We own a property on Kaanapali Drive and agree *completely* with everything Conrad Hewitt wrote in his email to you on July 9, 2022.

We are OPPOSED to having high density housing on the Altamura property and the proposed Hedgeside site. We have been in a mandatory evacuation situation (2017) and in our opinion, additional density in the Silverado area could have disastrous consequences. The horrific fires throughout Northern California these past few years show that the possibility of another mandatory evacuation is not remote and is a distinct possibility. Montecito/Trancas is the only ingress/egress to the area and is already a heavily trafficked area. Building these additional units could easily result in the tragic loss of life for current residents in the event of a very foreseeable future fire disaster and accompanying evacuation.

The area at the Napa State Hospital has more ingress/egress and is clearly a better choice for a high density low income housing project. Further, as Mr. Hewitt said, the population of California and Napa in particular is decreasing and does not warrant the building of additional residential units.

Robert & Gretchen Allen
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

I am submitting the following comments and questions on the Draft Housing Element Update as a member of the Housing element Update committee. Please distribute my comments with members of the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors and consultants and members of the Housing Element Update Committee.

The questions I have included here have not been answered by the Draft or by staff during the committee meetings. I respectfully request my comments and questions be addressed by staff in written format.

1. The draft should include a table which compares mobile home parks that were in existence at the time the 5th Housing Element was adopted as compared with the number of mobile home parks existing at the time of the Draft. This table should include the name of the park, location, number of units, details of park characteristics such as family or age restricted. This table should also include park ownership structure such as private individuals or corporations. The table must detail the number of units lost due to conversion to other use or natural disaster.

2. The Draft must be revised to clarify the loss of mobile home units due to conversion to other uses during the last housing cycle and discuss how the current 5th Cycle Housing Element policies were inadequate to prevent conversion and housing loss. While the draft notes units lost to wildfires, it is awkwardly silent in discussion of the loss of the Vineland Vista Mobile Home Park south of St. Helena for a proposed hotel, and also failed to mention the recent closure and proposed conversion of the Glass Mountain Mobile Home Park in Deer Park. The Draft must include a honest discussion of number of units lost to conversion and describe the internal County decision process whereby these parks were not actively protected from conversion to hotel development or other uses.

The 6th Cycle Draft should include policies that specifically provide actions and steps that staff will implement including time frames for actions, in order to preserve existing mobile home park communities. The Draft should include programs utilizing Housing Impact Fees or other grant resources to rehabilitate, provide rent subsidies to park owners, provide rental assistance to renters as well as consideration of adoption of new zoning and land use designation such as Mobile Home Park with minimum and maximum densities in order to prevent conversion to other uses. Similar zoning updates have recently been adopted in Santa Clara County.

The Draft should include the requirement for Staff to meet annually with mobile home park owners to evaluate the vulnerability of the few remaining parks to conversion. Staff should evaluate park conditions by site visits and inform owners and residents of funding for rehabilitation and and rental assistance programs. Staff should report the results of these meetings with park owners at a public hearing annually before Board of Supervisors and
Planning Commission. These hearings should be noticed to park residents so that they are able to fully participate and be informed of funding opportunities and access to rental assistance.

3. The Draft must include policy to support rebuilding of mobile home parks destroyed by wildfire including Mund Mobile Home Park and Spanish Flat Mobile Villa and prevent conversion to other uses if allowed by current fire severity designations.

4. The Draft should include policy specific to Capell Valley Estates at Moskowhite Corner in the Berryessa area, to provide immediate access to rehabilitation funds and to preclude the conversion of this park to 'resort or vacation' type of housing should resort development at Berryessa ever occur.

5. an updated survey of all mobile home parks in unincorporated Napa County should be included in this draft including mobile home park at pacific Union College.

6. Staff should provide a clear discussion of credits available to Napa County via HCD programs for preservation or rehabilitation of existing units of affordable housing (naturally occurring and not in a current program) and support the decision to not pursue these opportunities given the difficulty of finding sited acceptable to HCD.

Please share my comments with Housing Element Update Committee members at the next meeting.

sincerely,

Kellie Anderson
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

Please accept my comments on the Draft Housing Element Update. Please distribute these comments to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, consultants and Committee members.

1. The Draft must adequately discuss and provide specific policies for utilization of Housing Impact Fees for infrastructure improvements and extensions to support housing development on the proposed sites.

What is the funding currently available (Total dollar amount) for sewer and water access under the current 5th Cycle and the Draft? Specifically discuss how each project would apply for and be awarded Housing Impact Fees for needed infrastructure.

2. The Draft must include the Napa Sanitation District evaluation of providing access to the proposed Bishop and Altamira sites. Please provide all reports, communications, notes and correspondence with Napa Sanitation and any staff member or elected representatives that describe the upgrade/extension details and estimated costs. Staff should clearly explain in the Draft and in public hearings the availability of infrastructure extensions would be required at every proposed site.

3. The Draft is lacking evidence, however, to support the availability of sewer capacity at the proposed Spanish Flat location. Please provide correspondence with the Spanish Flat Water District including, reports, e-mails, notes or meeting minutes that reference the realistic capacity of this tiny rural special services district to support additional sewer capacity. The draft should also include and correspondence with Napa LAFCO related to changes to Spanish Flat Water District.

Please include my comments in the official record.

Kellie Anderson
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

Please accept my comments on the Draft Housing Element. Please share my comments with BOS, PC, consultants and the HEAC.

The Spanish Flat location is impossibly distant from any basic services to support development of Affordable Housing and provide opportunities for residents to thrive much less survive. The inclusion of the site by Staff and Consultants is as laughable and it is disingenuous. I'm shocked that staff and consultants have the hutzpah to try and pull this off!

The entire community of Spanish Flat, even before the devastation of the LNU Fire Complex, was failing and vulnerable. But following the near complete destruction of Spanish Flat in the LNU Fire, including the deaths of three residents, and the destruction of the one remaining bait and tackle shop (where ostensibly residents could subsist on Budweiser Beer, Cheetos and red wiggler worms) there are no services remaining at Spanish Flat save the cemetery and the shuttered Senior Center as all residents have been burned out.

The Draft is disingenuous in offering Spanish Flat site to HCD as a reasonable place for people to thrive much less survive. The HCD considers Areas of Opportunity in locating sites for AH, which in no way describes Spanish Flat.

While the site is not currently in the highest wild land fire severity zone/state responsibility area, the area's nearly complete destruction of housing in the LNU Fire documents the area's vulnerability to fire and the CalFire/Board of Forestry changing regulations must be considered.

Development in Spanish Flat would predictably precluded by the lack of available insurance and it is unclear if the Fair Plan would cover new construction. Besides the increasing temperatures in the Berryessa Area due to climate change, frequent PG & E power failures and Public Safety Power Shutoffs result in lack of wi fi, telecommunications and life saving air conditioning throughout the summer and fall. As you recall, the area housed a large population of low income seniors before its obliteration in the LNU.

Water from Lake Berryessa serving Spanish Flat is frequently prone to toxic blue green algal blooms and water quality frequently fails to meet state standards. Please discuss the upgrades needed of the Spanish Flat Water District infrastructure and its realistic capacity to accommodate new development for both water and sewer. What are the estimated needs for funding from the Housing Impact Fund or other resources?

In terms of equity, Spanish Flat falls FLAT on its face. There are no schools, and no remote campus programs, poor internet, no access to grocery stores or stores of any kind, no gas station, no electric charging station, no medical care save an ambulance ride or Reach helicopter flight to hospital or clinics far removed from the site.
However, Spanish Flat site promises to deliver isolation from church, after school programs and sports, medical care, social services, post office, voting center, auto mechanic, library, veterinary care or any of the multiple things that thriving, successful communities depend on. If you end up in Spanish Flat your cost of transportation is astronomical as there is no public transportation save hitchhiking, and is likely the most vehicle dependent area in Napa County!

Spanish Flat is thrown into the mix to support a speculative resort development the County of Napa Board of Supervisors is engaged in which has no assurance of ever being built. To adopt the Spanish Flat site with its extreme isolation, high fire risk, lack of any jobs is a cruel joke given the absolute desperate need for affordable housing right now along the Highway 29 Corridor in Napa County.

Make no mistake, should any resort development occur in the future, it's at least a housing cycle away and the only services to develop will likely include snack bars in resorts, mini marts and possibly a gas station! Should a low income resident of Spanish Flat seek a spa treatment, a house boat rental or moonlight pontoon boat booze cruise, in ten years all those necessary services might possibly be available. We will have to wait and see.....but a grocery store and a school aren't happening ever!

While the smoke and mirrors of offering this site might temporary be overlooked during the bigger battles occurring at the Altumura and Bishop sites, there is no doubt the State Housing and Community Development staff will find Spanish Flat an unacceptable location for future, successful residential development.

Spanish Flat indeed fails on every metric of a successfully community. Please remove Spanish Flat from the list of potential housing sites.

Kellie Anderson
[External Email - Use Caution]
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

Please accept my comments on the 6th Cycle Draft Housing Element Update. Please distribute my comments to Staff, Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and consultants and well as other Housing Element Update Committee members.

I request the inclusion of the existing small motel complex formally known and the Eagle and Rose Motel, located at 1179 Lodi Ln. St Helena, be included in the inventory of potential sites for affordable housing consideration as part of the 6th Cycle Housing Element Update.

As you are aware, this site is at risk of conversion from naturally occurring affordable units to other uses as it is surrounded by, but omitted from, the Kendall Jackson Inn at The Abbey Resort Project. Realistically, excluding this parcel from the greater resort project constitutes piecemealing and should not be tolerated by County Staff. Frankly it's shocking this is actually permitted to happen.

https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2020079021/2

The current single story complex houses up to one dozen families (per conversation with postal carrier delivering mail), is immediately adjacent to bus stop, is slightly north of St Helena City limits with all levels of highly desirable public schools, St. Helena Hospital and St Helena Women's Center, Pacific Union College and the Napa Valley College Upvalley Campus. Additionally, the Upvalley Family Center is located in St. Helena along with Boys and Girls Club, multiple parks and sports complexes, churches, grocery, hardware, banking and access to community events such as music in the park, Bicycle Rodeo, parades and fun
runs. St. Helena is one of the most desirable and affluent communities in California and provides the necessary access to resource opportunities which create a vibrant, successful, community.

In short, the preservation of the existing, occupied units on Lodi Lane should be the number one action of the Planning Staff and the Housing Element Update committee! If there is bandwidth to process approve a spa, hotel, winery and restaurant on the Freemark Abbey site, there should be a parallel effort made to preserve, rehabilitate and or expand the naturally occurring affordable housing on this site. Let's keep in mind that rehabilitation and conservation of existing at risk units is an important part of the Housing Update.

Access to water, sewer and road capacity is demonstrated by the pending approval of the resort! And jobs are plentiful and unmet in the St. Helena Calistoga areas according to employers due to a lack of access to housing for workers.

Please provide reports, notes, e mails and documents related to the preservation, renovation, rebuilding or conversion of housing on this site between Napa County staff, elected officials and representatives of Kendall Jackson and or Jackson Family Wines. Please provide a discussion as to why this resource rich site was excluded from consideration as a potential housing site in the Housing Element Update?

There is clear documentation that one unit of affordable housing can cost up to $750,000 in some areas of the state. The question the County Staff and Board of Supervisors must answer is why aggressive policy and funding to preserve an existing neighborhood of affordable housing isn't even on their radar? And how can this lack of interest in preserving existing housing plausibly be explained to occupants of the complex, members of the Update Committee, county residents and the Department of Housing and Community Development?

Please respond to my comments in writing and include my comments with the agenda at the next Housing Element Update Committee meeting.

Regards,

Kellie Anderson
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

Please consider including programs and policy with specific action item and implementation dates for working with Napa County Code Enforcement to rehabilitate vacant 'red tagged' housing in unincorporated Napa County.

As you know there is an emergency shortage of housing in Napa County and in the small community of Angwin, it has been brought to my attention by neighbors, that there are at least 6 vacant houses with County 'red tags' visible from the street in Angwin. None of these unoccupied homes are believed to be second homes or vacation homes but rather represent how things can 'go wrong' in life resulting in deterioration, waste, and ultimately loss of existing housing.

What possible programs and funding sources are available to work with homeowners to bring these and other units throughout the county into compliance and up to code? How about a yearly report and conference between Code Enforcement and Planning Staff to identify vacant at risk housing units?

Are Housing Impact Funds available to rehabilitate substandard housing? Would this be a feasible, economical manner of addressing the housing shortage in unincorporated Napa County?

What would staff time and budgeting look like if a program such as this was included in Housing Element programming?

Would securing vacant housing, and rehabilitation of vacant housing provide greater fire safety for neighborhoods? Would utilizing Housing Impact Funds to assist property owners with 'red tagged' units be a godsend for a local family?

As always, please disperse my comments to Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, consultants and Housing Element Update committee members.

Regards,

Kellie Anderson
Dear Members of the Housing Element Advisory Committee:

My name is Deanna Aronoff and I live at 212 Buttercup Court here in Napa. I strongly believe that Skyline Wilderness Park should remain in its current state of having no permanent housing developments located within the park. I would feel this way about any housing development there---multi-million dollar homes or housing for those experiencing homelessness. In an article published in Current Direction in Psychological Science 2019, Vol.28(5) 496-502, Schertz & Berman mention several theories as to the calming and rejuvenating effects of non-threatening environments like forests which result in stress reduction for people. Another theory they describe is soft fascination theory which allows the mind a "chance to replenish" after a walk in a wooded area. Some studies have shown a positive association between green space around schools and positive cognitive development in children. The Centers for Disease Control encourages communities to have access to green environments so people can walk and be more physically active which leads to a healthy lifestyle. In an article published in the International Journal of Environmental Research Public Health, Koselka and Weidner compared psychological outcomes from 38 participants who walked for 50 minutes along a busy road, on a forest path, or just walked during daily activities. They found that the people who took the forest walks had the largest and most consistent improvements in psychological state. The Forest Service Division of the US Department of Agriculture shares the concept of "forest bathing" from Japan. Several studies from Japan show that the effect of phytoncides from trees on human immune function by increasing the amount of natural killer (NK) cells in the body which lasts for up to one month as published in Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine. There is much scientific evidence that regular walks in a park with trees helps people mentally and physiologically.

I believe that once any permanent housing is established within the park limits, Napa will have set a precedent to introduce more housing within the park. The five acres of housing will grow to five hundred acres of homes and the wildlife will lose their habitat. Please review existing locations in Napa that could be remodeled to accommodate some of the homeless population without damaging Skyline Wilderness Park.

Thank you for your time.

Best,

Deanna Aronoff
Dear Mr. Morrison,
Below please find a letter I have written to you and the members of the planning commission regarding protecting Skyline Regional Park. Thank you for reading this letter and for your time—it is greatly appreciated. Would you be so kind as to distribute to the Planning Commission members? Thanks, again!

29 Montecito Blvd.
Napa, CA. 94559

July 9, 2022

Napa Planning Commission
Napa, CA

Dear Mr. Morrison and Planning Commission Members,

As a resident of Napa, California I am writing to beg you not to build housing in Skyline Park in Napa, California. While we are all in favor of increasing affordable housing across California and throughout the United States I feel that building in Skyline is a bad idea for multiple reasons. I will list just a few of what I think are reasons to preserve this park and not build on it below, but first I want to make it clear that this is not a "NIMBY" issue. Skyline is not in my backyard—it is a 10-15 minute drive away from my home, so my reasons for urging you—no, begging you—not to build there are for other reasons.

First, I will relay my personal reason for asking you not to build there. After moving to Napa in 2017 from Southern Marin County where there is ample open space for the enjoyment of all County residents, I was struck by a relative paucity of outdoor spaces for hiking, biking, camping in Napa despite its physical beauty as a locale. I found Skyline and began hiking, relaxing and running there. I found the park to be a gem but I don’t think I fully appreciated until the Pandemic hit.

I am a physician and medical educator and I work at UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento. I know that you have heard and read about the trauma of being a health care provider the pandemic has caused but I will add that I am a general internist who exclusively works in the hospital. This means that our specialty took care of the vast majority of adults hospitalized with COVID at our medical center. I won’t get into details but leave it that I saw a lot of bad and incredibly sad stuff. I am a scarred human being. It was (and continues to be) gut wrenching. I’m 63 years old and since the Pandemic began I have seriously contemplated retiring early—despite the shortage of physicians,
nurses and ancillary support staff and fact that I would feel terrible leaving medicine at a time when we are needed by society more in the state of California now than ever before. But COVID has a way of overriding our “better angels” and vanquishing passion for patient care and teaching (thus the record number of health care workers leaving the field these days and over the past 2.5 years). It has been unrelenting, exhausting and tragic several years.

So why haven’t I retired? Skyline Park. Skyline Park kept me going and kept me functional throughout the Pandemic. Amazingly, staff somehow kept the park open throughout the pandemic (always encouraging social distancing, masks, good hand hygiene) and it was being able to go there on the weekends and occasional weekdays off that truly kept me “in the game” as a physician. It was rejuvenating to head out there and enjoy the openness of the lower part of the park, to see other human beings walking, running, biking, playing frisbee golf, bird watching, tent and RV camping and just generally being momentarily happy despite the world apparently coming down around our ears from both the Pandemic and the toxic social/political standpoints. Walking through the Martha Walker Garden with all it’s native plants or just sitting near the open fields at the base of the park and soaking up the beauty of the views was, for me, life-saving. And, of course, heading up the trails deeper into the park was amazing, too. Suffice to say, Skyline kept me going to work. And I know that my experience was not unique from other park goers. I spoke with others at the park about how much the park meant to them and saved them from despair.

Second reason to NOT build: Skyline brings together a remarkably diverse group of human beings at a time when society is more divided than it has ever been in my lifetime. And it is the whole park that does this. One of the best things about the park is that I see every color and ethnicity of human biking, hiking, strolling, frisbee golfing and camping—it is a place that welcomes all and easily forces one to feel at peace and together with all people. I believe Skyline is unique in this—a sort of New York City Central Park of Napa—that brings us together in this divisive time.

Third, open space is dwindling across the state and there is currently not enough of it in Napa County. We owe it to our descendents to make sure they have open places to enjoy nature and to appreciate and value the beauty of California. To take away part of this magnificent, understated park would be a crime as well as a tragedy.

I could go on for several more pages but I will not. Please, please, please don’t build in Skyline. I fear that there are no nearby neighbors to the park to rise up and protect it. I am speaking for the many people who utilize the park and love the park as well as for the other residents of the park—it’s hawks, owls, wild turkeys, wild pigs, rattlesnakes, mice and mountain lions, among others, who exist for the sake of themselves and nature.

Thanks so much for reading this letter.

Sincerely,

Paul Aronowitz, MD

Paul Aronowitz, MD, MACP
29 Montecito Blvd, Napa

Health Sciences Clinical Professor of Medicine
Department of Medicine
UC Davis Health
Sacramento, CA
TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN,

My husband and I live on Hedgeside and attended the planning meeting on July 6th and were happy to see such a large turnout of neighbors opposing the Rezoning of the rural Bishop Ranch Site.

I appreciate the time you took to listen to the many concerns voiced around such a Re-zoning.

I know this is not an easy task to find the proper spot for high density building but clearly and without a doubt, Bishop Ranch is not the right fit. My husband and I just want to reiterate that we are diabolically opposed to the Re-zoning of the Bishop site.

Regards,
Janice and Todd Ballard
Good afternoon Mr. Hawkes,

I am writing in regards to the Draft Housing Element Update with much concern over the proposed Napa County Regional Housing Needs (RHNA) sites: Bishop 1 at 1806 Monticello Road (Hedgeside Avenue) and Altamura at 1011 Atlas Peak Road (the corner of Monticello Road and Atlas Peak Road). These sites are inappropriate to accommodate Residential Multiple (RM) developments. According to the Draft Napa County Housing Element – Section 9: Housing Sites Analysis, the screening criteria for these sites states the following:

1. Sites must have access to existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities with sufficient capacity available to support housing development (State requirement)
2. Sites must generally be between 0.5 and 10 acres in size (State requirement)
3. Sites must be located outside of areas designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space as of September 28, 2007 (the date specified in Measure P, approved by the voters in November 2008). Notwithstanding this requirement, sites within an area designated Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space may be identified for qualifying farmworker housing development and sites identified as an existing commercial establishment on General Plan Figure AG.LU-2: Location of Parcels Subject to Policy AG/LU-45 may be identified for redevelopment. (Local Requirement)

The existing water, sewer and other dry utilities are insufficient for the residents currently living in the rural residential area encompassing both the Bishop 1 and Altamura sites. Current residents rely on wells, septic tanks, and oftentimes unreliable dry utilities. PG&E services in the area are frequently turned off during Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) events, directly impacting all utility services including the ability to run wells for drinking water, water to flush toilets, and water for livestock and crop irrigation. During the 2017 wildfires, all power and gas services were shut off and residents were instructed to boil water after evacuations were finally lifted. Also as a direct result of routine power shutoffs, current residents have grown to expect refrigerated and frozen food to spoil, or have had to invest in alternative power solutions including solar panels and generators to reduce food loss.

The Bishop 1 site in particular does fall within the recommended parcel size, however, that is only possible after subdividing the entire Bishop property. The current Bishop property, while not designated as Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space, is in fact an agricultural and rural property. It is one of the last remaining cattle ranches in the valley and despite being listed as vacant in the Evaluation of Sites Location and Data, the proposed development site is occupied by cows, horses, and donkeys. The Bishop 1 site is located right along Milliken Creek and both the Bishop 1 and Altamura sites fall within the Milliken Creek Watershed. The sites are critical
for groundwater recharge, carbon sequestration, agricultural preservation in the county, and wildlife habitat. These sites are home to steelhead, Chinook salmon, geese, Red-tailed hawks, bees and apiaries, butterflies, Blue heron, Great egrets, frogs, snakes, foxes, coyotes, skunks, racoons, bats, Barn swallow, blue birds, Nuttall’s woodpecker, American goldfinch, and Barn Owls. Wildlife in addition to family pets are routinely seen killed alongside the roads in the area as many motorists do not pay attention and/or excessively speed without respect for residents and wildlife. Agricultural operations in the area already face challenges safely maneuvering equipment, supplies, and livestock. The “killer curve” on Hedgeside Avenue is incredibly dangerous even at low speeds and is a complete hazard for the residents with driveways along the curve. Any increase in light pollution, groundwater pollution, dumping of trash, increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG’s) from increased traffic and the urbanization of agricultural properties, oil runoff, soil erosion, increased flood and fire vulnerabilities, as well as safety concerns navigating the already dangerous roads, will all impact the watershed and impact the rural living of the current residents.

Additionally, the Housing Sites Analysis states that the goal for the County is to identify sites that are specifically:

1. Located outside of high and very high fire severity zones as designated (in State Responsibility Areas) or recommended (in Local Responsibility Areas) by CalFire
2. Located outside of Zones A through D of the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
3. Proximate to transit routes and/or employment opportunities and services (e.g., groceries) where Possible

Both the Bishop 1 and Altamura sites are located in high fire severity zones. The severity of the 2017 Atlas Peak fire dramatically impacted the area. Both sites have been subject to fire evacuations as well as power and gas shutoffs. The Bishop 1 site in particular is subject to fire insurance. The Altamura site has been used to stage firefighting operations in the area, with resources coming in from out of town, as well as PG&E staging to repair lines damaged in the fires. During the 2020 fires, the area encompassing both sites was prematurely listed as a mandatory evacuation zone but then downgraded to an advisory evacuation alert. During fire evacuations, the roads to flee are extremely limited. Any increase in urbanization will result in evacuation gridlock and will create very unsafe conditions. In addition to fire concerns, the sites present additional flooding challenges. Hedgeside Avenue does experience flooding from Milliken Creek. During the winter storms at the end of 2021 and the beginning of 2022, Monticello at Silverado Trail and Silverado Trail to Lincoln closed due to flooding. Additionally, Monticello at Woodside Drive experienced flooding and was later reduced to one lane for an extended time while Caltrans drained the area and repaired the roadways, culverts, and erosion control. Impassable roads as a result of climate change and natural disasters amplifies ongoing traffic congestion issues at Trancas at Silverado Trail, Monticello at Silverado Trail, Atlas Peak at Monticello and Vichy at Monticello.

There are no transit routes in the area. There are no grocery stores or pharmacies in the area and the single gas station at the corner of Monticello and Vichy is already overburdened. Valley Liquor & Gas as well as the Monticello Deli are the only amenities in the area and have ongoing problems with parking. Many customers, including local law enforcement as well as city and county workers, park along both sides of Monticello, crossing Monticello on foot. Customers often block wheelchair
accessible parking and block sightlines to safely navigate those locations, also blocking sightlines for residents trying to exit their properties. It is already incredibly challenging to safely access Monticello at Vichy due to traffic, speeding motorists, and customers blocking sightlines at Valley Liquor & Gas, making it incredibly difficult for families to drop off and pick up their children at Vichy Elementary School. Letting kids walk or ride a bike to school is far too dangerous even under the current traffic conditions. While there are many residents who enjoy walking, running, and biking, all residents in the area are car dependent. Rezoning the sites to RM would only increase GHG’s and exacerbate ongoing traffic and safety concerns. Monticello is a highway that many visitors use to access Lake Berryessa and is also heavily used on a daily basis by workers coming from Solano County and further away. Many motorists do not respect the speed limit in place, with some motorists traveling at speeds exceeding 60 or 70 mph, and it is not uncommon for impaired motorists to frequent the area after spending the day at Lake Berryessa. The only time that the speed limit is enforced is after residents call CHP and lodge complaints. Pleas to county supervisors to improve safety conditions in the area have gone unheeded. Residents attempting to access their driveways along Monticello or access Hedgeside Avenue know all too well the dangers and the inherent risk in trying to safely navigate the roads. Many have experienced debilitating car accidents simply trying to get home. There are no sidewalks, no bike lanes, hardly any street lights, and not enough turn lanes in the area.

I strongly encourage you all to remove the Bishop 1 and Altamura sites from potential development consideration under the Housing Element. These sites are not suitable land for RM development.

Thank you,
Daniela Bazán
1784 Monticello Road
Napa, CA 94558
Hi Trevor,

I attended the Planning meeting on July 6, 2022.

My comments are for removing
  Bishop Ranch
  Altamura
from this list of “housing” requirements
Additionally, there are comments on the process that was disclosed at the meeting.
My take away.

Process:
Clearly, CA legislature drives what this committee does and must ignore common sense.
Too often when questioned about specific issues by the Commission, chapter and verse was cited as expected
Unfortunately for taxpayers, this is unacceptable.

Most disturbing was the EIR (which is late to the June 24 release date) and will not address site specific issues.
- One questions why the EIR was not part of this meeting as a component. But there will be another public forum.
  Quite frankly, this is unacceptable and provides an out for this committee to address the real issues for which all participants were concerned.

When this was omission was disclosed, Commissioner Cottrell did the appropriate deep dive and tried to peel the onion on the deficiencies of the EIR, vis a vis. specific site survey.
Your responses to Ms. Cottrell were circular and never provided a clear response. She didn’t buy it and neither did the audience.
Eventually, it was admitted all the commission was required to do was to follow the policy/procedures which are vague and provide some sort of county wide description as opposed to site specific.
- In summary, the response was “Sorry, that is the way it is”.
  It became apparent, it was to check the boxes and move on.

You heard plenty of specifics from the residents of the concerned sites above.

With this in mind, it became clear there is no intention to do a field visit to these sites but merely evaluate them from a 2D Map.
Unfortunately, there appears to be no attention to detail for the taxpayers concerns, but make the numbers work.

On another note, the process to obtain ownership of the Bishop and Altamura properties is questionable. Did the county approach an owner and seek its sale for county housing?

The Specific Site Issues:
These properties mentioned above are traffic jams every day with the intersections of Atlas Peak, Vichy, and Monticello Roads. Whether it be all day volume from the Silverado Resort, Vichy school pickups, commuter traffic day and night on Monticello to Fairfield. If there is not be a traffic analysis specific to this area, this report to the Board of Supervisors will be deficient in detail and will be so noted.

Additionally Cal Fire helicopters have landed on the Altamura property during time of emergencies.

Additionally, while it may be “only a plan” what is to say in the time period 2023-2030, the directive is to implement? Has any thought be given to that?

Thanks,

Mike Bellanca
191 Silverado Springs Drive
Napa, CA 94558
[External Email - Use Caution]

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to any proposed high density housing in our neighborhood. This is county property and by law and because we voted for it, we have restrictions on the number of homes on any property. There is a shortage of water in the area and it would not support the number of new homes proposed. There is also the problem of traffic and noise. In case of fire we all need to be able to get out of the area quickly. Traffic congestion is a potential problem.

Please look to other areas of the City of Napa for more suitable land for high density low cost housing.

Thank you,
Barbara Bird
1812 Hardman Avenue
Napa, CA 94558
I am writing to oppose the idea of low-income housing units on the Altamura and Hedgeside sites. I strongly agree with the rationale put forward by Conrad and Linda Hewitt in the attached Letter to the Editor which appeared in today’s Napa Valley Register.

In addition, as one who lost her home and had to immediately escape the flames in the Silverado Highlands during the 2017 fire, I can personally attest to the traffic jam trying to get out of the area. It was a terrifying experience! I can’t imagine what it would have been like with hundreds of additional cars.

Linda Blank
16 Merion Circle
Napa, CA 94558
Attention: Trevor Hawkes, Project Planner

My wife Alma, and I, are adamantly opposed to the plan for re-zoning to residential multiple (RM) and development of multiple residential housing at the site along Foster Road. Anyone with common sense can see such a development will lead to excessive traffic congestion along Foster Road and the entire southwest adjacent areas of Napa. It will also cause excessive demand and strain for everyone on the water and sewer services in that area. In addition it will destroy the longstanding beautiful and exceptional town and country interface in that part of southwest Napa and will inevitably lead to a deterioration of the living environment there forever. It is a senseless plan that is done solely for compliance with ill-conceived state laws and to garner state money for the county and city while degrading the value of our city and valley which in the long run will lead to a net loss in revenue.

It goes without saying that such a development will also degrade the value of homeowner’s property in that area when compared to what it would be going forward, without the development.

I feel like it is probably useless to protest this plan, but nevertheless, I strongly urge you and anyone else in city and county government with integrity and a sense of duty to the interests of the residents and business owners of Napa to resist and oppose it at every turn.

Jonathan Blanton
Alma Blanton
17 Saint Francis Circle
Napa, CA. 94558
I Am very saddened to see the Housing Element Advisory Committee and Planning commission are even thinking of taking this parkland for development of affordable housing. It really shocked me to see Skyline Wilderness park referred to as "state owned land on Imola".

At the July 6 Meeting very few comments from the planning commission on how we can protect our park.
I think you people should know how many people use this park every month. Maybe you could get information from Skyline park on how important this park is.
I have been involved with Skyline Park since 1983.
This park has bloomed into a beautiful recreation and community service area for Napa Valley. Please Save Skyline Park.

Nancy Brightwell
707 2870362
I am a 25-year resident of McKinley Road, a cross street to Hedgeside Avenue. This is a peaceful, rural, bucolic setting with oversized lots and few homes. I moved from the Bel-Aire subdivision to enjoy the attributes of this neighborhood. City of Napa residents drive here to walk and jog our area.

The Bishop site, in my opinion, is completely unsuitable for a high-density, low-income project of approximately 125 units. That would potentially put 500 more people on that five-acre parcel, which exceeds the total population of the nearest three streets!

The ingress-egress is already inadequate onto Monticello Road, as we now compete with Solano County/Interstate 80 commuters, who come over the mountain to avoid Highway 29 traffic.

It would set a terrible precedent, as these big parcels, of which there are many out here, would then be able to follow suit and rezone and develop their properties similarly, which would forever change this neighborhood, lower our quality of life and cause a significant diminution in value. This area should continue the current zoning in perpetuity.

The infrastructure investment would require tens of millions of dollars to bring sewer, water, curb and gutter, sidewalk and PG&E to this area. Current building costs are approximately $850 per square foot and upward. This cannot be considered “low income” even by Napa standards.

I urge you to reject the rezoning attempt by the Bishops. Thank you.

Debbie Buccellato
1832 McKinley Road
Napa, CA
Sent from my iPad
Additional Comments on Housing Element update 2022:

Trevor,

Please include my additional comments into the record for the draft HEU and future concerns for this process as sites get selected for inclusion into the draft EIR.

In addition to my prior concerns around:

Traffic Safety:
Environmental resources, specifically with many threatened or endangered species historically found on or around the project site:

Growth inducing impacts:

I wanted to add further comments to accompany my testimony at the planning commission meeting July 6th.

The “Bishop site” is incompatible with many of the goals and policies contained in the draft plan. With a project site that is counter to so many of these goals and policies, I do not see how it can continue to stay on the list of proposed sites and respectfully that it be removed from consideration in the upcoming EIR.

In particular:

**Goal H-2** to direct growth into cities and towns to preserve agriculture. The “bishop site” is currently in production agriculture and this development would threaten that, it is also not in a city or a town. Changing the zoning would preclude this area from having agriculture as RM zoning is not allowed to have commercial agriculture whether or not this site gets built. How does the Bishop site work to further Goal H-2?

**Goal H-9** to focus on water conservation. Presumably this site would be granted access to the City of Napa water supply, although all additional permits and asks for hookups have been denied. This site requires significant increases in water supply which is already “over allocated” according to the State of California and the city of Napa as Evidenced by water curtailments over the last several years. What guarantees are in place that this proposed development would not revert to groundwater use in the event of a drought or additional water curtailment? This area is in the MST groundwater deficient part of napa and reliance on groundwater in the event of drought would put the entire MST in jeopardy from a water supply standpoint.

The Bishop site is also incompatible with the following policies:

**Policy H2-A**, we have been told that this site would not have any actual “affordability” requirements and does not seek combo AH zoning. There would be no requirement for the developer to actually supply affordable housing. This, like most “affordable projects” may result in market rate housing for second homes, further exacerbating the housing crisis. How will this parcel be compliant with this policy?
**Policy H2-B**, this is not a designated urban area, and it is not planned to have any deed restrictions placed on the property. How does the Bishop site work to further Policy H2-B?

**Policy H2-E**, this currently does not have AH zoning accompanying it. Will this property be required to have an AH zoning overlay on it?

**Policy H2-F**, this site is not in an incorporated area. Is this and the surrounding area planned to be annexed into the City of Napa anytime soon? It’s not in the RUL, will the RUL be expanded to meet the spirit of this policy?

**Policy H2-H**, currently there are no plans for deed restrictions or for the County to have this as a County funded affordable housing site. Would this project be able to use affordable housing dollars (in the county General budget) to do the required septic upgrades? If so, this is incompatible with Policy H2-H unless this is actually an affordable project sponsored by Napa County.

**Policy H4A**, this is not in an urban area and is not conversion of commercially zoned parcel. Several other sites fit this policy better than the Bishop site, and provide for a better, more palatable transition in zoning.

**Policy H4-B**, and AG/LU-119 as it relates to the counties growth management system. This site is incompatible with many of the policies in this general plan and land use code.

**Policy H4-C**, the Bishop site is not in a designated “urban area”.

**Policy H4-D**, this site does not serve to protect agriculture and utilize buffers that minimize agricultural impacts. This area was recently the site of a major problem with neighborhood complaints over a wind machine in an existing vineyard. Adding 500+ residents to an agricultural area is counter to this policy and will lead to further erosion of agriculture that exists on neighboring parcels and in the area. How does the Bishop site meet this goal better than some of the other sites in the current plan?

**Policy H4-F**, this site is in direct conflict with the goal of ag preservation and focusing on growth in commercial areas.

**Policy H4-H**, this site does not meet the goal of maximizing protection of ag lands and open space.

**Policy H6-A**, this site does not meet the foot, bicycle, mass transit, commercial services, and water usage goals of this policy. It is one of the poorest and most dangerous sites in terms of pedestrian and bicycle usage.

**Policy H-6C**, this project does not meet the greenhouse gas goals set forth in county code, state requirements, and how would it conform to the new air resources board greenhouse gas rules put in place merely a month ago. The bishop site in particular is one that will not be able to mitigate for these impacts.
In addition to the clear contradictions of the listed goals and policies in the HEU plan, this Bishop site is not compatible with many of the existing County general plan requirements, including the preservation of agriculture, fire issues, greenhouse gas, traffic reduction, water conservation, affordability goals that are in place for the current general plan.

We have been told conflicting information by County staff that once this site is “re-zoned” there will not be a “project EIR” that will address the specific concerns that a “normal” county project would have. I request that in the case of rezoning, a specific project EIR be required so these more specific concerns about site constraints can be heard and mitigated for.

Furthermore, it has come to my attention that significant property improvements may have taken place on the Bishop property without the benefits of permits in the past couple of years, including building a large “barn structure” out of shipping containers and wooden framing, including power to this structure, etc. I request that if this property is in fact in serious permit violation that the landowner not be “rewarded” with the opportunity to develop 125 units of high-density housing on their property. After the last 10 years of consternation by members of our community over permit violations; it would be a major problem if out of compliance property owners face no punishment, and potentially get rewarded by violating County codes by flagrantly violating our laws. Please update me with potential code violation concerns for this property.

Thank you for your thoughtful addressing of these concerns.
Respectfully,

Garrett Buckland
1024 Hedgeside Ave
Trevor,

Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because as I mentioned before the negative affects on the environment and the impacts regarding increased traffic to an already over crowded Monticello Road. I have also learned recently that the Bishop Site is already a water deficient area as per the county maps and this proposed development will further the impacting. Flooding is another concern. Thank you. Matt Buoncristiani in Monticello Park.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone
County of Napa:

My name is Kathryn Campainha and I live at 1848 McKinley Road in Napa.

To those considering the project impacting Hedgeside Avenue, thank you for your time today and for our community’s chance to bond in opposition to the proposal. Let me first express my disappointment for having only learned about this project about a week or so ago. I’m appalled and offended that the residents directly impacted by this project would be dismissed so callously. Perhaps it was an oversight, but know that we matter. What you fail to understand is the number of families that call Hedgeside their passage home. And, under threat of fire, Hedgeside is our only passage to safety. For this, I felt compelled to address you today.

Rather than repeat the concerns regarding traffic, flooding, limited road access, dangerously low ground water supply, fire threat, the killer curve, the negative environmental impact, and on and on, I’d like to share what has kept me in this community for more than 54 years. You see, my home on McKinley is not only where I live, but it’s where I was born and raised. In fact, my father built this home in 1952 with his bare hands and determined sweat. I came into this world a Napan and I’ve personally witnessed the development in the name of progress – both good and bad. Still, I felt blessed that our community of 2-lane country roads has largely been preserved. I’ve watched generations of deer give birth in the fields across from me, along with the coyotes, geese, skunk, blue heron and many species that have managed to flourish along Milliken Creek despite floods, fires and the vehicles that travel at dangerous speeds along Monticello Road or on Atlas Peak. This is home to that wildlife as well.

It is incomprehensible to me that a project of this size is being considered. I only hope that you will come to the same conclusion. However, if you are contemplating its passage, I invite you to take a drive down Monticello at the end of the day, traveling east towards Atlas Peak as parents pick up their children at Vichy Elementary or when commuters make their way over the mountain. Monticello is a highway. If you can, make a left hand turn into Hedgeside, praying that the driver behind you is paying attention and doesn’t rear end you into oncoming traffic. Only then will you understand just one of the many fears we have about this project. For all of the residents, commuters, tourists, wildlife, for the generations to come and for the memory of my Dad – please abandon this site. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Campainha
1848 McKinley Road, Napa, CA 94558
(707) 337-9118
kathryncampainha@gmail.com
My name is Cara Chang and my address is 3200 Pear Tree Lane, Napa, Ca, 94558.

I am commenting about the consideration of using some of the land in skyline park as affordable housing. I am strongly against it because for many reasons first this is the most used park, people adore and love that park, its part of napa's history. Another is the impact it will have on ecosystems within and throughout this area, all sorts of animals depend on that park, animals are suffering as well from environmental changes, to decrease what is so critical to them and the land and waters as well. It's going backwards, extremely detrimental to the environment there. I ask you please do not consider using land in the skyline for affordable housing, there needs to be more options that are not going to destroy an important part of our stewardship to the land, waters, creatures. We have to get more open, accepting the addition of affordable housing into the napa area but not to the detriment of our environment. With so much turbulence we need this place to help us get through these times. Thank you!
Hello Trevor, I live at 351 Troon Court in Silverado Springs and have lived here for over 17 years and love our community. I have heard that the County is considering building homes and apartments at lots adjacent to our community at the corner of Atlas Peak and Monticello and Hedgeside Road. I am writing to express my strong opposition to any development of these parcels. Here are my major concerns:

- Our local two-lane roads carry plenty of traffic as it is, and more than 100 new homes in a small area is estimated to produce more than 1000 extra car trips per day. Plus there is Vichy school that brings regular traffic to the area nine months out of the year. The traffic at the three-way Trancas-Monticello-Silverado Trail intersection on a day-to-day basis would be nightmarish.
- All entrances to Hedgeside via Monticello Road or Hardman are dangerous, with no traffic controls and limited sight lines, entailing sharp turns off two-lane roads.
- This project is simply pushed on residents with no evidence of demand, at a time of little or no growth in Napa County.
- The principal beneficiaries of the project will be real estate developers, not the residents who have made this area their homes for years.
- Addition of so many households inevitably will promote additional commercial development along Monticello Road such as C-stores, gas stations, and the like.
- Our limited number of access roads already complicates fire evacuation, and this would exacerbate the problem.
- High-density housing is incompatible with more than 50 years of zoning under the Agricultural Preserve.
- Upgrading the sewers will have the effect of promoting further growth and development.
- The Hedgeside site is situated on a flood plain, where substantial new construction is inadvisable.

Please pass my comments on to the decision makers who will decide the fate of these low income projects and urge them to build elsewhere where there is a lot more access and land than here at Silverado.

Thank you, Dan Chomko

dchomko@yahoo.com
415 829 3620
351 Troon Court
Napa, California 94558
Alexandria Quackenbush
Administrative Secretary I
Planning, Building and Environmental Services
County of Napa 1195 Third Street, Suite 210 Napa, CA 94559
Alexandria.Quackenbush@countyofnapa.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of the message, please contact the sender immediately and delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

From: Bianca Blengino <bblengino@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2022 11:34 AM
To: MeetingClerk <MeetingClerk@countyofnapa.org>; trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org
Subject: Draft Housing Element Update

[External Email - Use Caution]

Please leave Skyline Park alone! While I support affordable housing, I believe there are sites more appropriate then Skyline Park. Infilling or repurposing properties such as closed schools or shopping centers makes more sense.

Skyline Park is a wonderful area of wilderness in a valley already full of vineyards and houses. It is a fascinating place with visible layers of Napa's history, and a necessary wildlife refuge that supports a wide variety of plants and animals. Keeping natural areas of biological diversity is important for a healthy ecosystem. The area that is being proposed at Skyline Park would eliminate or diminish the revenue that sustains the park.

On any given day, you can find people at the park enjoying hiking or mountain biking. The physical and mental health benefits of being outside in the woods and meadows is priceless. Skyline Park is an important resource for a healthy community. Please take it off the list for proposed housing sites.
Sincerely,

Bianca Collins
312 E. Berna Ave.
Napa, CA 94559
Trevor,

I was catching-up on the Housing Element update discussion at the Planning Commission. To my surprise, I saw that my client, Eleven Eleven Winery, had their Big Ranch Rd parcel listed in the inventory. The staff report stated that Eleven Eleven expressed interest in developing housing, but that is incorrect. They have always desired to add a wine barrel storage building on the parcel and had engaged an architect and civil engineer to being the steps to rezone the parcel to Ag Preserve consistent with its existing General Plan designation of Agriculture to facilitate that project. Also, it appears that the General Plan land use map designation in effect in 2007 was Agricultural Resource, so a change in zoning would violate Measure J/P. This is based on a low resolution map in my files (see attached), so I would appreciate you sharing your research.

Thank you,
Jeff Dodd

Jeff Dodd
Coblentz Patch Duffy & Bass LLP
700 Main St, Suite 301
Napa, CA 94559
Direct 415-772-5724 | Office 415-391-4800
j Dodd@coblentzlaw.com
www.coblentzlaw.com

This transmittal is intended solely for use by its addressee, and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you receive this transmittal in error, please email a reply to the sender and delete the transmittal and any attachments.
Dear Reader,

There are serious concerns about The Hedgeside housing development proposal.

There are issues related to:

- safety
- environmental protection
- infrastructure cost
- traffic flow
- emergency response effectiveness during Fire Season
- quality of life
- architectural continuity

You have heard from concerned citizens regarding environmental impact (ex. the water table), the cost to the City to install new sewer and water systems, to build sidewalks and improve roads to accommodate the significant increase in traffic - both pedestrian and vehicular. Our neighborhood has been evacuated during the Fire Season. There is concern Emergency Response will be hampered during an evacuation. The proposed build site has significant issues with natural 'boggy' conditions given its topography.

There are other sites available where it is less expensive to build, will have no negative impact on wildlife and important creeks, and would architecturally blend as a multi-story apartment building.

Time is short for those responsible in government to make a decision. I respectfully ask our representatives to consider the following:

**Why** this site when others are available?

Thank you in advance for including my letter in the record re: 2022 Housing Element Update

Respectfully,

*Kim Donnelly*

1617 McKinley Road
Napa, Ca

--
Kim
To: Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
1195 Third Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
Attention: Trevor Hawkes, Project Planner

Please do not even consider putting any kind of housing in Napa’s Skyline Park. It is not “surplus” undeveloped land, It is a PARK, a valuable natural and community resource. People of all ages use this park for a multitude of healthy activities. It is a unique, important site rich with wildlife.

The location is a poor choice for low-income housing. The nearest grocery/pharmacy is a 35-40 minute walk along a busy narrow road with no sidewalks, and there are no nearby services for someone without transportation.

A better choice for low income housing in Napa is the Napa State Hospital property where there is a great deal of empty land, or empty acres of Napa Valley College. Both of these spots sit at a major Napa intersection and across the street from the Raley’s grocery and pharmacy, Target, Home Depot, Office Depot, and many inexpensive restaurants, (which are not common in Napa) as well as closer to the movie theater complex, bus stops, the Napa river trail, sports facilities such as softball fields and tennis courts, and gyms like Planet Fitness and InShape.

Putting housing of any kind in a wilderness park shows no insight or understanding of what makes communities. If we build housing in wilderness parks, there would be little reason to live here. Already too much land is easily allocated to wineries owned by international corporations. Please don’t let this happen. Thanks for your time.

Thank you,

Samanda Dorger
1405 Meek Avenue
Napa, Calif. 94559
707-363-1486
samdorger@aol.com

See: Red Flag Warning: Save Skyline Wilderness Park from Development, by Roland Dumas, PhD
and: https://www.skylinepark.org/

cc: Gavin Newsom
cc: Jason Elliot, Senior Counselor to the Governor for Housing and Homelessness
1021 O Street, Suite 9000; Sacramento, CA  95814
Draft Housing Element Update Comments from the Sierra Club

To: Napa Housing Element Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors, Governor’s office.

From: Napa Sierra Club Group Conservation Committee

The Napa Sierra Club Group has publicly opposed consideration of Skyline Wilderness Park as a site for housing of any kind. The park has been very successfully managed to provide a wide range of outdoor experiences to an extremely diverse community, experiences not available anywhere else in the county. We have encouraged members of the community to voice their concern that the county would even think about harming such a unique place; such a unique place that renders numerous beneficial services should never find its way onto such a list, no matter how well it “pencils out” against a set of criteria. Our position was published in our newsletter, and been distributed widely [https://www.sierraclub.org/redwood/napa/blog/2022/05/red-flag-warning-save-skyline-wilderness-park-development-roland-dumas-phd]

I recently captured the view of one user of the portion of the park that is on the list of housing sites. I told her and her mother that the 5 acres they are on might be turned into housing. Her response, unscripted, is here [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fOuyQjFbsfo]

Process

The draft housing element documents the process of selecting the target sites, including required information, criteria, various demographic analyses, and appears quite rigorous. It does note, however that in the description of each property, the current use of the property should be documented. For most of the locations, that would be a simple description, there is no current use. For Skyline, there was no description of the current use. Had the preparers of the document visited the location, they might have seen a wide variety of community activities. Had the preparers of the document contacted the Skyline Citizen Community, the organization chartered with management of the park, they would have received a comprehensive list of groups and activities that this parcel serves. They would have also discovered that the revenue from the “flat” portion of the park, this parcel included, supports the operation of the entire park, including the wilderness trail system. Had they looked and asked, they would have seen, heard, and understood.

The process depicted the Skyline Wilderness Park location as “state owned land on Imola.” That very generic label surely wouldn’t attract as much attention as “a piece of Skyline Park” would. We can only speculate why the lapse in transparency.

State requirement of park services

In the Planning Commission session of 7/6, Director Morrison narrated other counties’ experience with developing housing elements. He described Los Angeles County’s plan being rejected by the state because there were insufficient parklands for the planned new housing. That makes sense, because high density housing residents have less outdoor space associated with their residences. This requirement acknowledges the physical and mental benefits
of access to park services.

Napa, on the other hand, seems to be planning on destroying parkland for high density housing. The proximity of the rest of the park is noted as a positive attribute of the location. With the 5-acre location being part of a 20-acre parcel that is designated for eventual development, that positive attribute will have to be progressively decremented with each cycle. At the end, the park will not be economically viable and will not be able to host large group gatherings of any kind.

Implicit preference for sacrificing Skyline to save other locations.

In the 7/6 Planning Commission meeting, Director Morrison stated that the state intends for there to be low-income housing on this parcel. If the county doesn’t do it, the state will. Given this situation, the county should claim credit for housing at this location even if the state does the development, which would reduce the number of units needed at other locations.

Implicitly, this argues that development in Skyline Park may be a priority, as it would save other locations. The county is considering cannibalizing beneficial services to reduce the impact on, and complaints from, residents of wealthy areas. Frankly, this is a perversion of the mission of working in the public interest.

Transparency

Through the narrative description of the state’s views, requirements, and intent, there is no documentation of the veracity of these representations. We would like the county officers who are in dialog with state offices to document these meetings for the public to know that the public interest is being served.

Call to action

For members of the Housing Element Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors, we challenge you to protect Skyline Park from development. Do not succumb to “the process is making us do this”; declare that you will never vote to include Skyline Park in a list of sites to be developed. Protect it.

Roland A. Dumas, Ph.D.
Chair, Conservation Committee
Sierra Club Napa Group
3068 Soscol Ave
Napa CA 94558
Dear Mr. Hawkes

I am writing to implore you to keep Skyline Wilderness Park whole.

It is a jewel in Napa County’s crown that cannot be replaced. There is no other like it. Every part is important. This park brings together people of all ages and socioeconomic backgrounds for a wide range of activities-- activities that cannot be pursued elsewhere in the county.

We know from solid data the vital importance of green spaces on mental and physical well-being. And in the face of increased urban development, there is even more urgent need to protect such spaces.

Please read this brief abstract from the National Institutes of Health: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5663018/

“Together, these research findings suggest that individuals’ desire for contact with nature is not just the result of a romanticized view of nature, but is an important adaptive process, which appears to aid optimum functioning.”

Thank you.

Robin Ellison
Napa
1242 East Avenue
Dear Board of Supervisors;
My husband and I strongly oppose the building of homes at the intersection of Atlas Peak and Monticello adjacent to the fire station or the property along Hedgeside Avenue known as the Bishop site. Our neighborhood cannot accommodate the increased traffic that this would cause. Entering or exiting from Monticello road to Hedgeside is already very dangerous. Also given the hundreds or maybe thousands of new apartment homes recently built in Napa I cannot see a need for more homes. I do not see how we could supply water for so many more homes given the severe drought we are in at the moment. Also I believe our area is zoned Agricultural Preserve so high-density housing is incompatible with this designation. Having been evacuated in 2017 due to wild fires I can attest to the fact that it would be very difficult to get everyone out in an emergency with the small roads that enter and leave the area. I hope you do not succumb to influences of property developers but rather position yourselves on the side of the Napa residents.
Patricia and Fred Facchini
101 Silverado Springs Drive.
Napa, CA 94558
Mr. Hawkes,

My name is William C. Foureman, and I reside at 310 Deer Hollow Drive, Napa 94558.

I am writing on my own behalf, and on behalf of the Silverado Property Owners Association (SPOA), whose members include the owners of all 1091 properties within the Silverado Residential Community. Both I and the overwhelming majority of members of the organization I head wish to register our firm opposition to any further efforts to rezone and ultimately redevelop both the Bishop and the Altamura properties for high-density housing pursuant to the current Draft General Plan Housing Element Update.

SPOA was founded in [1990] for the express purpose of opposing the proposal by the then-current owners of Silverado Resort to add an unacceptably large number of new housing units within the boundaries of Silverado. Through SPOA's efforts, and with the active participation of the Napa County Board of Supervisors, the parties were able to negotiate a compromise whereby the resort owners were forced to accept 225 fewer housing units than they had originally proposed. This represents the current housing configuration within Silverado, and the compromise has stood the test of time in terms of balancing the opportunity for many people to enjoy the world-famous Napa lifestyle with maintenance of the low-key semi-rural amenities responsible for that lifestyle's reputation in the first place.

I can appreciate the difficult position in which the State of California's affordable housing mandate has placed the County. This is a piece of top-down governance which responds to no real need and is especially inappropriate at a time when California, including Northern California, is not gaining but losing population. Nevertheless it appears that the County cannot evade the requirement to select among the six sites the Planning Department has identified.

To the best of my knowledge, the lack of the ready availability to expand the capacity of the local sanitary sewer line has for some years posed an insuperable barrier to expansion of Silverado Resort's hotel facilities. It thus came as a considerable shock to hear, too recently to have had time to thoroughly investigate, that the Planning Department now believes that a significant sewer expansion can be achieved by the simple expedient of patching some leaks that have permitted stormwater to infiltrate the sewer line, and that the County possesses a slush fund earmarked for low-income housing sufficient to cover the cost of the needed repairs.
I hope you will forgive me for harboring the suspicion that the Planning Department's change of heart arises at much too convenient a time to be fully trusted without a thoroughgoing explanation and justification. What we are seeing, however, is the opposite, that is, an utter lack of transparency regarding the basis for the Department's conclusions. I, and SPOA, call upon the Department to immediately release to the public any and all information and analysis used by the Department to justify the conclusion that the sewers in the Silverado area can accommodate more than 100 additional new housing units. Failure to fully and accurately account for the basis of the decision will cast serious doubt on its legitimacy.

I do not believe I need to add cumulative testimony to the compelling reasons cited by witnesses at the Department's public meeting on July 6 and in written communications regarding the inappropriateness of developing either the Bishop or the Altamura site for high-density housing, e.g. traffic density and safety, difficult fire evacuation protocols, incompatibility with more than 50 years of prior zoning, groundwater depletion, follow-on development effects, and the simple ruin of a heretofore bucolic country lane. These remain sufficient independent grounds to avoid selecting either the Bishop or the Altamura site for the noxious developments the State wishes to force upon us.

In conclusion, I note Commissioner Mazotti's professional opinion on July 6 that current construction costs mean that no "affordable housing" developments will pencil out, as well as the Department's acknowledgment that the County's obligation is not to actually build the units but simply to create the regulatory framework for them to be built. It is difficult to take comfort in the likelihood that the required units will never be built when part of the process seeks to change the zoning category of one or more parcels. If either the Bishop or the Altamura property is rezoned to permit high-density housing it will hang as a Sword of Damocles over the heads of local residents. Ultimately, it is inevitable that economic conditions will eventually change to the point that a developer finds the costs now "pencil out". I and SPOA urge the Department to not allow this process to proceed to the point of rezoning either property, because eventually it will have a baleful and irretrievable effect on our precious neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Foureman
President, Silverado Property Owners Association
My husband and I attended the planning commission meeting, July 6, 2022, and were among the forty or so attendees who were on the first floor in the overflow areas. I would like some clarification on a few points from Wednesday’s meeting.

Do I understand correctly?

Once the Bishop property is rezoned to Residential Multiple, this is a permanent change, even if the State develops the Skyline property, or other properties are additionally chosen.

If the Bishop property is chosen, sanitation and water hookups will not be paid for by the developer, but will be paid for by the taxpayers through the General Fund.

If the Bishop property is chosen, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers would be satisfied as far as the State is concerned, however the Bishops and/or their developers are under no obligation to sell these units to low-income buyers.

According to the RHNA, Napa County has enough above-moderate housing units available.

If the above statements are true, then this seems to me to be a terrific deal for the developer and a lousy deal for the residents and taxpayers of the County. What we do not need is rezoning for the purpose of million-dollar townhomes.

My property is a one-acre parcel with two addresses. The first, 1150 Hedgeside was built in the 1920’s and the second, 1156 Hedgeside was built in the 1940’s. We are trying to tear down the eighty-year-old house and rebuild for my son and his family, (exactly because affordable housing is so hard to come by in Napa County). This has not been an easy process. The home will not be approved to be rebuilt where it stands because of new building codes. The square footage is limited, as are the setbacks, etc. Additionally, several of my neighbors have been unable to build standard 1200 sf ADU’s because the Hedgeside neighborhood is designated “water deficient”. How does it make any sense that two properties away from mine, 20-25 units per acre are being considered? Just because the project will have City water hookup does not mean this project won’t do additional damage to the surrounding ground water.

We share our neighbors very valid points that the Bishop property is not a good option. The multiple problems with this site include that this country lane is unable to safely handle issues of additional traffic. This includes unsafe pedestrian, bike and car traffic and fire and flood evacuation. Other issues such as water aquifer depletion, environmental issues, and more, are already on the record. We believe this is not in the best interest for the goals of the project, the taxpayers and the hundreds of neighbors whose properties will be forever changed for the worse.

Please remove the Bishop property from the list of potential high-density housing. If the planning commission is truly invested in increasing low-income housing in this area, instead please consider easing the way for the neighborhood to increase low-income housing through ADU’s without destroying the rural life we have come to cherish.

Respectfully yours,
Laura and Jim Gholson
Hi Trevor,

Apologies. I forgot to CC you on the email below. Thanks for reading.

Best,

Ricardo Graf

Sent from Mail for Windows

From: Ricardo Graf
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2022 3:09 PM
To: Alfredo.Pedroza@countyofnapa.org
Subject: Opposition to Bishop and Altamura Sites - Ricardo Graf, Monticello Park Resident

Dear Supervisor Pedroza,

First off I’m deeply concerned about the lack of notification to the residents of Monticello Park and others affected by the potential site alternatives the County is contemplating for development. My wife and I only just learned (last week) about the exercise County Planning is undergoing and the alternatives that are being considered for the development of high density housing that will be contained within an upcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

I’m a resident of Monticello Park and given you’re the Supervisor of our district I’m directing my vote of opposition to the siting of high density housing on planning alternatives known as the Bishop and Altamura sites for the following reasons:

- **Traffic impacts** – as a father of two taking my young kids to school by making a left from Lorraine to Monticello Road is already difficult and dangerous given the volume of traffic at those times of the day. Adding 1,250 trips per day on to Monticello Road will likely create a scenario where it will be even more impossible to make turns and likely necessitate traffic signals or at very least traffic controls like Napa County Sherriff officers directing traffic. Monticello Road was NEVER designed for the type of density the County is contemplating for these sites and more accidents would happen.

- **Sewer infrastructure is inadequate** – the 10 inch sewer line that runs along Monticello Road and feeds the Silverado area is not designed to absorb the additional units contemplated. As you know Monticello Park residents have been looking for ways to tap into City sewer for a long time so we know the existing sewer infrastructure WILL NOT support this sites. If either
or these two sites move forward the County will have to pay millions to upgrade the sewer system not to mention repairs to the existing system.

- **Zoning is incompatible for the area** – proposing high density housing within rural resident simply makes absolutely no sense at all. It’s urban planning 101. High density belongs where there is infrastructure, public transportation, walkable amenities and services, etc. If you put high density within rural residential areas (1 acre lots +) what do the residents of high density that don’t own a vehicle do? What quality of housing would they truly have? It just seems like a shoehorning approach at trying slam the most amount of housing units in whatever acreage is available without further thought about zoning compatibility. You have to admit it’s a MASSIVE stretch to support this type of zoning in this area.

- **Precedent setting dangers** – I understand the State has really brought this pressure onto the County. And because of the pressure Planning seems to be forced to consider some fairly far reaching options as stated above. Options that they wouldn’t otherwise consider in under normal conditions. The County should be extremely careful about being forced to make decisions that set an unintended and negative precedent. Once the decision is made to shoehorn density in our rural communities there is no going back. If the Bishop and Altamura sites are developed for high density what will happen is more and more landowners in the area will want to re-zone their properties for higher density pointing to Bishop and Altamura as the precedent. That will surely lead to the extinction of rural communities in Napa County. Again, density belongs in downtown centers.

I would like to request the County remove the Bishop and Altamura sites from consideration by directing Planning Staff to remove these two sites from the upcoming Draft EIR which would remove them from study process. Including them in the study would be reckless and damaging to our rural community. Thanks for reading.

Best Regards,

Ricardo Graf
Resident of Monticello Park

Sent from Mail for Windows
[External Email - Use Caution]

Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

July 11, 2022

Trevor,

Hedgeside Avenue has formed an advocacy neighborhood group that is in opposition of rezoning the Bishop site for High-Density Housing. This group is composed of our nearby residents who share concerns of such type development that pose hazards to our current properties and that of potential new residents or tenants whom would occupy this High-Density Housing. I have attached a screen shot of our petition (as you advised) representing the numbers of signator’s in opposition. The Chang.org petition was just created on July 2nd and represents 326 signatures to date of this email.

Our neighborhood just learned of this HEU 6th Cycle process on June 20, 2022, when the County of Napa mailed out letters (postmarked 6/16) to residents within 1,000 feet of a proposed site. Recently we’ve learned this HEAC process has been moving forward since Fall of 2021 and public outreach has been limited in nature. As public citizens, we have already missed public comment periods occurring back in February 25th, 2022. These timelines should bring awareness that the Draft HEU was published on June 10th, 2022 and comments close July 11th, 2022. This is a very short window for residents to educate themselves of this Draft HEU plan and digest the safety concerns the Bishop site presents.

Regards,

JC Greenberg
1033 Hedgeside Ave
STOP THE RE-ZONING OF THE RURAL "BISHOP SITE" TO HIGH-DENSITY HOUSING

326 have signed. Let’s get to 500!

At 500 signatures, this petition is more likely to be featured in the media.

Take the next step!
Trevor,

The Bishop site is surrounded by flood mapped areas and many residents experience flood water damage from the rising Milliken Creek. Hedgeside Ave resides in a low depression that makes travel routes impassible, even during routine storms. Picture below is of Hedgeside Ave at Milliken Creek, February 2017.

The Bishop site proposed is a flood plain to hold water and prevent downstream flooding of Hedgeside residents, along with residents residing towards Silverado Trail. This project will further impact and escalate these problems by removing 5 acres of holding ground and absorbing rainfall. This will cause further flooding not mapped below and not allow rainfall to recharge aquifers of an area already deemed “ground water deficient” area. (Napa County PBES maps verify)

My home at 1033 Hedgeside sits below elevation grade of Hedgeside. Water run-off from Bishops property already flows through my parcel at max capacity. Hardscaping over 5 acres of Bishops land will send an unmanageable amount of rain water onto my property and cause flooding of my house. This is also true of other neighbors on Hedgeside and around Milliken Creek. Will the EIR address these concerns and provide mitigating measures? FEMA flood maps have lagging data when identifying flood areas. The local knowledge and events experienced on Hedgeside pertaining to Bishops lands flooding have identified these gaps.
The physical design of the Bishop site is not conducive for adding 125 homes and displacing 5 acres of flood water holding ground. A project specific Environmental Impact Report would identify these problems and exclude such development that causes flood damage to adjacent and downstream homes. Will the Draft EIR cover concerns about flooding, impassable egress routes on Hedgeside, effects on Milliken Creek with 5 acres of additional runoff?

Thank you,

JC Greenberg

1033 Hedgeside Ave

(707)738-7100
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

July 11, 2022

Trevor,

Following our meeting on July 5th 2022 at your office, we discussed the deed restrictions that would be imposed on all sites selected in the HEU and you advised there would not be any proposed deed restrictions. Could you provide further clarification on deed restrictions being layered on these sites in the Draft HEU Plan.

***On page 236 of the Draft HEU Plan it states Government Code section 65583.2(h) that requires 20% or more of the units are affordable to lower income households.

1) Is the HEU Plan going to comply with the Government Code and implement deed restrictions to comply?

2) What data and screening process is utilized to meet the lower income criteria when occupying this 20% of housing?

I request you watch the HEAC meeting recorded on April 20, 2022.

Scroll to 1:28:00 – 1:30:30. (link below)

HEAC - Housing Element Advisory Committee - Zoom

This committee raised some valuable concerns that once properties were rezoned, they easily could be built into resort style condos and not the intended use identified through this State required process. This allows property owners and developers to easily take advantage of a State system to avoid an otherwise thorough CEQA requirement of a project specific EIR.

Could you respond with details of Napa County’s decision regarding imposed deed restrictions for these 6 sites?

This Bishop site has extensive concerns to the Eastern Napa neighborhood regarding fires, floods, and traffic. More specifically the population in place and lack of road capacity during evacuations, which impose life threats to residents, as was experienced in the 2017 Atlas Complex. Adding 500 residents on the Bishop site and 250 on Altamura will only further complicate evacuations. This scenario is closely mirrored to the Camp Fire in Paradise (2018), where residents of a geographic area attempted to evacuate, and road capacities could not accommodate this volume of vehicles. This situation is our
Eastern Napa area consisting of Atlas Peak, Silverado Country Club, Monticello Road, Hardman, Estee, McKinley and Hedgeside.

I understand each of these 6 sites have their own risk complications and there’s not a perfect solution. I will highlight that Napa County has experienced horrific wildland fires and lost lives during evacuations. This should not be a trade-off to meet a State requirement process of identifying future housing. This Bishop site has many risk imposing complications identified above and should be removed from Napa’s Draft HEU Plan.

Thank you,

JC Greenberg

1033 Hedgeside Ave

(707)738-7100
July 7, 2022

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
1195 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

RE: Draft Housing Element Update

My name is Pamela Hakman.

Our family owns a 2400 square foot residence at 1012 Augusta Court, Napa, California. We have owned three properties in the Silverado area since 1984.

Please be advised that we strongly oppose construction of high-density housing around or near Silverado. Our local two main roads currently carry plenty of traffic. One hundred or more new high-density homes or apartment/condo units around or near the Silverado area would produce substantial additional traffic. There is little traffic control and a great deal of foot traffic.

Existing entrances to Hedgeside via Monticello Road and Hardman are dangerous. There are no traffic controls and limited sight lines. There is no demand from local residents for such a development. Also, such projects would compromise our access to roads for fire and flood evacuation.

You are welcome to contact me in the event further input is desired.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Pamela Hakman
Hello Trevor,
As homeowners in the Silverado development, we are Bill and Vicki Hamilton at 109 Canyon Drive and want to go on record with our deep concerns for the potential rezoning of the Hedgeside site or the Atlas Peak-Monticello site. We feel that the County needs to solve our current traffic, water and fire issues before allowing more houses on the east side of Silverado Trail! Thank you for listening….
The Hamiltons

strongly opposed to rezoning either the Hedgeside site or the Atlas Peak-Monticello site;

telling them that they need to solve our CURRENT traffic, water & fire issues BEFORE they allow more houses on the east side of Silverado Trail. (One thing the County needs to do immediately is create a round-about on the east side of the creek where the Trail/Trancas/Montecito intersect at the 3-way stop sign. There is plenty of room there for a round-about & it would ease the traffic back-ups in all directions there.)

4 P.M. on July 11. The Subject line for your email should include “Draft Housing Element Update,” and YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS. Send your email to trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org.
Hi Trevor,

We are OPPOSED to having high density housing on the Altamura property and the proposed Hedgeside site.

Unfortunately, the County is being forced by a State, unfunded, mandate to provide high density low income housing for no particular reason except for political reasons. We suggest that the State donate sufficient land at its Napa State hospital which occupies 138 acres-mostly vacant land to the County of Napa to satisfy the State mandate, or to consider locations that are not already high density areas.

I was a member of the Steering Committee for the 2008 County of Napa 20 year General Plan. The Plan, unanimously by its 20 members, called for:

1. Direct housing enterprises to the incorporated jurisdictions and designated urbanized areas through the use of maps and policies
2. Provide the additional workforce and affordable housing by identifying necessary sites and programs and by collaborations with municipalities

The County of Napa 20 year General Plan is all about preserving our historical culture of an agriculture community and quality of life in a rural setting, not to be invaded and changed by high cost developers, and by rezoning from Ag to high density. The rezoning for the high ultra density low income units is incompatible with over 50 years of zoning for Ag Preserve.

Further, the State mandate to have 106 units be located in high income areas is not necessary nor wanted by anyone. Particularly when other more realistic areas exist.

Some real problems and barriers to have any residential or commercial rezoning at the Altamura site includes:

1. Sewer line is at capacity and would require a substantial cost to install a new sewer line
2. Water resources are extremely limited and not available for the additional 106 units
3. Fire evacuation routes have been, and will continue to be, a challenge with the many threats of fires. Additional high density units on the Altamura property facing Monticello Road and Atlas Peak Road will create additional heavy traffic congestion and challenges for a fire evacuation route. Not to say the amount of traffic in both areas to increase considerably on a daily basis.
4. Silverado has always been opposed to increasing density in our rural neighborhood including a quality of life which we choose to live because of its
location, culture, rural setting, and life style.
5. The entrances to the sites are dangerous
6. There will definitely be more crime in our neighborhood
7. The ultra high density units will be extremely costly to build because of building requirements, cost of construction etc-
8. Milliken Creek has flooded more than once and the ecosystem of Milliken Creek will be impacted with these ultra high density units.
9. A big consideration - as more people choose to leave the state of California the amount of housing being built in Napa should be sufficient to accommodate the need for additional housing. We have a declining population in our County.

In summary, these are just a few reasons to oppose this State mandate of low income, ultra high density units, in high income areas.

We hope that you will objectively consider all the various reasons to oppose the Altamura property and the Hedgeside site as not appropriate sites for any ultra high density low income units.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Conrad and Linda Hewitt
279 Kaanapali Drive.
Napa, CA 94558
Dear Mr. Hawkes and Planning Commission Members:

We are writing to express our opposition to any county efforts to locate high density low income housing in the areas referred to as the Altamura site and the Bishop site near Monticello and Atlas Peak Roads. The preservation of our semi rural community's neighborly care for our environment and for one another is vital to us and to our neighbors. Any rezoning to high density is incompatible with over 50 years of planning for Ag Preserve.

Serious barriers to such high density development should be considered.

1) Vehicle traffic along Monticello Road, Hardman Road, and Atlas Peak has been increasing for some time due to commuter traffic from up valley to/from towns/cities east of Napa Valley. This is of increasing concern already.
2) The main route through and along the areas being considered, Monticello Road / highway 121, is already a busy narrow highway with practically no shoulder. It is popular already with bicyclists and pedestrians with no marked bicycle lane. It is dangerous. Entrances to these sites will be particularly dangerous.
3) For evacuation during the October, 2017 fire, Silverado area traffic was significantly hampered as residents were forced to leave along streets simply not capable of handling such evacuation volume. Lives could be lost during future fires with 106 new residents in this area of limited egress.
4) The Milliken Creek ecosystem is sensitive and subject to flooding. It would be negatively impacted by significantly increased housing density.
5) Water and sewage lines are near capacity already and would be costly to extend.

Our thoughts above are only a few of the reasons that Altamura and Bishop sites are simply not appropriate for high density housing development. We ask that you objectively consider all possible areas for high density housing in our county and reject these two sites outright.

Sincerely,

Philip M. and Shirley T. Hooks
150 Westgate Dr
Napa, CA  94558
INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION ADVOCACY RESEARCH AND EDUCATION
ICARE
PO BOX 4256
NAPA, CA. 94558
cmalan1earth@gmail.com
icarenapa.org
707.322.8677

July 5, 2022

The Institute for Conservation Advocacy Research & Education, (ICARE) established in 2004, is a non profit community-based organization located in Napa County, California. ICARE's mission is to restore and conserve the biological integrity and ecosystems health of watersheds, the Napa River estuary and the greater San Francisco Bay Area through science-based advocacy, research and education.

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services/PBES
Napa County Planning Commission/PC
Napa County Housing Element Update Advisory/HEA
The County General Housing Element 6th Cycle
1195 3rd Street, Suit 210
Napa, Ca. 94559

Chris Malan
Executive Director
Institute for Conservation Advocacy Research and Education
Comments #2-please use these comments for the record and disregard the prior comment letter.

Re: Napa County General Plan Housing Element Update-Public Hearing comments for the preparation of California Environmental Quality Act/CEQA for the State of California’s 6th cycle housing element update

Dear Planning Commission,

The Institute for Conservation, Advocacy, Research and Education offers these comments about the 6 sites the three entities, PBES, HEA, PC met and discussed then chose out of 230 parcels, 6 parcels/sites that might fit the County’s needs to comply with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation/RHNA of the Bay Area for housing.

The six sites selected do not include building low income housing which the County continues to not meet this critical housing need. The Spanish Flat Site #1 and the Imola Stie #5 are for
affordable housing and the other 4 sites fail to state the type of housing being built from affordable to low income housing.

**Site #1: Spanish Flat**

This area has had wastewater treatment issues such that Lake Berryessa has been polluted by failed wastewater treatment infrastructure on-going for many years. Lake Berryessa has had harmful algae blooms for years now requiring public advisories for people to stay out of the water. Harmful algae blooms can cause mortality to humans and pets and is caused by nutrient loading to the fresh water that comes from stormwater runoff from: grazing/cow poop, fertilizer/vineyards, illicit discharge of wastewater treatment plants/sewer spills. Algae, that is naturally occurring in fresh water rapidly multiplies in presence of high nutrient loading to the waters forming large colonies of algae that can without notice turn to toxic blooms.

Will the current wastewater treatment plant be able to handle 100-125 new households? Where does the water come from?

Locating 100-125 new units close to infrastructure will reduce green house gases/GHG. What is the GHG mitigation for this development that will require 150 more cars to travel long distances for essential services each day vs. locating this affordable housing near essential services.

This site is too isolated for people who need easy access to care and services and does not provide mass transportation for those who can not afford a car.

This is identified as medium fire threat area. This area has seen severe fires since 2017 causing area wide evacuations of people onto small country roads.

**Site #2-Bishop:**

This site is a wrong location for 100-125 high density housing (20-25 units per acre) for these significant environment reasons:

- This land fits the description of prime agricultural lands as determined by State Lands and should be protected as such even though the current zoning is Residential Country District/RCD. The current use has been used for farming/grazing for decades and is the best use of this fertile soil. To convert these site to concrete is a tragic waste of this high value natural resource, agricultural lands which is in drastic decline statewide.
- The current zoning/RCD should remain the same which is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood character.
- The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recommends preserving natural lands to mitigate the environmental impacts of climate change. Napa County must recognize that
agricultural lands must be protected for raising crops that can serve to feed people during climate disasters where food shortages and supply chains can cause harm to human survival and quality of life. Further, soils, and natural vegetation and crops sequester carbon, housing developments do not sequester carbon but rather increase green house gases/GHG.

- What are the GHG emissions from 100-150 cars driving into town daily? What is the mitigation for this?
- Mass transportation does not come to this location currently. What is the plan for this?
- Young of the year steelhead trout, a threatened specie listed on the Endangered Species Act/ESA, cohorts migrate, spawn and live for 2 years in Milliken Creek which runs through this property. This species is vulnerable to pollution and human interference with their habitat. A healthy riparian buffer of 150 feet must be maintained to keep the fish in good condition.
- Increased rate of stormwater runoff from this housing project will discharge into Milliken Creek via a culvert. This increased rate of stormwater runoff will cause habitat destruction from erosion of the bed and banks of Milliken Creek at point of stormwater discharge to the creek. What is the mitigation for this?
- This increased rate of stormwater runoff, (caused by 100-125 housing units) will scour the steelhead eggs and destroy these egg nest/redds. What is the mitigation for this?
- This property is in the flood area of Milliken Creek. Putting in 100-125 units of concrete right on the creek will cause all the homes on Hedgeside to flood due to increased rate of stormwater runoff. The soils will no long infiltrate stormwater and instead all this stormwater will run directly into Milliken Creek. In the last large storms since the North Bay fires of 2017, Milliken Creek has been at the top of the bridge and over flowing the bridge going on to Hedgeside Road causing raging flood waters.
- The Milliken Sarco Tulocay/MST groundwater aquifer, (where this parcel overlays), is in severe groundwater depletion. Covering up this parcel with concrete will deprive the MST of critical groundwater recharge.
- Milliken Reservoir dam is under the watchful eye of the State Division of Dams and Safety. The dam was retro-fitted about 10 years ago due to the cracks and degradation of the cement dam. Multiple holes were bored in the face of the dam to try to keep the water surface level of the dam below 15 feet from the face of the dam to reduce the pressure on the dam should an earthquake occur of a level 8 or more. However, in large storm events like the October 2021 deluge, the holes bored in the dam can not keep up with the storm water roaring through Milliken canyon which is a very steep and deep crevasse. Therefore, the dam itself is not safe during this time where storm water overcomes the bored holes. The high water surface elevation can go on for weeks where the dam retrofit does not keep up with the flows entering the reservoir after a large storm. Should an earthquake occur during this time, the dam could crumple. People living below the dam only have seconds or minutes to evacuate should the dam fail. A wall of water and mud with go all the way to the City of Napa putting the city under 3 feet of water and mud. This high density housing project should not be built in harms way. What is the mitigation for this?

Site #3- Altamura:

Same comments as Site 2.
Site #4: Big Ranch Rd.

- This site includes Agricultural Watershed zoning therefore RHNA housing needs is not allowed here according to the criteria established PBES, PC and HEA.

- Steelhead and Chinook salmon, both listed on the ESA, use Salvador Creek to migrate, spawn and rear. The Salvador Creek is on and near this site and the riparian area is considered critical habitat. Pollution and increased rate of stormwater runoff will harm these endangered and threatened species.
- All of the stormwater runoff and MST issues stated in Site #2 apply to this site also.

Site #5-Imola

- Same comments as site 2 and 3 about the MST groundwater comments here as well.
- Marie Creek has steelhead trout and endangered specie on the ESA. This project will harm migration, spawning and rearing habitat. Same comments as site 2 and 3 regarding the specie harm due to increased rate of stormwater runoff. What is the mitigation for this harm to the environment?
- Riparian protection is necessary.
- This current zoning of agricultural watershed/AW zoning must not be changed to high density affordable housing, regardless of the State owning this land. Agricultural lands have soils of high value that should be protected for growing food and carbon sequestration. What is the mitigation for the loss of high value prime agricultural lands and the GHG emissions from the high density housing?

Site #6-Foster Rd.

- Sacramental splittail minnow is listed on the ESA and is known to be in this location. Therefore, the streams and wetlands need protection from housing pollution and increased rate of stormwater runoff to the stream which could damage this species habitat. What are the mitigations to protect this critical habitat?
- The current zoning includes Agricultural Watershed, therefore, RHNA housing demands can not be used here.
- What type of housing is proposed for this site, affordable or low income?

Other comments:

For all these sites the DEIR must clearly state the GHG emissions and how they will be mitigated.

Add to the Draft Housing element 2023-2031 a map showing the 230 parcels that could be considered to meet the housing need criteria.
To Whom it May Concern:

I have lived in Napa almost all of my life. I have been hiking at Skyline Wilderness Park for the last 10 years. This land is not unused and is not surplus. Our community uses this park and it is very important. Not only was it used in the last fires to save Napa it has been of great comfort to me during the pandemic. I work in healthcare and it can be a very demanding and stressful environment. Having green spaces has been scientifically proven to be essential to our mental health and wellbeing. To have our park taken away for so-called affordable housing would be a travesty. I actually go every single weekend to Skyline in order to commune with nature and let the stress of the week fall away. During the pandemic this was very essential for me, I don't know what I would have done without that outlet. We have plenty of gyms in Napa but it is not the same as being in nature. When you hike in Skyline and come upon a momma deer and her baby it is magical. The fact that they rarely run away but just stare at you as you walk by is mystical! Skyline is special and there is nothing like it nearby. If we didn't have Skyline I would have to travel out of town and frankly that is just not cost effective. Given how expensive it is to live here locals should be able to have the benefits of a park like this. It's important to so many people.

They have horse shows and many people take their horses there. It is an affordable place for out of town bottle rockers to stay. They always have the indigenous plant sale there. Of course they have disc golf and an archery range. The Canadian Geese stop there to rest and get water. The Scouts have trips there. Truly people from all walks of life come to Skyline to enjoy what it has to offer.

We need affordable housing. But we also need this park. It is essential to this community. My hiking buddy and I use the seek App in the park and have identified 188 different plants so far. We have seen rabbits, deer, turkeys, all sorts of birds. Some people ask me why I go there every weekend, don't I get bored? I tell them no way because it's different every weekend. One time the creek was so high I had to go back, there was no way to cross it. In spring the wildflowers are amazing! There are no better views than the views you can get of Napa on those hiking trails. Seeing the beauty and changing seasons of the park is a blessing and a privilege. Please protect Skyline Wilderness Park.

Sincerely,

Melissa Iorio
Trevor and team,

I hope this email reaches each of you well. As residents of nearby McKinley Road, my wife Nikki and I have a number of significant concerns as it pertains to the proposed building of high density residential units on Hedgeside Road. I have included a brief list below which I hope you will include for the update meeting.

1. Based on many years as a resident of the community, we can state with strong conviction that Hedgeside Road is NOT built for increased traffic. There is a significant blind turn on the road which is *already* a danger to pedestrians, children etc and that will be exacerbated with the proposed construction of residential units. Anecdotally speaking, I frequently run along the road as well as walk my dog and have been nearly struck by cars numerous times. We are fearful what accidents could happen with a significant increase in traffic.

2. Furthermore, increased cars on the road will plague the area with traffic as there are no stop lights regarding a left turn onto Hedgeside or onto Monticello from Hedgeside. This will result in increased accidents and unnecessary traffic in a very rural, residential neighborhood.

3. As parents, we are also very concerned about the safety of our three children under the age of eight with more cars zipping down the road.

4. We also worry about the environmental impact the building will have on existing species in the area.

5. We were in the 2017 fires and I can NOT imagine trying to evacuate in a very narrow timeframe on a very narrow, dangerous road as is with so many more cars – this would be a real issue that a proposed building would cause.

We understand the difficulty of your task in terms of finding an ideal location for the building of residential units. However, as a long-time residents of the area, we wanted to make clear our concerns around the Bishop Site. The infrastructure is simply not in place nor is the location appropriate for the proposed project.

Please feel free to contact me with any concerns or questions.

Jeff Chang
Qatalyst Partners
Phone: 415.844.7763
Mobile: 415.990.1966
jeffrey.chang@qatalyst.com
Qatalyst Partners may collect and retain email, including all personal information therein, for business operations purposes and to comply with applicable laws and regulations. Personal information will be used and managed in accordance with our Privacy Policy, available at https://www.qatalyst.com/privacy-policy/
Trevor,

Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because the impact of this high density project in this area will be negative and drastic. From the traffic impact to the environmental impact to the appeal of the area. I myself have almost been hit with people pulling out from Hedgeside and this would only increase the probability. That road can't take it and that neighborhood wasn’t designed for it.

Please do not allow this to go forward.

Amir Khalil

1190 Monticello Rd.
Dear Sir,
I am writing my strong opposition to Rezoning Bishop Site to Ultra High-Density Housing!

As napa is well known as a wine country, tourists already have a significant traffic increase on Atlas Peak road, Hardman Av, Monticello road, and Silverado trail. Also, wildfire and earthquake dangers are constantly threatening our community. We have to make sure our escape roads are available in an emergency.

As an evacuee from the wildfire in 2017, my concern is how our neighbors can safely escape dangers without traffic griddle lock. Hedgeside Avenue Rezoning will cause catastrophic results for our existing neighbors.

Sincerely,
Debbie Dongshin Lloyd
My name is Karen Lynch and I live at 1531 Estee Ave. I want to begin by saying that I am frustrated that so few neighbors were included in the letter that was sent out regarding the potential high-density housing on the Bishop Ranch site. I literally live right up the street and drive or walk by the bishop site numerous times a day. High density housing on that site would have major consequences and a lasting impact for the whole neighborhood and surrounding areas. I believe that Napa can and should do a better job with public outreach.

We live in a high fire danger area and huge consideration must be taken to ensure that all residents have a viable and safe exit strategy.

In 2017 when I was being evacuated from the Atlas Peak fire, I was extremely grateful not to be stuck in a traffic jam trying to leave my home to get to safety. As you are aware there are few routes in and out of that area. With the proposed high-density housing, safe and fast evacuation would no longer be the reality. We could potentially have hundreds of cars trying to exit via hedgeside making that exit no longer viable to Estee or McKinley residents during an evacuation. I am also concerned how residents of the new development would be able to get affordable fire insurance, especially low-income residents. I am lucky to live right outside the mile mark from the Atlas Fire, so my insurance wasn’t cancelled but it doubled in price. The Bishop development is within that mile. Will affordable insurance be readily available for the potential development?

My other major concern is traffic. As most of you are aware there is no left-hand turn lane from HWY 121 onto Hedgeside – every time I must make that turn, I feel that I will be rear ended or hit by cars trying to squeeze by and pass me on the shoulder. This is especially dangerous when traffic increases during to rush hour or when Vichy elementary is starting or finishing school. We have seen a large increase in traffic since a few of the Napa elementary schools were closed and children were transferred to Vichy Elementary. I can’t even begin to imagine the back up on HWY 121 that will occur with this development. To even make this site a consideration I believe a left-hand turn lane will have to be created to keep drivers safe or at least safer.

The blind curve will also have to be addressed. Anyone walking around that curve takes their
life into their own hands. Is there a plan to straighten out that curve and is it even possible?

The walkability of this area receives a score of 0. It is almost impossible to walk to the store safely and there is no public bus service or transportation. What that means is thousands of more car trips in and out of the area with this development.

From what I understand this development will be put on city water and sewer. When this infrastructure is brought into the neighborhood will other property owners that are struggling with failing wells be able to tap into city water too? Can surrounding neighbors hook up to the sewer? It would only seem fair and if this is the case can the sewers handle this additional load?

I feel very strongly that all these issues must be addressed to the satisfaction of the people living in this area before even considering this high density development. The safety of our family and neighbors is paramount.

Sincerely,

Karen Lynch
This letter is to reiterate that we are against the rezoning for the properties at Skyline Park (Imola) and Bishop Ranch for the purpose of meeting the unit count for the State of California housing requirement.

As Planners for the County, we hope you will put the needs of the community ahead of the State’s requirement. We understand that State funding is part of the job but to sacrifice Skyline Park and put the Hedgeside/Monticello/McKinley/Estee neighborhood into a libelous situation cannot stand.

It appears there is time to reorganize and look at other locations. The caller, Kelly, at the meeting on Wednesday, July 6, 2022 made some very specific points of how to accomplish this. Those affected by the 6 sites were not given much of a chance to protest and it is with this in mind that we ask the Commission to further study alternate locations.

Additionally, an environmental report on EACH of the sites should be required. A combination report of all 6 sites is of little value.

Thank you,

Chris and Molly Mausser
Estee Ave.
Napa, Ca
Dear Trevor Hawkes,

Will the Hedgeside location actually fulfill the state and supposed county objective or just the high density requirement?

I understand that the county needs to fulfill the state requirement for high-density housing but does the Hedgeside location fulfill the state and county objective? From the standpoint of a developer, this location is perfect for resort-style high density dwelling. Hedgeside Avenue is a remote quaint country road which would be appealing to high income, second home buyers. Since there are little to no deed restrictions, Real Estate professionals agree that this location will be the desired location for this real estate segment (2nd home & high earners paying cash). Once a unit is for sale, it would very quickly be purchased with a quick close cash offer. This would not allow time for lower to moderate income individuals and families to go through the lending process before the housing is very quickly bought by an unintended real estate segment.

Other locations that are in closer proximity to grocery stores, pharmacy and other essentials and services are not the target market for the 2nd home buyer.

So again I ask again, will the Hedgeside location actually fulfill the state and the supposed county objective or just the high density requirement?

Thank you,
Jessica McDonald
1023 Hedgeside Ave, Napa

2022 housing element update
Dear Mr. Trevor Hawkes,

During the Board of Supervisors meeting July 6th many concerns were brought to my attention that I would like have addressed.

Please explain the reasoning as to why Napa County Officials allowed Hall to remove a “high” density housing mobile home park knowing affordable housing options for lower income individuals and families is needed?

I was extremely frustrated to learn that Hedgeside Avenue is being considered for rezoning to accommodate for a high density housing project site when Hall was able to remove an affordable living mobile home park. Yet Hedgeside is in a higher fire danger area, not designed for high volume traffic or high density, in a flood zone, has a blind curve, within a water shed with sensitive and endangered species and mail and garbage collection can pose a threat to our safety due to increased traffic. This counter intuitive decision is very difficult to understand for those of us that could potentially have an ill-advised high density housing project on Hedgeside Avenue, can you please explain? Please make a sensible decision and remove Hedgeside Avenue from the list to rezone to high density dwelling.

Rezoning an RC designation does not go with the general plan of Napa County. Converting this RC zoned area has not been planned or designed for high volume traffic, ingress, egress, sight lines, blind curves, infrastructure, etc.

Well & Water:
Being in a water deficient zone, I have concerns about 5+ acres being converted to impervious surfaces for the water level of our well, health of our well since it’s our drinking water source, as well as flooding concerns.

Is there anyway that this project can affect our well recharge negatively?

Will studies be conducted in regards to well recharge and this proposed high-density housing project?

Is there any possibility that toxic chemicals could end up in our well/drinking water due to this project?
Will there be an in-depth analysis done prior to the rezoning to ensure this will not be an issue brought on by this high-density housing project? Providing these assurances prior to rezoning is the responsible thing to do and would be greatly appreciated by all of us on and near Hedgeside Avenue that relay on an unreliable water source.

Fire concerns:
Post fire action reports of the Camp Fire, Tubbs Fire, Atlas Complex Fire, Lightning Complex Fire, Glass Fire, the list go’s on and on….they show that the magnitude of wildfires that we experience today cannot be ignored. The “new norm” of these fast moving, damage causing, life taking (not just threatening!) fires must be acknowledged and accounted for in future planning of housing developments.

Recently, May 31, 2022 a wildland fire started off of the lower section of Atlas Peak Road (Old Soda Springs). If the north winds were predominant on that day Hedgeside, McKinley and Estee Households would have been in danger and in the direct line of fire. This is no longer a rare occurrence, this is our “new norm” and Hedgeside Avenue is at risk.

What has Napa County done to improve evacuation routes?

Will there be assistance in evacuating residents in this high-density housing project on Hedgeside Avenue?

I had to call a handful of insurance agencies before I was able to locate one that would insure our home due to its location. Fingers crossed they won’t drop our insurance as more fires occur.

More fires will occur so how does the developer guarantee that insurance will be available and continue to be available? That is a very big concern knowing that it’s already difficult to get insurance in our area.

Napa County Planning Department needs to further evaluate high density housing projects in wildland urban interface (WUI), current high fire danger areas and evacuation routes.
What is an appropriate number of houses per acre in fire danger and evacuation route areas? (i.e. 2 max per acre rather than 20-25 homes/acre?)

Voters of Napa County voted NO on measure L, which would have provided an ongoing funding source to provide resilience against wildfires. Unfortunately, that
funding source will not be available.

While funding for wildfire mitigation is one avenue for prevention, the Planning Department of Napa County carries a vitally fundamental role to ensure new housing developments, especially high density, are not approved in fire prone areas such as Hedgeside Avenue.

I strongly oppose the rezoning of Bishop property on Hedgeside Avenue.

Thank you,
Jessica McDonald
1023 Hedgeside Ave., Napa

2022 housing element update
Mr Hawkes:

I oppose any proposal to place multiple new units of high density housing in our Silverado neighborhood, namely the Altamura corner property and The Bishop site on Hedgeside.

We already have a traffic problem with commuters using Atlas Peak and Hardman as cutoffs to the Silverado Trail, not to mention the noise and pollution caused by all these cars. Water usage and sewer overload are two other very important issues on already stressed systems.

Please do NOT ok these developments.

Naomi McGinn
36 Fairways Drive
Napa, CA 94558
Regarding the planned development in the Hedgeside area, we are concerned about a few things. We were out of town at the time of the July 6 meeting, but would like to express our concerns for our area.

Our property is part of the agricultural area long established around Napa. We have wells which might be impacted if our water table is affected by large developments and overcrowding. It is a major concern of all the grape growers in our vicinity.

We are also concerned about the increase of traffic in our quiet area. Roads are not in the best shape to handle such an increase in population.

Finally, the amount of work that is involved in maintaining vineyards could be a nuisance to the people new to the area who may not understand the amount of noise, dust, and night work necessary for the upkeep of the vineyards leading to complaints and misunderstandings.

We are all for carefully planned developments in Napa County. But agricultural needs should be well balanced with the needs of the potential residents when deciding a development location. Water, traffic, noise, dust etc. should be a top priority for both sides of the issue.

Respectfully,

Margaret and Marcello Monticelli
1760 McKinley Road
Napa, CA
margaretmonticelli@comcast.net
marcello@monticellibros.com
To the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Altamura (Atlas Peak and Monticello) & Bishop (Hedgeside) sites in the upcoming Draft Housing Element Update and request your careful consideration in the matter.

The building of 100+ new homes in both of these small confined areas of land are extremely detrimental to the area.

Traffic and safety of pedestrians are major areas of concern.
- All entrances to the Hedgeside site via Monticello Road or Hardman are dangerous. Vehicles drive extremely fast on narrow and/or hilly roads. The stopped traffic has to pull out very far into the intersection to see clearly. The existing roads have very little room for bicycles and pedestrians and virtually no shoulder on either side of the roads.
- Monticello Road is a main traffic route to the Silverado and Berryessa area's and does not have left turn lanes, routinely causing backup on the road as well as rear-end accidents. Major traffic backups that already exist during peak times the three-way Trancas-Monticello-Silverado Trail will only increase.
- With such a small area to build so many homes, I don't see how they can accommodate any more areas for play and there are no sidewalks or shoulders along these busy roads for children to play or walk to school.
- There are a limited number of roads for fire evacuation, and this would increase the danger and confusion during possible evacuations.
- Is the amount of parking for these homes being adequately accounted for? People routinely have 2 or more cars per household and often do not park in the garage. This will require overflow parking areas that cannot be accommodated on the roads surrounding these two sites.
- The parking at the commercial buildings in the area is currently unregulated and often dangerous.

These sites are not near services, nor businesses and there is no public transportation running to these parts of the county. How is this convenient for low-income residents?

The impact on the environment must be closely considered.
- The homes in the area are large lots, with vineyards, farms and livestock.
- Please consider the negative impacts the increased noise will have on livestock, and pollution on neighboring organic farms and gardens.
- Wildlife in the area will be further confined and increase their invasive behavior on residences; scavenging in trash, eating landscaping, etc.

This type of high-density housing is inconsistent with the neighborhoods developed in this area. The other proposed sites are nearer to services and public transportation. They have wider roads that can accommodate the increased traffic and provide greater safety.

Thank you for your continued service and support of our communities.

Best regards,

Jane Monticelli
137 Canyon Dr
Napa, CA
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

I have a property on McKinley Road. The rural Bishop site is simply not the right parcel to add Ultra High-Density Housing.

We are very concerned about the lack of infrastructure to support this kind of development. There is so much talk about a drought, yet the state wants to add significant new housing that will require a lot of water and other resources. If approved, are property owners in the area afforded the same right to hook up to city water?

What will this do to the groundwater and existing wells in the area? My guess is our wells will run dry.

Not to mention light and noise pollution.

I am also very concerned about the loss of life in the event we have to evacuate due to fires. We won't be able to get out.

This is a rural area. Please help preserve this land.

We strongly oppose this project/rezoning.

Sincerely,
Mitch Peters
Dear Planning Commission members and Napa City staff:

We are very fundamentally opposed to the most inappropriate choice of the Bishop Site for high density housing on Hedgeside Ave for the many reasons cited at the July 6th (2022) Planning Commission Meeting (incl. Public comment input as well as Housing Update info), not the least of which entail very real and highly probably bottleneck traffic and safety evacuation issues, traffic danger year round in general, and very real and clearly predicted flooding and watershed impact.

There are several other concerns, but these these constitute the gravest and most troublesome of them that require in-depth review and smart final analysis, especially since according to climate AND other current regulations, at least three of the sites (incl the Bishop site) may well fall under an ILLEGAL status as far as allowing for any high-density urban development in a traditionally former (and current) AG/ farming use and endangered watershed issues are concerned, given that ANY such site choice seeking "blanket rezoning" for all sites that specifically threatens sustainable use (and/ or any specific species impact) in a critical watershed, is REQUIRED to undergo INDIVIDUAL SITE-SPECIFIC EIR's before final determination is reached. Taking short-cut measures and blanket re-zoning in order to meet state-mandated housing needs is NOT, in fact, allowed when specifically threatened watersheds are being considered. Circumventing existing regulations in this climate context should not be twisted to allow a "broad sweep" determination over such vastly-differing sites

Site-specific EIR’s are simply required for any/ all short and long-term effects, lest the results of express-rate (and essentially illegal), unsustainable general/ blanket EIR approve high density housing in highly inappropriate sites, in spite of the obvious fact that exponentially poor outcomes will outweigh the short-term gain in meeting the state-imposed mandates. While recognizably and appreciating the challenging dilemma for all of you as our officially elected or appointed representatives, please review all public comment from July 6th for the purpose of broadening the horizons for higher density housing via POLICY standpoint and the need to examine past potential sites, both within and outside of City limits, extended allowance for ADU’s/ other private renting opportunities, as well as any other measures that open up numerous and more appropriate sites. There’s no need to put citizens, their safety (nor that of a critical watershed and its habitats and species), deliberatly in harm’s way.

QUESTIONS:

How would planning mitigate for the ever-present (and FUTURE predictable) traffic dangers along Hedgeside Road?

Will there be a widening of the shoulder on both sides of Hedgeside Lane (in an already squeezed and limited safe walking margin on either side)?

(Also, please see photos sent in a separate email that reflect the result to Bill Bishops fencing at the bottom of “killer curve” that show regular “patching” following countless vehicle accidents caused by speeders who cannot hold the curve and crash into Bishop’s fence, or conversely, spin off into our fence across the road. We’ve had to take people to court for the cost of repairing our fence, and we dreed the day the next out-of-control driver will come crashing though our fence and perilously close to the house).

Will there be an extra lane for turning off Monticello and onto Hedgeside (still not solving the predictably long back-up of traffic waiting to turn onto Hedgeside)?

How would the long line of traffic waiting to turn from Hedgeside onto Monticello be addressed? (If traffic backs down into the curves on Hedgeisde, there will be additional traffic hazards as drivers approach from the lower part
of Hedgeside to join the line-up of those waiting to turn onto Monticello, so, current problems will only increase.)
Therefore, how will both ingress and egress be mitigated?

Will there be a traffic light installed at this junction?

What are the measured time delays caused by an installed light for heavy morning and afternoon commuters into/ out of Hedgeside as well as the commute traffic that’s already substantial along Monticello Rd?

How would added traffic exacerbate the bottlenecks created and resultant life-threatening dangers during emergency situations (people escaping Wooden Valley and vicinity, Atlas Peak, Silverado neighborhoods, etc., during emergency evacuations? (Keeping in mind such emergencies are on the rise, not decline, and we all know the past fire history here, the risk of which increases steadily. The Paradise fire and the 80 plus deaths that occurred due to limited escape routes and congestion comes to mind.)

Why would Napa County choose a site that’s guaranteed to add increased traffic along a route that’s so critical to safe escape and the NEED for fire-fighting forces to ACCESS threatened regions as well? On the scale of 1-10 for traffic and safety dangers imposed on multiple levels, this site registers over the top, indicating a high red-flag warning on its own and calls for immediate removal from the list of sites being considered. The same might be said for Skyline Park in terms of both ingress and egress (not to mention the absurdity of decreasing valuable park and recreational land in an increasingly crowded region, where recreation is beneficial and necessary for public health).

Would the County plan to widen Hedgeside Ave to include wider shoulder margins, walking/ biking paths?

Have you at all considered the greater likelihood of children being injured/ killed on the blind curves, as residents moving in and out regularly will undoubtedly include children/ adolescents who might try to skateboard/ bicycle ride down the slope that includes two dangerous blind curves that already see regular speeding in both directions?

How would the County even begin to mitigate these certain factors in such a narrow corridor?

(To date, wildlife and escaped beloved family pets have been the primary victims, but occasional cyclists who misjudge the curves also suffer injurious falls. Families and couples who are aware of the dangers already navigate this road VERY trepidatiously. The “sense” of adding large numbers of children and/ or adolescents and other pedestrians into the mix makes NO sense at all. To get some drivers to slow down is enough of an existing challenge; to "count on" even more to do so is unlikely; and to "consciously place" more innocents in harm’s way might well be considered negligent, if not worse.)

How does the County plan to JUSTIFY such a plan on an already challenged road and in an endangered, depleted watershed? Who’s going to monitor the road? Who’s going to stop the flooding or destruction to habitat if we don’t collectively do so now?

Where would predictable “spill-over” parking be planned on this site? (There’s already limited/ non-existent shoulders/ borders for walking. Cars that legally/ illegally park along the shoulders will preclude walkers from venturing out safely. As grandparents, we already have frightening moments pushing twin grandchildren in a stroller along Hedgeside Ave. when we have to regularly pull to the side and HOPE that drivers speeding by see us, as some slow down and give us a broader swath, but not all.)

What position does this project put you in, as our elected/ appointed officials? Do the ACTUAL dangers/ losses posed by adding traffic into a rural residential and Ag neighborhood and the LIABILITY looming concern you enough to prevent any such likelihood? The very real potential of a child being killed or injured rises exponentially with a project such as this on an existing dangerous road.

ADDITIONALLY, we believe that in no way, shape, or form should the Bishop Site (or Skyline Park, for that matter) be legally exempt from the site-specific EIR mandate that’s directly called for under existing AG/ rural watershed zoning regulations, especially in the context of past and current AG/ farm use of the Bishop site, the current “Water-Deficient” designation on the County Map, as well as within a designated and documented “severely depleted” aquifer. Attempting to somehow fit these complexities into an already "multiply-challenged" region of a rural environment and critical watershed is unwise, unsafe, and contrary to the practical considerations that merit
intense scrutiny for a high density complex such as this one, not to mention the lack of transportation or easy access to medical and other services.

How does the County account solely for the practical concerns and/or needs of new residents, let alone mitigate for the safety and welfare of existing residents and, additionally, in a climate-changing environment and critical watershed that’s evolving constantly?

The damage to wildlife and habitat is incalculable. How will County mitigate for essentially unrecoverable habitat/watershed damage in the face of growth-inducing planning that would also see increased run-off from pavement, loss of permeable soil and guaranteed increased flooding?

With SOIL as "a valuable resource" that is in statewide decline, how will County measure the impact of this run-off and future run-off in terms of increasing pavement and massive run-off?

How will GHG’s be accounted for and mitigated in both local and broader context?

The overall picture dictates a change in how state/local policy currently operates, allowing a broader range of sites to be considered, especially in ways that minimize/reduce the loss of permeable soil…)

What are some of the options that might better accommodate more vertical development within existing paved areas, for instance?

LASTLY…. HOW can Napa County take a LEADERSHIP role in NOT caving to existing limitations/criteria but, rather, offering up more ADU allowances, private rental options for home owners, and City-County partnerships (as a few examples) in which shared funding and more visionary consolidated, smart planning could promote development in practical, smart ways?

Cumulatively speaking, could the County meet mandated square footages through even a partial-adoption of expanded rental policy and loosened standards that would allow more housing options?

(We recognize the existing challenges and appreciate all parties’ hard work. At the same time, would you please share (and accept input for) any potential measures/options that could help Napa County meet criteria without adding to watershed encroachment and destruction as well as increased increased risks and real safety hazards?

Our comments and questions pertain to only some of the many concerns and complexities around high density development that are subject to insufficiently-identified criteria. PLEASE take our comments and questions as LARGELY related to both human and watershed safety and less toward a diminished “rural way of life,” although they’re intertwined. We’re burning up in climate-dangerous times and need to not only mitigate for increased risk factors but also adopt better policy and broader global context as we plan ahead. This means stretching constraints that are matrices over grids and ways of thinking. It is often said, “As CA goes, so goes the world!”

It behooves us to utilize all opportunities creatively and set new precedents for sustainable planning.

Thank you for your diligence on behalf of Napa residents, our wildlife and watersheds, and visitors alike as you closely examine the workability/non-workability of the current sites being considered. The Bishop site, expressly by virtue of its clear NON-feasibility on several levels, offers an opportunity to revisit and revise both previously and newly-considered sites where there’s better, more practical access to services and amenities, etc. Conversely, this direction lends itself toward improved policy toward (and protection of) our valued resources and smart, futuristic planning in an increasingly uncertain world. Napa can choose to lead, if we so desire.

Thank you,

Bill and Parry Murray
Dear Planning Staff, County Commissioners and Board of Supervisors:

QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO THE BISHOP SITE:

What roadway and pedestrian improvements will this rezoning require?

How many feet of property alongside the roadway at the Bishop site will the County acquire for the rezoning? Currently, the County roadway in front of my property is 35 feet wide.

What improvements will be required at the terminal ends of Hedgeside Ave to accommodate the increased traffic impact that this rezoning would create?

Will all of Hedgeside Ave be widened?

Will improvements be made to the blind curves on Hedgeside? How so?

Will offsite street parking on local roadways, including Hedgeside Ave, be prohibited?

What provisions are being undertaken to protect our groundwater from further depletion and contamination that the rezoning and development would create?

How will night time lighting be restricted on site?

What would the setbacks from the ephemeral riparian creek on the site’s eastern boundary be in terms of specific number of feet?

What are the development setbacks alongside Hedgeside Ave?

What impacts from local and downstream flooding would this rezoning and development create and how does County plan to mitigate for increasingly high risks of flooding as more pavement displaces water in the future with any added growth and development?

What are the determined impacts to groundwater recharge and aquifer contamination factors being taken into account from onsite runoff to our local well water?

How would this be mitigated?

Thank you for responses to these questions, concerns and more.

Bill Murray
[External Email - Use Caution]

Nancy Niebling
189 Kaanapali Drive
Napa Ca. 94558

and

Diane Calhoun
264 Kaanapali Drive
Napa, Ca 94558

Re: Proposed high density housing on Altamura property and Hedgeside site
We are OPPOSED now as we have been in the past!

Sewer, Water and Traffic problems are just a few obstacles. We are already in a water shortage and rationing - imagine the impact if this is approved

Sewers would have to be upgraded; Zoning changed

There is no mass transit and traffic could not be handled in case of fires, floods and evacuations.

Parts of the area are in a flood zone

School is not equipped to accept so many new students

Then there is Commercial development to be considered, again traffic problems on two lane roads.

Crime is sure to increase

People are leaving California - more housing is not needed.

We do not want, nor do we need this.

Please oppose this proposal for high density housing in our neighborhood!

Thank you,

Nancy Niebling
189 Kaanapali Drive

Diane Calhoun
264 Kaanapali Drive
July 11, 2022

DELIVERED BY E-MAIL

Mr. Trevor Hawkes, Project Planner
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
1195 Third Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org

SUBJECT: Comments on Draft Napa County Housing Element Update

Mr. Hawkes:

The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Napa County appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Napa County Housing Element Update. The following comments are offered based on LAFCO’s regulatory and planning responsibilities under the authority of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000. These duties include, but are not limited to, regulating governmental boundary changes through annexations or detachments, approving new or extended governmental services, preserving agricultural and open space lands, and forming, consolidating, or dissolving special districts.

Housing Sites Inventory

The Draft Housing Element Update identifies six sites for potential housing development in the 2023-2031 planning period. Any future housing development within any of the sites will require public water and wastewater service.

Site 1 is located within the jurisdictional boundary of the Spanish Flat Water District (SFWD), which provides both water and wastewater services throughout its boundary. However, SFWD has informed LAFCO that the District lacks the available wastewater system capacity to serve the 100 new housing units that are contemplated for Site 1.

Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not currently have access to public water or wastewater services. The nearest providers of public water and wastewater services for these sites are the City of Napa (“City”) and the Napa Sanitation District (NSD), respectively. Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 are located outside the jurisdictional boundaries and spheres of influence of the City and NSD. Site 6 is located within the spheres of the City and NSD, but outside their jurisdictional boundaries.
The Draft Housing Element Update states Sites 2, 3, and 4 are located within the City’s Water Service area, where City water may be provided upon approval of the City Council. However, this is misleading given the City may only provide water to these sites if LAFCO first approves a separate action. Specifically, water or wastewater provision would first require LAFCO approval of either of the following alternative actions: (1) sphere of influence amendments and annexations; or (2) outside service agreements. These alternatives and discussion of key LAFCO considerations are summarized below.

1) **Sphere Amendments and Annexations:**
   Annexation of Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 to the City and NSD would enable the agencies to provide public services to the sites. A prerequisite to annexation is consistency with the affected agency’s sphere. Site 6 is already located with the spheres of the City and NSD and therefore eligible for annexation to each agency. Sphere amendments would be required for Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 before they could be annexed.

   State law provides LAFCO with sole discretion in designating local agency spheres, including consideration of sphere amendment requests. LAFCO’s sphere policies are oriented towards facilitation of orderly growth and development, prevention of urban sprawl, and preservation of agricultural and open space lands. Sphere amendments for purposes of urban development are strongly discouraged for any territory designated for an agricultural or open space land use under the County General Plan.

   Notably, Sites 2 and 3 are non-contiguous to the City’s boundary and sphere, which suggests their inclusion within the sphere would not facilitate the orderly growth and development of the City. In addition, NSD’s existing sewer line in this area was intentionally undersized to limit growth inducing impacts. NSD’s sewer line in this area lacks additional capacity, which suggests NSD would be unable to serve the 158 maximum new housing units that are contemplated for Sites 2 and 3.

2) **Outside service agreements:**
   Local agencies may provide public services outside their jurisdictional boundaries under limited circumstances if they first request and receive approval from LAFCO.

   This alternative is problematic for Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 under LAFCO law (California Government Code Section 56133). Specifically, outside service agreements for territory that is located outside the service providing agency’s sphere are limited to situations in which the service will remedy a threat to public health or safety. Based on present land uses, it appears unlikely a determination can be made that any of these sites are subject to a threat to public health or safety involving a need for public water or wastewater service.

   This alternative appears feasible for Site 6 given its location within the spheres of the City and NSD. Outside service agreements for territory that is located within the service providing agency’s sphere may be approved by LAFCO in anticipation of a later annexation. Site 6’s inclusion within the spheres of the City and NSD suggests annexation to each agency in the future is anticipated by LAFCO.
These comments are intended to convey LAFCO’s role in the process and associated challenges with respect to the provision of public water and wastewater services to the sites identified in the Draft Housing Element Update. Please contact me with any questions by telephone at (707) 259-8645 or by e-mail at bfreeman@napa.lafco.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Brendon Freeman
Executive Officer

cc: Margie Mohler, LAFCO Chair
    Vin Smith, City of Napa Community Development Director
    Phil Brun, City of Napa Utilities Director
    Tim Healy, Napa Sanitation District General Manager
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

I have a property on McKinley Road and am deeply concerned about the proposed Bishop rezoning.

I am mortified that this project is even being considered. Are we going to destroy every last bit of open space in the name of "low-income" housing? Is this going to be affordable to migrants working the land? Of course not! The light pollution already destroys every bit of the nighttime environment. The traffic alone is unbearable as it is. I am so sick of hearing how I need to stop using water and all I see around me is more people and more development without ANY concern for the existing community or the health of the people, period. We do not have the infrastructure for these types of giant developments. We don't have the roads to support it either. The bridges aren't wide enough and we are already in danger of being trapped in a fire. First fix these issues. Show us you care about the lives existing here already. I'm moving out of Lafayette, CA. to get away from the danger from overcrowding. It is disgusting that the countryside and farmers are being decimated for some fake cause. Stop complaining about greenhouse effects then continue to destroy land. It's not safe! We are a "pitchfork" community and will fight for what we love. It is not yours to destroy it!

Thank you for taking the time to listen to us. We realize that the Bishops have a right to sell this property but this development is so out of place it's just incomprehensible.

Sincerely,
Linda Peters
Dear Trevor

I have concerns over the Hedgeside and Altamira site for the low cost housing site building. Both properties have been in their original state without disturbing the precious land. The properties are very close to the Ritz hotel site that had to do architectural digging to make sure that we were not building on Native American burial or tribal sites. This must be answered before we build a
must be answered before we build a permanent structure that will never allow Napa to preserve its Native American roots.

Thank you for your consideration on this most important matter.

Sincerely,
Laurie Principe
150 Canyon Dr.
Napa, CA 94558
Sent from my iPhone
To Whom It May Concern;

Several years ago I sat on the Board of Napa Valley Community Housing. Affordable housing is dear to my heart. I purchased my first home 40 years ago as affordable housing. The Bay Area needs more of it and Napa County needs considerably more. I’m pleased that the City of St. Helena just finished one self-help affordable housing project and is starting another, but these are just a drop in the bucket as far as need. There is so little housing available for our workforce here in the valley, our roads are clogged with workers driving in every morning and driving out every evening.

Like many, I see the problem but the solution is neither quick, nor simple. Land and materials are expensive and labor even more so. While I would like to see more housing, I don’t think we need to part with valuable infrastructure to do so.

I am writing today to express my concern that a portion of Skyline Park is being considered for housing development. I’ve read the documents and considered all the sites identified by the state. There is no perfect site but among the sites listed, Skyline would affect the most people and result in the most negative consequences. I’m not a NYMBY. I don’t live near the park. If there was property available near my home for affordable housing, I’d be behind the project.

I My wife and I visit Skyline Park to hike often, perhaps once a week. I’ve attended several bicycle related events there and a couple other fundraisers. It’s a nice park. We need more parks, not less. Yes, the initial proposal is to develop only 5 acres but that acreage is by far the most valuable in the park and essential for the production of large events.

I can see you must have difficult choices. To recommend another location? and anger other people. To recommend no location and anger the state? I don’t have a solution. Some might say- you have to choose to anger the fewest people. I’m guessing that’s not going to be choosing Skyline Park for development.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns,

Rich Collins
312 East Berna Avenue
Napa, CA 94559
[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Mr. Hawkes,

This is to register my concerns about the proposed high density house project on the Altamura property at the corner of Monticello and Atlas Peak. We moved to Napa in 2004 to a house at 105 Canyon Dr. in the Silverado Crest Neighborhood. Since moving in we have been evacuated twice because of fire. The first fire in October 2007 was spotted early and brought under control with the help of the prison volunteers and we only suffered some landscaping and smoke damage. The second fire was the 2017 Atlas fire which completely destroyed our house and all its contents. We left with the clothes on our backs and almost nothing else. Our greatest fear during the Atlas fire was our ability to exit safely due to the traffic congestion. After almost 30 minutes we were able to reach Monticello Rd., which was also jammed and barely moving.

I had been active in the Silverado Community having served on the board and as President of the Country Club. I was also a director and President of the Silverado Property Owners Association. We were looking forward to rebuilding and were scheduled to break ground in the spring of 2021 (on our Canyon Drive property). However our ongoing concerns about the fire danger caused us to reconsider and in April of 2021 we moved to our current house (14 Huntington Ct. Napa 94558). We still belong to the Silverado CC and feel very much part of that community.

I would urge the County to reconsider the Altamura location because of the fire safety issues. The area has a long history of fires. In addition Monticello road is congested with narrow shoulders increasing the difficulty of evacuating. The addition of a dense housing development with more people and cars also increases the difficulty of evacuating. I am sure that you know, there is little in the way of commercial development in this vicinity and people must travel, by car, to shop for daily necessities. Surely the County has County owned land or other properties that would be a more suitable location for this important development.

Best regards,

Paul Roberts
pjiroberts@sbcglobal.net
415 608-3351
Mr. Hawkes,

My name is Ronald Ryan, and I reside at 158 Silverado Springs Dr, Napa 94558.

I am writing on my own behalf, and on behalf of the Silverado Springs Owners Association (SSOA), whose members include the owners of 97 single family homes within the Silverado Residential Community. Both I and the majority of members of the organization I head, wish to register our firm opposition to any further efforts to rezone and ultimately redevelop both the Bishop and the Altamura properties for high-density housing pursuant to the current Draft General Plan Housing Element Update.

I can appreciate the difficult position in which the State of California's affordable housing mandate has placed the County. This is a piece of top-down governance which is especially inappropriate at a time when California, including Northern California, is not gaining but losing population. Nevertheless, it appears that the County cannot evade the requirement to select among the six sites the Planning Department has identified.

To the best of my knowledge, the lack of the ready availability to expand the capacity of the local sanitary sewer line has for some years posed an insuperable barrier to expansion of Silverado Resort's hotel facilities. It is a considerable rumor to hear that the Planning Department now believes that a significant sewer expansion can be achieved by the simple expedient of patching some leaks that have permitted stormwater to infiltrate the sewer line, and that the County possesses a slush fund earmarked for low-income housing sufficient to cover the cost of the needed repairs.

I, and SSOA, call upon the Department to immediately release to the public all information and analysis used by the Department to justify the conclusion that the sewers in the Silverado area can accommodate more than 100 additional new housing units. Failure to fully and accurately account for the basis of the decision will cast serious doubt on its legitimacy.

Additionally, I believe traffic density and safety, difficult fire evacuation protocols, incompatibility with more than 50 years of prior zoning, groundwater depletion, follow-on development effects, and the simple ruin of a heretofore rural country neighborhood within the Agriculture Preserve. These remain sufficient independent grounds to avoid selecting either the Bishop or the Altamura site for the noxious developments the State wishes to force upon us.

In conclusion, I note Commissioner Mazotti's professional opinion on July 6 that current construction costs mean that no "affordable housing" developments will pencil out, as well as the Department's
acknowledgment that the County’s obligation is not to actually build the units but simply to create the regulatory framework for them to be built. If either the Hedgeside or the Altamura property is rezoned to permit high-density housing it will be a financial and safety penalty to the 1000+ residents of the Silverado area. Ultimately, it is inevitable that economic conditions will eventually change to the point that a developer finds the costs now "pencil out". I and SSOA urge the Department to not allow this process to proceed to the point of rezoning either property, because eventually it will have an irretrievable effect on our neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ron Ryan, Silverado Springs Board President
158 Silverado Springs Dr
Napa, CA 94558
(M) 415-297-2440
RNRyan@outlook.com
To the Planning Commission,

My name is Mayumi Sakazaki owned a home in Silverado Springs 35 years ago and built our home in Silverado Crest in 2001.

I oppose building low-income housing in the Silverado area because of road conditions.

I belong to Silverado Fire Safe Council and our organization educates residents to protect their homes and environments from catastrophic wildfires. We want to make sure that our neighbors will have access to Montecello and Hardman in case of another fire. Those roads are already busy and adding more homes in this area is a big problem.

Best regards,

Mayumi Sakazaki
121 Canyon Drive
Napa, CA 94558
I am writing in support of the preservation of Skyline Wilderness Park. Although Napa County has been given the challenging task of increasing low income housing, I do not think that development of any part of Skyline Park is the way forward. I walk at Skyline Park at least once a week and cross paths with folks of all ethnicities and ages. Some have been coming to the park for years and some are discovering it for the first time. People love this park.

I have heard the argument that this is the best location because it is closer to services, stores, bus line. In this there is an assumption about who needs and will live in affordable housing in Napa; assumptions that they will only be people who do not drive and who need supportive services; that they would not be able to thrive in other parts of the county that have been identified as possible building sites. While that is one group there are also those who have lived and worked in all parts of Napa County and have contributed much to the community but now cannot afford the cost of housing. Maybe they are single, they do not earn enough at their jobs, they do not have as many family resources, etc. I personally know several people in this situation. I do not believe that affordable housing can only be located in south Napa.

Please do not succumb to the threats that Skyline Park will be developed eventually anyway or the idea that it’s just five acres. Please use your elected or appointed position to protect our quality of life. Skyline Park, every acre of it, is worth preserving for today and for future generations.

Thank you for your time and attention,
Diane Slade
TO: HEAC, BOS, Napa County Planning Commission (Please disseminate)

From: Heather Stanton, HEAC Member

RE: Public Comment to be incorporated into Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element

I have copied and highlighted in yellow passages sections of the Draft Document for which I have comment. I have inserted my public comments in red for incorporation into the public comment section. It is with gratification I was given the opportunity to serve on this Committee which attempted to address the update to our next Housing Element.

Document text and comments:

As required by CGC Section 65583c7 that local governments make diligent efforts to solicit public participation from all economic segments of the community, especially low-income persons....I have been provided no evidence during this process of any diligent efforts to reach this portion of our county.

County staff established the Housing Element Advisory Committee. This working group was formed to vet and gather feedback throughout the Housing Element update process on housing-related planning and policy projects. (6 meetings) on demand Spanish translation services being available upon request for the first four HEAC meetings, with the last two HEAC meetings having scheduled Spanish translation services available by default. Embarrassingly our first or second meeting a zoom participant requested Spanish translation to no avail.... hardly understandable with 31% of the population Spanish speaking.

The purpose of the HEAC is to act as the collective body for consolidating and discussing input to be provided by participating in the Housing Element Update process via community workshops, and stakeholder interviews, sufficiently ahead of formal hearings of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. This Committee was given little if any such info to act as a consolidating/discussion point and I found no recommendations from this group included in this 365+ paged document from this group and I don’t recall voting for same

the HEAC will provide input to the Planning Commission and BOS to assist in the decision-making and adoption process. To minimize the review process, all input received from the HEAC will be directly incorporated into planning documents by Staff and proceed to Planning Commission and BOS review. The HEAC was given no forewarning or information about the hearing held with Planning Commission and consequently provided to recommendations/comments.

What do you think Napa County should do to protect existing renters and homeowners? Feedback considered in Goals, Policies, and Programs section: - Rent stabilization/control, ownership. - Private rehabilitation loans. - Essential workforce development/retention/aging population retention. - ADUs as a tool for protecting housing. I personally requested critical data regarding low-income existing home owners on unincorporated lands constructing low income ADU’s in the past two years during our last HEAC meeting. A month later I have received nothing

Effectiveness of the 2015 to 2023

County is falling short of its objectives in the production housing units affordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households. However, the County has already exceeded its objectives for production of housing units for moderate- and above moderate-income housing units. How many
years has this been our response? There is nothing in this document that will change this. This document is kicking the can down the road as has been done for many iterations of our Housing Element Update

When cost-burdened seniors are no longer able to make house payments or pay rents, displacement from their homes can occur, putting further stress on the local rental market or forcing residents out of the community they call home. Understanding how seniors might be cost-burdened is of particular importance due to their special housing needs, particularly for low-income seniors, who tend to face modest or severe cost burdens. This is the case in Unincorporated Napa County, where approximately two-thirds of extremely low-income seniors are spending the majority of their income on housing. There is nothing in this document which addresses this specific and critical need for our GROWING elderly population. There is no suggested solutions or proposed evaluations.

In closing, I believe this process should begin again and provide a real platform for public input. We, as HEAC members have received hundreds of emails from the community about one potential housing site with adamant rejection. Several of the other potential sites are as negatively received. There are ideas in the community about Housing Sites that have not been considered. There is an opportunity to improve what has been included in this update.
July 10. 2022

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
1195 Third Avenue, Second Floor, Suite 210
Napa, California  94559

Mr. Hawkes,

Our names are James and Janice Tidgewell and we reside at 138 Bonnie Brook Drive, Napa, California  94558.

We encourage you not to recommend the Altamura site for high density housing development. Traffic at that location (Monticello Road) is very high during the afternoon commute of Solano County residents going home after work. Any large development in that area will only negatively impact the traffic patterns and make the intersection less safe for pedestrians and vehicles alike.

We also understand that the sewer line is currently at capacity. If the sewer line is expanded, we question how the owners of the one and two acre parcels on Monticello Road between the Silverado Trail and Atlas Peak Road will react. Will these owners then request further zoning changes for more development, which would once again result in increased congestion on Monticello Road?

Our unique tranquil and rural setting is at great risk if the Altamura property is approved for the proposed high density housing development.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

James E. and Janice W. Tidgewell
138 Bonnie Brook Drive
Napa, California  94558

From the Napa Valley....Have a happy day!!!
[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Sir,

Please do not ruin the beautiful jewel of Napa that is Skyline Park! Napa has serious water shortage during drought years that come over and over. Why allow more housing? We are already low on water and building hundreds more homes every year is just not sensible. Putting homes at the park is really not good for Napa. Please do not allow homes at Skyline Park. Please!!

Please consider how traffic will be impacted by all the cars for these new homes. Thank you for making a wise choice and remember that we don’t have the water for these homes no matter where you allow them.

Sincerely,

Jean Wheeler
Dear Mr. Hawkes and Members of the Housing Element Advisory Committee:

Skyline Park provides an important recreation site for Napa County residents and visitors from around the country and world. The area listed, as a possible site for affordable housing, is an important part of the park’s function and financial income. The area is used for large group gatherings such as the Boy Scouts’ jamboree and 4-H shows. The area is also used for camping during the Bottlerock Festival. No other park in the County can accommodate large group gatherings.

People from all ethnic groups enjoy using the many features of the park. Skyline Park offers:
- 25 miles of trails for hiking, biking and equestrian riding
- Disc golf courses
- Public horse arena and camping sites
- Archery range
- Martha Walker Garden (world renowned)
- Picnic areas
- RV camping
- Tent camping
- Large group activities

The parcel listed as a possible site for affordable housing, is part of the park that financially supports the operation of the park. Loss of that parcel would result in reduced income and could lead to a reduction in staff and loss of hours of operation of the park. As the park operates today, it is fiscally self sustaining.

There is a large, vacant, unused site south of the State Hospital, that could be a site for affordable housing. Please consider that site.

Please support protecting all of Skyline Park’s acreage for the critical recreation area that it provides and is economically self sustaining. Skyline Park Citizens Association should be commended for successfully operating such a highly used and enjoyed park. Please remove Skyline Park permanently from the list of sites for affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Lynn Wyman
1081 Green Valley Road
Napa, CA. 94558

Sent from my iPhone
Re: Site 5 (APN: 046-450-041) of Draft 2023 – 2031 Housing Element (pages 249-250)

Dear Napa County Housing Element Advisory Committee:

Understanding that you have a huge responsibility with the Housing Element, I appreciate you taking on that job, as difficult as it may be. As a frequent user of Skyline Park, I have the responsibility of letting you know that changing the zoning of Site 5 from Agriculture/Watershed/Open Space to residential is not healthy for the community or for people outside of the community.

Housing is needed. Recreation is needed. Removing recreation to allow for housing is counterproductive. As the ‘Draft’ report indicates, the parcel is not vacant. This parcel is used by many groups for healthy outdoor gatherings. This includes but is not limited to Burkes School, California Highway Patrol (helicopter training drills), City of Napa Parks & Recreation, Girl Scouts, 4H, Boy Scouts, Napa County Sheriff and Napa Land Trust. Removing these 5 acres from recreation not only removes a space for these groups to meet, it also takes away money to Napa brought in by outside users.

While the Draft indicates the State is not subject to the County’s General Plan and Zoning, it is confusing why the County would approve a project not consistent with its own zoning.

Please do not allow Site 5 (APN: 046-450-041) be rezoned to residential use.

Sincere regards,

Colleen Williams

Colleen Williams
July 2, 2022

David Morrison
Director
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

Dr. Mr. Morrison,

I’m writing to respectfully register my objection to using Skyline Wilderness Park for housing.

Skyline Wilderness Park is just that—a park. It already has a use—it’s not surplus. And it’s not just a park, it’s a singularly unique park, one that’s beneficial to the whole community in that it uniquely offers hiking, biking, equestrian activities, archery, and so much more in a uniquely natural and wild setting. That combination of communities that the park brings together, along with its very natural and wild quality, make it something to be protected and treasured.

Skyline Park is also uniquely large—that’s one of the things that makes it feel so far away even though it’s not. But taking away any piece of it threatens the health and livelihood of the rest of the pieces. In other words, the activities that take place on the portion that’s being considered for housing help fund activities in the other areas. Without the unique combination of them all, the park’s ability to function completely independently of any city, county, or state funding—which is the current case—would be threatened.

Skyline Park is a jewel in the Napa Valley and the greater Bay Area. I understand that housing is important, but please don’t use an area that’s already so useful and beneficial to so many for this purpose.

Thank you for your consideration, and your work,

Jill Silverman Hough
I am writing to you today to tell you how very important Skyline Wilderness Park is to me. It is crucial to my mental health. I am a health care worker. My job is stressful and demanding, and we still wear N95 masks! Skyline is my go to for communing with nature and letting all the stress of the week melt away. Having these kinds of parks is scientifically proven to be instrumental in having good mental health. It makes absolutely no sense to take it away. Napa needs this place. If Skyline did not exist I would have to drive to find another place to hike which would be a hardship for me. Gas prices being what they are I really am forced to stay close to home. Skyline Wilderness Park was instrumental in getting through the pandemic. I fast knew what I would have done without it.

I am primarily a hiker but the events they have at Skyline are so fun and a benefit to our community. I get to see a horse show, a Medieval day where people
were dressed up, disc golf, and the wildflower/native plant sales. For regular locals there is no place like it. We need this space to be available for all of us and generations to come. Please do not use this Park for housing! It is beneficial as is!

Sincerely,

Melissa Torio
To: David Morrison

As a Napa resident for many years, an educator, and a public health professional, I understand and support the need for affordable housing.

However, putting it on land that is used by all folks in Napa, including those who need affordable housing, is not a move for healthy communities. Healthy communities NEED open spaces and places for kids to play and learn about nature.

Skyline Park is a crucial member of this community and partners with many local organizations, for example the story walk that was just installed. EVERYONE uses this park and the park makes sure that access is available to so many regardless of your interest.

Its heavily community driven and they are a model for partnerships and open spaces are essential for reducing social determinants of health.

Please, find another location that is not a heavily used open space and a true gem in this area. The kids campers, horses, dogs, bikes, birders, RV folks, fire training staff and youth will
Dear David Mamson,

I am writing to request that Skyline Park on Imola not be used for housing or any other enterprise other than its current use as a public park. This park is beneficial to the entire community for a number of reasons such as, recreation, socialization, interaction with the environment and health improvement.

As a healthcare worker, my friends and I recreate on the hiking trails to exercise and mentally recuperate; especially during the pandemic.

Many people of diverse backgrounds can find equality participating in the various activities held, meeting other hikers and bikers.
Skyline is also one of the few places where deer, fox, and other animals can live. Not only, there are hundreds of beneficial edible and medicinal wild plants. The spring wildflowers are wondrous!

Skyline park improves all of our health. I have become strong from my weekend 8 mile hike and my mental health improved, making me a contributing community member.

For all these reasons, Skyline park is a very important place to keep as is. Please, please do not let anything happen to our park.

Sincerely,
Laura Healy
COTA 180R
321-537-9058
Irene DeWeese
1042 Olive Hill Lane
Napa, CA 94558

David Morrison
Director
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559

RE: Housing and Skyline Park

To The Planning Commission:

Please select a location for future housing in Napa County other than at Skyline Park. Surely a site that is vacant now would be a better choice than to endanger the future of Skyline Park that serves the entire Napa community as well as the Bay Area and visitors from other parts of the world.

It may seem like taking a small part of the park for housing would not have an adverse effect on the rest of the park, but it would. The area identified is used continuously by groups and activities for large numbers of people and brings in the majority of the money that supports the park.

Anyone and everyone uses this park, all ages, income levels, races, and physical abilities.

I have lived in Napa for over 75 years and have been involved with the park since its inception as an equestrian, hiker and volunteer. This park is a jewel and must be saved in its entirety for my children, grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Sincerely,

[Irene DeWeese's signature]
Irene DeWeese
Dear Mr. Morrison,

I understand that Skyline Park is one of the sites suggested for affordable housing in Napa County. I understand and fully support affordable housing but I respectfully request that Skyline Park is not the chosen area.

We live off Finafa directly across from the Park and have enjoyed this park for over 27 years. Finafa Traffic has increased significantly and another 100 units would impact it greatly. We also need sidewalks for children to walk to and from the park & the school.

Please look for another site. I would hate to find Skyline diminished in size. If anything I would like it to increase.

Sincerely,
[Signature]
We appreciate your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Margaret Koselent
21600 Penny Lane
Napa, CA
94559
David Morrison,

I would like for you to reconsider using part of Skyline Park for fulfilling part of the Napa County housing obligation. It will significantly affect traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians on Imola Avenue. Furthermore, adding housing to an area that is on the wildland urban interface is not a very good idea in these times of increased fire hazards.

I fully support increasing affordable housing in the county but don’t think Skyline is an appropriate setting. Thanks for listening.

Regards,
Lawrence Kent
2160 Penny Lane
Napa CA 94559
To: Housing Element Advisory Committee.

Skyline Wilderness Park provides me with solitude from the crowded area I live in. It provides camping and is near Napa to give local people a close getaway. A five acre housing project will put a strain on the park's ability to collect needed income to support the park and will encroach on the barrier of the wildlife. Please consider the Kennedy Park area or more Gasser wetland development area.

Once the buffer between development and the park is gone, it will never change.

Thanks for your consideration.

Dennis Dowling
5. Terrace Dr., Napa
Dear Mr. Morrison,

Napa County Planning, Building &
Environmental Services

I understand that a large part of Skyline Park is to
be used for housing development.

I wish to voice my unequivocal opposition to this idea. There is, no doubt, a need for affordable housing. But this need must be considered in the context of already existing amenities for the existing and future populations in and around Napa, and further afield. Many Californians out with the immediate area make use of this unique park and my wife and I are prime examples, as we live in the U.K. Our daughter lives in Napa and when we visit we always make a point of walking the many trails in Skyline Park. Why? Skyline Park has a unique and irreplaceable beauty, with an equally unique mix of fauna and flora. As a butterfly enthusiast I have been regularly amazed at the extraordinary diversity to be found here. It was here also that I first came to discover and appreciate the California Bay Tree. Found everywhere across Northern California, here the leaves seem to have a special colour and pungency, and here in Skyline Park they exist and proliferate in surprising number. Deer roam free here, birds of prey as well as many other varieties of finches and woodpeckers thrive. Also, the
The geology of Skyline Park is unique and provides a glimpse of California's past over millions of years. But what story will the Park relate in the future? And why is all of this important anyway? Who cares if the Park stays or not?

"National Parks display the best of America"—as stated by an eminent Senator. They are an enduring symbol of what makes the U.S. great and represent a stoic determination to preserve and admire what we all know is beautiful. They are a statement of Truth and also intent, and not, in my opinion, to be sold off by the pound for coin. Once gone, it can never be recovered.

I hope you will take all the above into account, and also, most importantly, remind yourself of why you decided yourself to go into Public Service.

Respectfully yours,

Peter J. Taylor
Dear Director Morrison,

Since our daughter came to live in Napa in 2010, we have enjoyed the open space that Skyline Park affords. We have hiked every trail on each visit we have made from the U.K. where we live.

Napa city has such a wonderful asset in this unpolluted, wild area that provides opportunities to hike, ride, admire the built up city from a distance and to breathe fresh, unpolluted air, far from the incessant, vehicular traffic.

Coming from an overcrowded, built up part of U.K., the pleasure we experience seeing and using Skyline Park fills us with joy and peace. If you lose any part of this, you will never get it back.

I fully understand the need for affordable homes but there are numerous areas in and around the city that would be more suitable and appropriate. Even close to downtown there is a large, unkempt, area that would make a better development area. It would also allow home owners/tenants to access the local commercial areas without having to rely on a vehicle.
Today the park is full of young children enjoying the garden and the story trail. As a retired educator, it fills me with sorrow to think that such an educational asset would be removed forever. The opportunities to learn and experience the proximity to wildlife, the local flora would be permanently lost.

Listen to Joni Mitchell! They seek paradise but put up a parking lot! You have the paradise. You don’t need homes and parking lots here.

I hope to return each year to enjoy our favourite Skyline Park and to find it as beautiful, peaceful and unspoilt as ever.

Generations will thank you.

Sandra Taylor
1 Beacon Lane
Little Bealings
Woodbridge
Suffolk
11/3/617.
To: Napa Planning Commission  
    David Morrison, Director  
    1195 Third St. Suite 210  
    Napa, CA 94559

From: Diane Slade  
      15 Belvedere Ct.  
      Napa, CA 94559  
      dianeslade@att.net

Re: Skyline Wilderness Park Proposed Housing Site

First of all I want you to know that I understand the need for low income housing more than most. My work history includes Progress Foundation, six years at Napa Emergency Women’s Services and fifteen years with Napa County Health and Human Services-Adult Mental Health. I live in a condo in southeast Napa that I was able to purchase through the first time homebuyers program otherwise I would not be able to continue living here on my retirement income. So yes, I definitely support affordable housing.

I also want to tell you that Skyline Park has been my island of sanity for the twenty nine years that I have been living in Napa. While hiking there I have been lucky enough to spot a beautiful mountain lion, a pair of cavorting foxes, golden mantled squirrel, coyote and of course the beautiful deer. This past week I was thrilled to see my first Northern Pygmy Owl on the Manzanita trail. I would not miss the wild flowers in spring. This land is not only a sanctuary to the humans who travel the trails to find health and peace of mind but home to many wonderful birds and animals and the proposed building site is an integral part of the park.

I am respectfully asking that you please first consider the other locations that are not currently being used as a park to build affordable housing. Skyline Wilderness Park is too valuable to the health and well being of the community to lose.

Thank you,  
Diane Slade