



A Tradition of Stewardship  
A Commitment to Service

Agenda Date: 10/2/2013

Agenda Placement: 9B

## Napa County Planning Commission Board Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Napa County Planning Commission

**FROM:** Charlene Gallina for Hillary Gitelman - Director  
Planning, Building and Environmental Services

**REPORT BY:** LINDA STCLAIRE, PLANNER III - 707.299.1348

**SUBJECT:** Flynnville Wine Company Use Permit

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

#### **PD PROPERTIES LLC / FLYNNVILLE WINE COMPANY / USE PERMIT P12-00222 & VARIANCE P12-00223**

**CEQA Status:** A Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) was prepared. According to the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, the proposed project would have, if mitigation measures are not included, a potentially significant environmental impact on the following area: Biological Resources. This project site is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5.

**Request:** Approval of a Use Permit for a 300,000 gallon per year winery as follows: 1) construct 14 individual wineries in four phases for a total buildout of 82,236 square feet of winery buildings to include a welcome center ( 2,477 sq ft) and a hospitality building (4,015 sq ft), and 5,730 square feet of crushpad area; 2) allow phased by-appointment tours and tastings visitation divided equally amongst the 14 wineries for a total at buildout of a maximum of 500 visitors per day; 3) allow for a phased marketing plan, divided equally among the 14 wineries for a total maximum each of: one (1) 500 person event per year, five (5) 250 person events per year, eight (8) 100 person events per year, eight (8) 50 person events per year, and two (2) 25 person events per year; 4)construct 109 parking spaces (to include four ADA accessible spaces); 5) install a new on-site winery process and domestic wastewater treatment 6) employ 30 Full-time employees; 7) on-premise consumption adjacent to the existing winery structures consistent with AB2004; and, 8) approve a variance to construct the winery 136 feet within the 600 foot setback from State Highway 29, 124 feet within the 300 foot setback from Maple Lane and 94 feet within the 300 foot setback from Drew Lane and to allow winery coverage of 32.9%. The 11.44 acre project site is located on the northeast side of State Highway 29, bordered by Maple Lane on the south and Drew Lane on the north, 0.87 mile northwest of its intersection with Larkmead Lane within the Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP) Zoning Districts at 1184 Maple Lane, Calistoga, CA. (APNs: 020-320-003, 004,005,006,009,015,016, and 020-170-012).

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff is recommending to continue this item after discussion and seeks direction from the Planning Commission on an appropriate project scope.

**Staff Contact:** Linda St. Claire, Planner [linda.stclaire@countyofnapa.org](mailto:linda.stclaire@countyofnapa.org) (707) 299-1348

**Applicant Contact:** Dan Pina (707) 967-4805

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Proposed Actions:**

That the Planning Commission:

1. Discuss Variance (P12-00223) for road setbacks and winery coverage and the Use Permit (P12-00222).
2. Continue the item and direct Staff to return at a date uncertain with alternative project, including use permit findings and conditions of approval.

**Discussion:** A variety of industrial uses have been operating on the site since the early 1960s. In 1968, the original zoning designation, Manufacturing (M), which allowed for industrial uses, was changed to Planned Development (PD). In 1977 Industrial uses were excluded from PD zoning and in 1985 the zoning was changed to Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP). At that point the majority of uses on the various parcels became non-conforming. In 1986 and 1991 the owners of the site were denied two separate requests from the Planning Commission to amend the General Plan designation from Agricultural Resources (AR) to Commercial (C) and/or Industrial (I). Each decision was appealed to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and each appeal was denied by the BOS.

The proposal is to merge eight parcels into one 11.84 acre parcel and to construct a single 300,000 gallon winery with multiple winemaking facilities. As indicated by the applicant, it is no different than other multiple winemaking facilities located in the county such as those operated by the Laird Family and Napa Wine Company. Staff believe the project is somewhat different than those operations given that each tenant will have a separate wine making tenant space with private tasting room. Each winemaking facility could include all winemaking functions such as tank and barrel areas, covered crush pads, office and tasting rooms.

The proposal also includes Variance requests for road setbacks (Highway 29, Drew Lane and Maple Lane), as well as winery coverage. Staff has concerns regarding the coverage, parking and visitation (refer to Discussion, below) on the proposed project. Planning staff are supportive of the general concept of converting the non-conforming Industrial use to a conforming agricultural use, however, there are concerns over the size of the facility, both in development coverage as well as visitation and marketing intensity. Therefore, staff is recommending that the Commission conduct it's public hearing and continue the item with direction to Staff on project design. The Planning Commission has the following alternative options it may wish to consider for action on this request:

1. Direct staff to prepare findings and approve the proposed variance with conditions of approval for the project as proposed; or
2. Direct staff to prepare findings and conditions of approval for a reduced project design as recommended in this staff report; or
3. Direct staff to prepare findings for denial of the requested use permit and variance based upon the project not meeting required findings of fact for a variance of the winery coverage; or
4. Direct staff to prepare findings and conditions of approval on an alternative design based on evidence and

testimony presented at the hearing.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact?                      No

### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

Mitigated Negative Declaration Prepared. According to the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, if mitigation measures are not included, the proposed project would have potentially significant environmental impacts in the following areas: Biological Resources. The project site is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5.

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

**Owner:** PD Properties LLC, Flynnville Wine Company; Dan Pina (707) 967.4805

**Representative:** Jeff Redding (707) 255.7375

**Zoning District:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) & AP (Agricultural Preserve)

**General Plan Designation:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) & AR (Agricultural Resources)

**Original Application Filed:** July 6, 2012

**Application Deemed Complete:** July 22, 2013

**Parcel Size:** 11.84 acres

**Winery Size (Proposed):** 82,236 square feet (phased)

**Setbacks (Proposed):** 136 feet in a 600 foot required setback from State Highway 29, and 94 feet on the west and 123 feet on the east in a 300 foot required setback (Variance is being requested).

**Production Capacity (Proposed):** 300,000 gallons per year (phased).

**Accessory to Production Ratio (Proposed):** 39.8%

**Winery Coverage (Existing):** 24%

**Winery Coverage (Proposed):** 32.9% (25% is allowed); Variance is being requested.

**Number of Employees (Proposed):** Thirty full-time (phased)

**Hours of Visitation (Proposed):** 10:00am to 6:30 pm, daily.

**Hours of Operation (Existing and Proposed):** 8:00am to 8:00pm, daily.

**Tours & Tastings (Proposed):** A maximum of 350 per day on weekdays and a maximum of 500 per day on weekends, by appointment only (phased).

**Marketing; (Proposed):** Two per month with a maximum of 25, eight per month with 50, eight per month with 100, five per year with 250, and one annual event with 500. Food service will be catered at all events with over 50 people in attendance (phased).

**Parking Size (Proposed):** 109 spaces, including 4 ADA-accessible space (phased).

**Adjacent General Plan Designation/Zoning District/Land Use:**

Northerly - Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Resources (AR) - Three parcels approximately 1.22 acres (Stephens), 3.19 (Drew) and 2.73 (Flynn), each with a single family residence. The Napa River also borders the northern border of the site. Two additional parcel on the eastern side of the Napa River are accessible by Maple Lane as well as Solano Ave. One is a 40 acre vacant parcel (Pacholec) and the other is a 16.57 acre parcel (Laird) with vineyard and a single family residence.

Southerly - Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS) - Two parcels, one wooded vacant parcel approximately 14 acres in size (Jinks) and a 68 acre parcel with vines and the access drive for Villa Amorosa Winery.

Easterly - A 12 acre parcel zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and split General Plan designation of Agricultural, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS) and Agricultural Resources (AR) planted with vines (Diageo).

Westerly - A 10 acre parcel zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and split General Plan designation of Agricultural, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS) and Agricultural Resources (AR) planted with vines (Heitz).

**Nearby Wineries (within about a mile of the project site):**

Villa Amorosa - 4025 St. Helena Hwy - 250,000 gallons per year - Public tours and tastings with an average of 600/week.

Azalea Spring Winery- 4301 Azalea Springs Winery - 12,050 gallons per year - Tours and tasting by appointment (125/wk).

Sterling Vineyards - 1111 Dunaweal Lane - 1,500,000 gallons per year - Public tours and tastings with an average of 3,850/week.

Paoletti Estates Winery - 4501 Silverado Trail- 16,000 gallons per year - Tours and tastings by appointment (350/wk).

Twomey Cellars - 1183 Dunaweal Lane- 36,000 gallons per year - Public tours and tasting with an average of 75/week.

Larkmead Vineyards- 1100 Larkmead Lane - 36,000 gallons per year - Tours and tastings by appointment (120/wk).

**Parcel History and Evolution of this Application:**

A variety of industrial uses have been operating on the site since the early 1960s.

In 1968, the original zoning designation, Manufacturing (M), which allowed for industrial uses, was changed to

### Planned Development (PD).

In 1975 a use permit was issued (U-347576) to construct two structures for warehouse and storage use on APNs 020-320-004 & 007, and in 1976 a use permit was approved (U-777576) to allow the operation of an equipment sales and service and farm supply business on APN 020-320-006.

In 1977 Industrial uses were excluded from PD zoning and in 1985 the zoning was changed to Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP). At that point the majority of uses on the various parcels became non-conforming.

In 1993 Clegg Robinson (owner) applied for a Certificate of Legal Non-Conformity (CLN) to recognize the nonconforming uses on APN 020-320-006. The use, for a tractor sales and service company, was established in 1959 and was conforming at that time under the M zoning. Offices, warehouses, retail rental, fleet repair and a cleaning service were some of the other uses at the site after the tractor sales and services had departed. The Zoning Administrator determined that the uses were not continuous and did not conform to the original use, therefore, a certificate of legal nonconformity was not issued. The owner appealed this decision to the Board of Supervisors in August 1993. In April 1994 the Board denied the appeal to recognize nonconforming uses at the site but issued a CLN to recognize the existence of three nonconforming structures only.

In 1986 and 1991 the owners of the site were denied two separate requests from the Planning Commission to amend the General Plan designation from Agricultural Resources (AR) to Commercial (C) and/or Industrial (I). Each decision was appealed to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and each appeal was denied by the BOS.

In 1997 a use permit was approved (96626-UP) by the Planning Commission to establish a public utility corporate yard and offices for use by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) on APN 020-320-007 and to utilize APN 020-320-008 for equipment parking, outdoor storage and a fueling station for company vehicles.

The parcels continue to have AW and AP zoning with non-conforming uses. Moving clockwise from the parcel at the southwestern corner of State Route 29 and Drew Lane, (APN 020-320-015) contains three structures, one is used by the applicant for storage, another is currently leased out to Jim's Supply (a fencing company) and the remaining structure is the Upper Valley Barrel Storage Company. There is one structure on APN 020-320-004, which is used for barrel storage. APN 020-320-003 (also known as Ida Lane) is vacant and used as a easement by some neighbors. There are two vacant parcels north of Ida Lane, (APNs 020-320-009 & 020-170-012) and the wastewater pond is proposed for APN 020-320-009. A residence on APN 020-320-005 is currently vacant. Two structures on APN 020-320-006 are used as storage. The former PG&E site (APN 020-320-016), at the corner of Maple Lane and State Route 29, has no structures and contains equipment storage.

### Code Compliance History:

The Code Enforcement Division did not identify any specific enforcement issues. The site has many non-conforming uses since the change in zoning in 1985.

### Wineries with Similar Traits:

Below is a table of wineries with similar traits as Flynnville. Like Flynnville, they are all wineries with approximately 300,000 gallons of production or more. Other wineries of this size range in visitation from 50 visitors a week to 1,308 per week. Only one winery, Silver Oak Wine Cellars, has comparable visitation relative to the production. Flynnville has proposed visitation of 2,750 per week. The proposed building size is relatively larger than most wineries of this production level. However, should the variance not be permitted and the site redesigned, a building of a smaller size would be more proportional to the site (see Variance discussion below).

There are five wineries in Napa County with Tours and Tastings by appointment with 2,800-2,900 visitors per week. They range in production from 100,000 gallons per year to 1,980,000 gallons. They include Caravan Serai, Beringer, Domaine Chandon, Rombauer, and Raymond. There are ten wineries in the county with visitation levels higher than 2,900 per week, the highest, Robert Mondavi, has an average of 4,025 visitors per week, and those ten are pre-WDO wineries.

Winery	Address	Building Square Feet	Approved Production	Tours & Tastings by Appt/Wk	Marketing Plan
Markham Winery	2812 St Helena Hwy	70,783	300,000	Public 400/wk	No
Miner Family Winery	7850 Silverado Trl	38,950	300,000	Public 1,308/wk	No
Pine Ridge Winery	5901 Silverado Trl	67,741	300,000	Public 922/wk	No
Wilkenson Winery	110 Camino Oruga	13,000	310,000	None	Yes
Stag's Leap Winery	6150 Silverado Trl	9,400	315,000	Appt 10/wk	Yes
Silver Oak Wine	915 Oakville Cross	28,058	210,000	Public 3,000/wk	No
Stag's Leap Cellars	5766 Silverado Trl	83,672	330,000	Public 700/wk	Yes
William Hill Winery	1761 Atlas Peak Rd	38,000	335,000	Appt 50/wk	Yes
Cuaison Carneros	1221 Duhig Rd	34,350	340,000	Appt 525/wk	No
Clos Du Val Wine Co	5330 Silverado Trl	60,614	350,000	Public 987/wk	No
Silverado Vineyards	6121 Silverado Trl	78,218	360,000	Public 850/wk	No
<b>Flynnville Wine Co</b>	<b>3180 State Hwy 29</b>	82,236	<b>300,000</b>	<b>Appt 2,750/wk (represents full buildout)</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Note: Total Visitation Ave/Wk number, are approximate.

#### Discussion Points:

Proposed Winery Uses - The proposal (upon merge of the eight parcels) is for a single 300,000 gallon winery with multiple winemaking facilities, and as indicated by the applicant, no different than other multiple winemaking facilities located in the county such as those operated by the Laird Family and Napa Wine Company. As proposed, it is the intent of the applicant to lease space for wine production and accessory uses (e.g., tank and barrel areas, covered crush pads, office and tasting rooms). A single hospitality building will be utilized by all the tenants for marketing events. However, unlike other multi-entity wineries, this facility will feature individual tasting rooms for each leased space.

The applicant is proposing a tours and tasting program with a maximum of 350 visitors each day Monday through Friday and 500 visitors on both Saturday and Sunday. Staff is recommending a smaller visitation program of a maximum of 100 visitors per day Monday through Friday and 200 visitors on both Saturday and Sunday with a maximum weekly visitation allowance of 700 visitors to address traffic, neighbor and development area coverage

issues, as well as to be commensurate with the visitation levels approved at other similarly sized facilities.

Variances - The proposal includes two variances to the zoning requirements. The first variance is a request to construct a new winery within the winery setbacks required for State Highway 29 (600 feet) and road setbacks for Drew Drive and Maple Lane (300 feet). The proposed setback would be 136 feet from State Highway 29, 94 feet from Drew Drive and 123 feet from Maple Lane. The winery proposal would otherwise be limited to a small area within the eight merged parcels, approximately 2,800 square feet. The applicant contends that the variance would make the site economically viable and without the variance it would pose a hardship for the applicant, thereby preventing them from the preservation and enjoyment of their substantial property rights.

The second variance is a request to increase the allowed coverage on the site from the required 25% to 32.9%. The current coverage is 24%. Napa County Code Section 18.104.250 defines coverage as: the aggregate paved or impervious ground surface areas of the production facility, storage areas, (except caves), offices, laboratories, kitchens, tasting rooms, paved areas and access roads to public or private roads or rights-of-way and above ground sewage disposal systems.

The applicant has indicated that the proposed coverage will be less than what is existing and, by allowing a winery in its place, will eliminate a non-conforming use. Agricultural uses are, according to the General Plan, the highest use of a site and a winery proposal meets that use. Staff has had numerous meetings with the applicant to discuss justification for this variance request. The applicant has indicated that the project would not be economically viable if it was reduced in size.

In review of this request, staff has determined that there has never been any winery approvals with a variance request on lot coverage. To grant a variance, the findings must be met and it is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate why they need a variance and how they will meet the findings (see Attachment A - Variance Application). Section 18.128.060 of Napa County Code details the findings that must be made prior to approval of a project, such as special circumstances that must exist and because of strict zoning regulations would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zoning classifications. Otherwise, the grant of this variance may constitute a special privilege. However, there may be grounds for a variance and if the Planning Commission is inclined to grant the variance, findings may be met due to the parcel constraints; the applicant cannot develop a winery on any of the parcels individually and must merge them to meet the ten acre minimum requirement.

At this time, staff is not supportive of the amount of parking spaces proposed and the amount of visitation requested; thus, a smaller winery would be more appropriate at this site. It should be further noted that if these parcels are not merged for winery purposes, the applicant has the option to develop, by right, each individual lot with a single family residential development. Per zoning requirements, a single family residence would be permitted on each parcel. Since five of the parcels are located within AW, then a second unit and a guest cottage could be developed in addition to the single family residence (15 units). The remaining two developable parcels are located in the AP and would be permitted a single family residence with a guest cottage (4 units). The total potential number of residences could be 19 units. No lot coverage requirements exist for this type of development; only setback requirements would apply.

Traffic - The applicants are proposing a maximum of 350 visitors per day Monday through Friday and 500 visitors per day on Saturday and Sunday, upon completion of Phase four. A Traffic Study by Omni Means, dated December 15, 2012 was conducted and responses to comments were made and the study amended September 19, 2013, both have (based upon current Caltrans traffic volume records) concluded that existing peak traffic on Highway 29 west of Larkmead Lane to be within the carrying capacity of a rural two lane highway and indicative of Level-of-Service (LOS) condition of "C". The study included an additional 9% to reflect summer peak conditions. There also currently exists, on Highway 29, an eastbound left turn lane to Maple Lane with 150 feet of vehicle storage.

Maple Lane and Drew Lane currently provide access to existing businesses at the proposed site and to single family residences. For turning from Drew Drive and Maple Lane into oncoming traffic on Highway 29, Drew Drive currently operates at a LOS C and Maple Lane at LOS B. Both intersections operate at a LOS A for turns onto Highway 29 into the flow of traffic. The project proposes to use only Maple Lane as the access point for all project trips to and from the winery.

To determine the traffic conditions with the proposed project, the calculated trips were added to the existing volumes. The proposal would add 328 weekday daily trips with 120 weekday PM Peak hours trips. During a typical weekend (Saturday), the project would be expected to generate 418 daily trips with 109 mid-day (afternoon) peak hour trips (45 in, 64 out). These projections include the existing daily trips (residential and commercial). LOS on State Route 29 would remain within the carrying capacity of a two lane rural highway with conditions equivalent to a LOS C.

The cumulative (no project) traffic impacts were derived from the traffic volume forecasts in the Napa County General Plan Update EIR. The cumulative volume for 2012 on State Route 29 was 12,600 daily trips and would increase in 2030 to 27,150 daily trips. The General Plan Circulation Element projected operating conditions of LOS F on State Route 29. The Maple Lane intersection would operate at a LOS E during the weekday and weekend peak hours based on existing traffic use. Drew Lane/Heitz Way would operate at LOS F.

The cumulative (plus project) traffic impacts were also included in the traffic study. Based on the transportation model's forecast volumes on State Route 29, operations along the entire SR 29 would be affected. The intersection at SR29/Maple Lane will be operating at a LOS F during peak hours and would just meet the minimum for signalization. Engineering judgment should ultimately be used when deciding the appropriateness of signal controls and additional signal analyses would be necessary. Additional measures implemented by the County as use permit conditions or mitigations, including vehicle trip reduction strategies by the project such as providing bicycle racks for visitors and working with employees to encourage use of public transit and scheduling options to facilitate carpooling, would further mitigate long term conditions. Omni Means has recommended a westbound right-turn taper to be installed from State Route 29 onto Maple Lane. The applicant has included this measure into the project proposal.

To aid in traffic reduction, the applicant has indicated in the April 2013 letter that they are willing to reduce the weekly visitation to a maximum of 350 persons per day. They have also indicated that their voluntary participation in the following actions will further help reduce traffic at the winery: bike parking, shuttle services, avoiding peak hour travel, closing the winery to visitors when events of 250 persons are occurring, focusing and promoting visitation at hotels and resorts in Calistoga and St. Helena in order to focus on "up-valley" visitors, maintaining a website which encourages visitors to utilize shuttles and nearby hotels, providing site management to manage and ensure pickup and deliver schedules occur outside of peak time periods, and a willingness to participate in a future traffic improvement fund to pay their fair share of county-wide traffic improvements. (see Attachment D - Correspondence from Applicant).

Grape Sourcing - The applicant has signed the "Initial Statement of Grape Source" document in the application. In the September 21, 2012 and May 17, 2013 Napa County Completeness Memos, the applicant was asked for additional information regarding sourcing to ensure the seventy-five percent rule would be met. The applicant responded by indicating that they are committed to complying with the seventy-five percent rule for any tenant that leases either the entire property or the individual tenant spaces. Since no tenants have been identified, the applicant indicated that they cannot, at this time, identify specific grape sourcing commitments. Therefore, Staff believes it would be appropriate to apply a condition of approval that requires the permittee to demonstrate compliance with the 75% rule with each phase of development prior to authorizing additional gallonage and approval would be granted upon demonstration that the prior production has complied with the 75% rule. Staff also recommends that the applicant require each leasee to prepare a business plan indicating the grape sourcing and submit this documentation to PBES prior to approval of each tenant improvement. All wine produced at the



winery is subject to the 75% rule and the owner will be responsible for maintaining the sourcing requirements.

Neighbor Concerns - Staff has been contacted by various neighbors regarding the proposal. Neighbor indicated their concern for the size of the winery. They have also raised concerns for tree removal, traffic, wildlife corridors and production limitations. Staff has met and spoken with some of the neighbors about these concerns.

Napa Valley Vine Trail - A letter dated September 23, 2013, was received from Vine Trail Napa Valley with a request for a portion of the bike trail to be included in the project. Napa County General Plan Policy CIR - 32 states that "All development along fixed transit routes shall provide appropriate amenities designed to encourage carpooling, bicycle and transit use", and CIR 33 states that "Pedestrian and bicycle access shall be integrated into all parking lots where feasible and appropriate and considered in the evaluation of development proposals and public projects". Staff recommends that the applicant consider the request from Vine Trail Napa Valley in their proposal.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies - In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development. The District's screening table (BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1) suggests that similar projects such as a quality restaurant and light industrial uses with less than 9,000 square feet and 121,000 square feet of floor area, respectively, would not generate GHG in excess of the significance criterion (1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year). By comparison a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips.

The applicant was required to complete a Data Request for Operational Characteristics of Commercial, Residential, or Industrial Projects and indicate potential reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The applicant has indicated that they will participate in composting and recycling of their waste and will provide charging stations for electric vehicles. They have also indicated that they may potentially include a employee transportation demand management plan with feasible commute incentives, use of gravity flow pumping equipment, and may participate in the Napa Certified Winery program. No other measures have been proposed at this time. The proposed floor area is below the screening levels for similar uses in the District's Guidelines, therefore the proposed use would not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted. GHG emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions resulting from the project.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

- A . Application
- B . Permit History
- C . Environmental Documents
- D . Biological Survey
- E . Traffic Study
- F . Correspondence from Applicant
- G . Correspondence - Napa Valley Vine Trail
- H . Correspondence - Flynn

I . Greenhouse Gas Summary

J . Graphics

Napa County Planning Commission: Approve

Reviewed By: John McDowell