# MINUTES

**NAPA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

1195 Third Street, Ste. 305

**Monday, August 10, 2015**

 **9:00 A.M.
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

## CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

***Committee Members in attendance:***

***Christina Benz, John Dunbar, David Graves, Eve Kahn, Peter McCrea, Bruce Phillips, Stan Boyd, Sharon Gardner, Ted Hall, Jim Krider, Dan Mufson, Debra Dommen, Jeri Gill, Charles Hossom, Tony LeBlanc, Lucio Perez,

Committee Members in absent:
Oscar Renteria***

***Alternate Members in attendance:***

***Michelle Benvenuto, Carl Bunch, Bob Fiddaman, Rex Stults, Jeff Dodd, Phil Blake, Harvest Duhig, Gary Margadant***

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
2. **CITIZEN COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee invites comments and recommendations from the public concerning current problems and future prospects of a planning nature which are within the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Protection Advisory Committee. Anyone who wishes to speak to the Committee on such a matter, if it is not on the agenda, may do so at this time.

***Geoff Ellsworth, Michelle Benvenuto, Jim Savovich, Gary Margadant, and Tom Falcon made comments.***

***(Please refer to the Napa County website at*** http://napa.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\_id=27 ***for audio of these citizen comments)***

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

***May 11, 2015 Minutes were approved as corrected
Motion by Charles Hossom seconded by John Dunbar***

***July 27, 2015 Minutes were approved as corrected
Motion by Charles Hossom seconded by Debra Dommen***

## SECRETARY-DIRECTOR’S REPORT

1. **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**
	1. This meeting is being conducted by the Agricultural Protection Advisory Committee and County staff to allow for input, discussion, and tentative recommendation regarding proposals for amending the County Zoning Code. The focus of this meeting concerns: (1) definitions; (2) Proposal X; (3) Option F; and (4) clarification and corrections to the Tentative Recommendations.

***Committee members held discussions and took tentative actions on the proposals described as follows: See chart for Committee member’s vote
(Please note that these and future recommendations will be considered again at the end***

***of this process as a part of the final report of the Committee to the Planning Commission, and that the Committee will have additional opportunity to further interpret and refine the definitions when the Committee moves on to the next proposal.***

1. ***Proposal X***

***Bruce Phillips made a motion, seconded by Lucio Perez to clarify that proposal X is intended to serve as guidelines or benchmarks for decision-making authorities, and that Proposal X would apply to new wineries. It would also apply to the modification of existing winery permits only to the extent of those issues are not already addressed within the existing use permit.
6 in Favor - 10 Opposed***

***John Dunbar made a substitute motion, seconded by Peter Mcrea, that Proposal X only apply to new wineries.
8 in favor - 8 opposed***

1. ***Residential Uses***

***Lucio Perez made a motion, seconded by Christina Benz, to recommend to the county that the calculation of maximum winery development coverage for an agricultural parcel include any area of residential development.
8 in favor - 8 opposed***

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
* ***Reconsider the agricultural definition to look at the range of uses allowed as a part of agricultural processing and the range of accessory use.***
* ***Staff should prepare a comparison of the intensity of uses in the Agricultural Preserve, with regards to Proposal X and maximum lot coverage.***
* ***Take action on the content & tone of the APAC report for the Planning Commission and direction to staff for delivery of the presentation, including any outstanding proposals.***
1. **ADJOURNMENT**

 ***The meeting was adjourned to the regular APAC meeting of May 26, 2015.***

The following chart reflects committee member’s votes for consolidated definitions or proposals.

As a reminder, any recommendation being forwarded to the Planning Commission for their consideration must have support of a super-majority of those Committee members present. For the full Committee of 17 members, a minimum of 12 votes is needed to move an item forward.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CommitteeMembers | Bruce Phillips Motion to amend and clarify Staff’s Proposal X | John Dunbar substitute Motion to Proposal X | Lucio Perez Proposal to include Residential Development in Max Area Development |
| Y | N | Y | N | Y | N |
| Christina Benz |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| John Dunbar |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| David Graves |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eve Kahn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peter McCrea |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruce Phillips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stan Boyd |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sharon Gardner |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ted Hall |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jim Krider |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dan Mufson |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debra Dommen |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jeri Gill |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charles Hossom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tony LeBlanc |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lucio Perez |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| In Favor | Opposed | In Favor | Opposed | In Favor | Opposed |