

From: [Becky Carlton Dice](#)
To: [Gallina, Charlene](#)
Subject: Comment on Winery Analysis Comparison Table
Date: Thursday, August 13, 2020 11:13:12 AM

[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Planning Commission:

I look at these winery analysis comparison tables and feel like projects must stand on their own two feet for approval...not be approved based on someone else's approval.

I live in Angwin on Friesen Drive. It is a private road (not maintained by the County). O'Shaugnessy applied to have tasting and events in addition to their grape-growing. They had to request many variances from code because Friesen is a dead-end road that is 10 feet wide at some parts. It is in a high fire danger zone on the edge of Bell Canyon Cimarossa also must use the variances...I assume Davis, who is stripping the forest at the end of the road has received allowances as well. Ballentine (Red Lake Ranch) has an application to put in a 30,000-gallon winery next to our home and the Angwin municipal water supply on the same road. They are requesting to use the same variances from Count/safety code as the others. You could look at a comparison table and say, "Well, we let these guys do it...better let Ballentine do it, too."

Just because the Planning Commission approved something for one winery does not mean that it was or is a good idea.

When a fire comes roaring up the canyon during peak tourist season and Crush, I know that it will be hard to get out. I have a safe place to go with my babies during a fire...but will the dozens of slightly inebriated tourists that come wandering up our narrow driveway? Project feasibility and safety must stand alone, not piggy-back on the allowances given to others.

That comparison table may perhaps be useful to show how irresponsible development has been in the past, but it should not be used to justify continued poor decisions.

Thank you,
Rebecca Dice
840 Friesen Drive, Angwin