

**County of Napa**

**Planning Commission Hearing**

**Mountain Peak Winery (MPW)**

**Use Permit #P13-00320-UP**

**January 4th, 2017**

Speaker: Glenn Schreuder, Soda Canyon Resident

Topic: Use and Limitation of Comparable Winery Data

Honorable Commissioners,

- My name is Glenn Schreuder and my family has lived in upper Soda Canyon continuously since 1956.
- I wish to respectfully draw your attention to the “Comparative Analysis of Daily Visitation” contained on page 14 of the 18 page applicant’s Project Statement, as revised on March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
- Five Wineries are listed in “Comparative Analysis of Daily Visitation”
  - Chappellet
  - Ladera
  - Oakville Grade
  - Schramsberg and
  - Somerston Winery.
  
  - Purportedly selected for their location on “Hillside Roads”, well sort of hillside roads, but I’ll get to that shortly.
  - The analysis also represents that the daily visitation for MPW is 58% of the norm when compared to these five wineries of similar Gallons per Year.
- This analysis clearly cherry picks 100K Gallons per Year (GPY) “hillside” wineries with material visitation entitlements that are **not located on dead-end, one way in and one way out rural, residential roads:**
  - Chappellet: Located on CA Hwy 128 (aka Sage Canyon Road, NOT on a dead end road and NOT in the heart of a rural neighborhood, it’s actually a driveway on a state highway toward Winters, CA.
  - Ladera: Located on **two-way in/out** White Cottage Road a short distance from Angwin (a census-designated place with a population of ~3,000)
  - Oakville Grade: Located on the **two-way in/out** Oakville Grade, not a dead-end.
  - Schramsberg: Located up **private** Schramsberg Road off of CA Hwy 29 (not a neighborhood, a private road to the winery).
  - Somerston: Located **again** on CA Hwy 128 (Sage Canyon Road) NOT a dead-end road and NOT in the heart of a rural neighborhood).

As a result this analysis is, in essence, comparing five apples to one orange which is misleading.

Further, in regard to **Exhibit F** “Updated Winery Comparison, 100,000 GPY”, of the 18 wineries listed in the comparison, 14 are indicated to be on the “valley floor” and 4 are indicated to be “hillside” wineries, however according to Google Maps:

- Kent Rasmussen Winery has its tasting room in the Napa Valley Corporate Park.
- Pahlmeyer Winery has its tasting room at 811 St Helena Hwy #202, St Helena, CA
- Trinchero Napa Valley also its tasting room at 100 Main St, St Helena, CA, and
- Moss Creek Winery is located at Moskowite Corners, at the corner of Hwy 128 and Steele Canyon Rd

None of these four wineries appear to really be ‘hillside’ wineries at all, like the MPW project is. While some of their vineyards may potentially be somewhere in the hills, three have tasting rooms on the valley floor and Moss Creek, while remote to the valley floor, is right off CA Hwy 128 on the way to Winters and Davis, CA.

While all 18 wineries appear have use permits for 100,000 GPY, and varying levels of annual visitations, **none** of these 18 wineries are substantially similar to the MPV project in terms of (a) being in a very remote dead-end box canyon location and (b) having very limited access in terms of a safe, properly maintained roadway to serve it. I’m really unclear what conclusion can be drawn from this exhibit other than if MPV were on this list it would be a non-homogenous member by way of its inherently out-sized proportions in comparison to roadway access.

A more appropriate comparison would be to compare wineries up another **nearby** dead-end, “one way in one way out” road, **Atlas Peak**:

- Kongsgaard 9.4 miles up Atlas Peak road, 12,000 GPY, no visitation allowed.
- Alta 9.0 miles up Atlas Peak road, 5,000 GPY, 208 visitors allowed per year.
- Ripe Peak 8.8 miles up Atlas Peak road, 1,500 GPY, 1,456 visitors allowed per year.
- Vin Roc 8.1 miles up Atlas Peak road, 18,000 GPY, 416 visitors allowed per year.
- William Hill 1.4 miles up Atlas Peak road, 720,000 GPY, 13,000 visitors allowed per year.

(Note that William Hill Winery is a large facility almost on the valley floor, certainly not on the hillside and even then only has only 13K/year visitors allowed. It is almost **certainly not by accident** that a winery of this scope and scale is not 6+ miles up a dangerous, dead-end road like **Atlas Peak** or **Soda Canyon**).

And another more “apples to apples” comparison would be to compare MPW to other wineries on dead-end, “one way in one way out” **Soda Canyon** road:

- Antica 6.5 miles up Soda Canyon road, 450,000 GPY, only 5,200 visitors allowed per year.
- Astrale e Terra 6.4 miles up Soda Canyon road, 20,000 GPY, no visitation allowed per year.
- Krupp Winery 6.0 miles up Soda Canyon road, 48,000 GPY: PROJECT WITHDRAWN.

(Note that the proposed Krupp Winery was originally planned on the same parcel as MPW and was apparently abandoned by the former owner of the property).

In summation, it is clear from this comparison that the wineries selected for comparative analysis in the applicants project statement are only comparable to the extent that they have the same GPY and varying degrees of visitation, otherwise their locations are far away in terms of distance from Upper Soda Canyon and are not remotely comparable in terms of the traffic impacts that Soda Canyon road (as a dead-end road) and its residents would suffer.

In the 2010 Amendment to the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) there is a seminal section of interpretive guidance that addressed the issue I'm raising today. I will close my statement by reviewing this guidance for the record and for the benefit of everyone here today:

III. The Appropriate Intensity of **Marketing Programs:**

To ensure the intensity of winery activities is **appropriately scaled, the County considers the remoteness** of the location and the amount of wine to be produced at the facility when reviewing the permit proposals, and endeavors to ensure a direct relation between access constraints and on-site marketing and visitation programs.

**In Summation:**

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission DENY or VERY SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE the permitted Gallons Per Year and annual visitation requested so this project is something more akin to a family home and relatively small, unobtrusive estate winery that a majority of our neighbors would likely find to be significantly **less** objectionable.