

Ayers, Dana

Planning Commission Mtg

From: Lynn Craig <craiglynnrobert@netscape.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 5:59 PM
To: Ayers, Dana
Subject: Proposed Palmaz heliport project

SEP 06 2017

Agenda Item # 7A

We would like to add our names to the growing list of property owners in the Coombsville area who are opposed to the Palmaz heliport, which is once again being considered tomorrow. We own a vineyard off of Hagen Road, not far from the Palmaz property, and are very concerned that approval of this project would generate noise pollution in the area as well as setting a very bad precedent. Also, proximity to such a heliport would affect the value of our property and others (requiring disclosure).

For the 25 years we have lived in our vineyard, we have never felt the need for a helicopter to facilitate our travels, and we do not believe that such a need has been demonstrated in this instance (the Napa Airport is only 25 minutes away!). There is absolutely no reason that the frivolous wishes of one person should be allowed to prevail over the interests of hundreds of area residents.

Please vote no on this proposal.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Robert and Lynn Craig
1084 La Londe Lane
Napa, CA 94558

September 6, 2017

Dana Ayers, Planner III
Napa County
Planning, Building and Environmental Services
1195 Third Street, Napa, CA 94559
Phone: 707-253-4388
E-Mail: Dana.Ayers@countyofnapa.org

Planning Commission Mtg.
SEP 06 2017
Agenda Item # 7A

Dear Dana,

We were not able to attend today's hearing, so please include our following comments in opposition to the proposed Palmez Personal Use Heliport Project (Use Permit Application #P14- 00261 – UP) into the Public Record. Thank you.

Generally, approval of a personal use heliport would establish and promote an environmentally and socially unwise precedent: To allow private helicopter flights, exclusive personal commuter and business use for the sole purpose of accommodating the wishes of wealthy individuals is wrong and would disrupt and diminish the rural agricultural character of Napa Valley and the tranquility of people and the natural ecosystems adversely affected.

Specifically, Palmez Project is in conflict with and runs counter to AB 32, California's Global Warming Solutions Act. Approval of the Project would lead to an impermissible incremental net increase in GHGs. For this reason alone, Project approval must be denied. From a planning perspective, approval of the Project would be irrational and socially irresponsible.

Helicopter flights in Napa Valley must be limited to emergency situations and public safety requirements.

Approval of the Palmez Project is opposed by an overwhelming majority of informed residents living in a wide-swath of land that would be negatively impacted beneath the the helicopter's flight path. Residents would be subjected to unwanted, objectionable, and environmentally harmful percussive noise pollution.

Without equivocation, the Palmez Personal Use Heliport Project must be rejected, summarily. Public decision makers, civil servants, do the right thing and deny the Palmez Project Use Permit Application.

Sincerely,

Sandra and Steven Booth
E-Mail: juniperbooth@gmail.com

SEP 06 2017

7A

PALMAZ PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT Agenda Item # **September 6, 2017**

George Caloyannidis, Calistoga

From my extensive written comments and documentation, I summarize here why this application ought to be denied.

1) The "applicant" and owner of the land is a Trust yet the Trust cannot fly a helicopter. The helicopter is owned by a corporation registered in Delaware. The county does not know if this corporation is a trustee to the Trust nor does it have the power to approve changes in the Trust. This use permit would convey rights to unspecified entities within or outside the Trust.

2) The revised staff report recommends that the vacant property on which the helipad is proposed must not be sold separately from the rest of the property. This would set a precedent in permitting helipads and hangars on vacant parcels owned by people who own or "control" other property anywhere in the county as long as these properties are not sold separately.

Furthermore, staff has not defined what "controlling" a property means.

3) This use permit is patently unenforceable as it is impossible for anyone to adequately document non-adherence. Without specific documentation, no complaint can be filed.

4) Adherence to the conditions lies entirely on records maintained by the commercial helicopter operator. In view of this, testimony regarding the gross past use permit violations of the Trust are material. Chair Gill's barring such testimony is a procedural error.

5) If the flight monitoring device is detachable, the operator may detach it to avoid recordation at any time without violating FAA rules. At the same time, the county lacks the resources and expertise to analyze its data.

6) If the recording device is fixed, the helicopter must fly to an accredited facility for data analysis. Such facility has not been identified.

7) Lastly, I refer you to the 5th District ruling last May which found that Camas County, Idaho had erred in granting a permit for a plane to land on private property because it showed: "*Complete disregard for the well being of the neighborhood*".

The Palmaz neighborhood is right here!

Thank you

Ayers, Dana

Planning Commission Mtg.

From: K.C. Kovar <kc@cpask.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 8:35 AM
To: Ayers, Dana
Subject: Palmaz Heliport

SEP 06 2017

Agenda Item #: 7A

Please vote no on the Palmaz Heliport. My husband and I live on East Third and we would be in the path of helicopters. If this is approved it will set a precedent for future wealthy winery owners to get their own heliports which destroy our quiet rural setting.

K.C. Kovar
sent from my iPhone