

Napa County Planning Commission:

Reviewed By: