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Mr. Hawkes:

We request that this letter to be included in the 2022 Housing Element Update record.

-We were not notified about this project; had to learn from the newspaper and neighbors. We are neighbors, and within 1000 ft of the project and consider this a violation of County Code for proper notification about significant projects. To date we have still not received any official notification about this site being included in the recently publish DEIR.
-As such, we was not able to participate in this important process and missed the opportunity to comment during the May Board of Supervisors Meeting
-Since this type of project seeks to circumvent the CEQA process, we object to the "bulk zoning changes" put forth in the DEIR. The DEIR is inadequate and do not address specific site concerns for the Bishop property.

-**We have major concerns about:**
-Traffic, this project would generate an additional 1,250 or more car trips per day on a rural county road that was never designed for this type of use.
-Our speed limit was recently raised despite serious opposition
-Concern about sensitive species in Milliken creek. Milliken creek is one of a handful of streams in the Napa River Watershed that hold water year-round and are critical spawning habitat for Steelhead, Coho Salmon, Chinook Salmon, 3-spined stickleback, California Roach and other threatened or endangered fish. Ultra-high density housing developments do not belong adjacent to such a sensitive and important biological resource.
-The Creek and adjacent uplands around this project are home to western pond turtle, and offer important egg laying habitat for this species.
-This site has numerous cultural resources, as creek adjacent properties were important areas for indigenous populations. Ample evidence of indigenous people's camps exist on or near this site including arrowheads, grinding bowls and other native American artifacts.
-Access to hedgeside avenue is dangerous, as there is no left-hand turn lane from Monticello ave.
-sightlines at Monticello Rd. do not accommodate safe ingress and egress onto hedgeside avenue or onto Monticello rd. due to being at the bottom of a hill
-the intersection of Monticello Rd and Hedgeside avenue is currently dangerous (many cars have missed the turn and crashed into the Stahlecker fence.) Many cars pass narrowly on the right around stopped vehicles waiting to turn left onto hedgeside avenue.
- The intersection of Hardman and Estee is dangerous due to limited sightlines and high traffic speed. Adding 1250 or more trips per day in this area creates a clear danger to drivers.
- The intersection of McKinley and Atlas Peak is dangerous due to limited sightlines and high traffic speed. Numerous accidents occur at or near this location, including recent fatalities of intoxicated guests of Silverado Country Club.
- Increasing traffic in rural areas that do not have city services, violates other policies of the general plan, and is counter to the traffic reduction goals of Napa County and the climate action plan.

- Napa County is experiencing negative population growth, and currently has many vacant units at any of the recently developed "low-income projects" along Soscol Avenue and the former Napa Register site; this project is not simply not needed.
- We are currently experiencing major drought conditions. Where will the water come from for this project? I am being mandated by the state to reduce my water usage, yet this project requires extremely high-water demand from an already over-allocated system.
- High density housing is incompatible with the agricultural nature of this area.
- This development will infringe on the right to farm. There are many active farms in the area that are under constant attack to reduce noise from regular operations like wind machines. Adding so many new neighbors threatens the right to farm for existing agriculture operations in the area.
- This development is incompatible with 50 plus years of zoning in Napa County, and is incompatible with many of the general plan policies in place today.
- This development creates a visual eyesore and disrupts valuable greenspace in Napa County.
- This development will contribute significantly to the greenhouse gas inventory of Napa County, counter to other state mandates to reduce greenhouse gasses.
- This development will have growth inducing impacts that are not adequately addressed in the DEIR and would violate CEQA under normal circumstances.

- This Development is located within the 100 year flood plain and significant flooding has occurred on the proposed project site. As Sea Levels and Flood levels rise with Climate change, this project is in the wrong location.
- During floods, Milliken Creek at hedgeside avenue is flooded and impassable. All traffic would have to exit at Monticello Rd. Monticello Rd at Silverado trail is also flooded during these times. Exits are limited during flood periods that are increasingly frequent.
- Lighting from this project will impact nocturnal species of animals, many of which are endangered. Migrating birds and native bats are sensitive to light pollution similar to what this project will produce.
- Fire resources in this area are currently unable to support additional development. While this area is not in the state mapped high fire severity area, this many additional residents will take away valuable firefighting resources (as seen in the 2017 and 2020 fires) where emergency services personnel have to focus on evacuations rather than stopping the fire progression. This is an impact that is not addressed in the DEIR.
- This area is routinely evacuated due to fire risk. Increasing development in this area puts all
neighbors at risk of increased fire incidents and decreased response to emergency services. Some neighbors put out small fires in their yards during the 2017 fires from falling embers. This area is not suitable for such high-density housing due to fire risk. The devastation due to fire of similar developments in Sonoma County communities like Fountaingrove, with similarly ill planned urban sprawl, are evidence of this problem.

- Crime: increase in crime is a concern, as Sherriff patrols in our area are infrequent at best. This development will require an increase in police services that are currently inadequate in unincorporated Napa County. Increase property crime and agricultural property thefts are on a steep increase, and urban sprawl projects like this increase crime in rural areas.

As native Napans and long time residents on McKinley Road, we have major concerns and are strongly opposed to the proposed development of housing on the Bishop property on Hedgeside Avenue and Monticello Road. With many acres of land in unincorporated areas in Southern Napa between the airport and American, where utilities are already available, it seems particularly absurd to propose congesting a rural but populated area on such a small plot of land. We feel this proposal is entirely inappropriate for the neighborhood, residents and proposed residents.

Respectfully,

Gay and Robert Sherman
McKinley Road
Greetings,

Please include my letter in the record Re: 2022 Housing Element Update

My names is Jessica McDonald. I live at 1023 Hedgeside Ave in Napa with my husband and 12 year old son. We bought our home on Hedgeside Ave to be in a quiet agricultural setting with nature and minimal traffic of both people and vehicles. We have a cat, chickens for selling eggs and a livestock guard dog to protect our livestock.

Once we bought this property we realize there was a tremendous amount of history in this area. Our home was build in 1900 or prior, according to County Records and there is even an old canning basement under the house. We have found many artifacts on this property from old window weights, hand forged nails and stakes and an oxen plow. **We even found a grinding bowl and pestle made from rock on the property believed to be from the Native Americans who lived in this area.** This is an area that has an incredible amount of cultural and sensitive historical importance. Milliken Creek was an important resource for the existence of the Native Americans in the area. This unique area should be preserved. This is one of the few healthy creeks that have water flowing all year in the county so let’s be mindful to preserve this sensitive and important biological resource as well as honor these indigenous cultural sites where Native Americans lived.

Why was I not notified about this project? I was first aware of this when I saw the article in the paper. I am a neighbor within 1000 ft of the project so I consider this a violation of County Code for proper notification about significant projects. To date I have still not received any official notification about this site being included in the recently publish DEIR.

When will I be able to participate in the process to oppose this location as a potential site? I missed the opportunity to comment during the May Board of Supervisors Meeting. What can I do to have my comments be heard?

Since this type of project seeks to circumvent the CEQA process, I object to the "bulk zoning changes" put forth in the DEIR. The DEIR is inadequate and does not address specific site concerns for the Bishop property.

**Major Traffic Safety Issues!**

This project would generate an additional 1,250 or more car trips per day on a rural county road that was never designed for this type of use. It will exasperate accidents in these dangerous intersections.

Access to Hedgeside Ave is dangerous, as there is no left-hand turn lane from Monticello Rd. How will this be addressed?

Sightlines at Monticello Rd do not accommodate safe ingress and egress onto Hedgeside Ave or onto Monticello Rd. due to being at the bottom of a hill. How will this be addressed?

The intersection of Monticello Rd and Hedgeside Ave is currently dangerous (many cars have missed the turn and crashed into the Stahlecker fence). Many cars pass narrowly on the right around stopped vehicles waiting to turn left onto Hedgeside Avenue. With additional traffic, how will this left turn be addressed?
The intersection of Hardman and Estee is VERY dangerous due to limited sightlines and high traffic speed. I personally try to not go that way because of the inherent danger due to the limited sightlines. Adding 1250 or more trips per day in this area creates a clear danger to drivers. How will you address this intersection?

The intersection of McKinley and Atlas Peak is dangerous due to limited sightlines and high traffic speed. Numerous accidents occur at or near this location, including recent fatalities of intoxicated guests of Silverado Country Club.

Increasing traffic in rural areas that do not have city services, violates other policies of the general plan, and is counter to the traffic reduction goals of Napa County and the climate action plan.

Our speed limit was recently raised despite serious opposition

**I have major concerns about the ecology of the area:**

I am very concerned about sensitive nature of this area. Specifically in regards to the species in Milliken Creek. Milliken Creek is one of a handful of streams in the Napa River Watershed that hold water year-round and are critical spawning habitat for Steelhead, Coho Salmon, Chinook Salmon, 3-spined stickleback, California Roach and other threatened or endangered fish. Ultra-high density housing developments do not belong adjacent to such a sensitive and important biological resource.

The Creek and adjacent uplands around this project are home to western pond turtle, and offer important egg laying habitat for this species.

Why would you choose to put high density dwelling next to an important and sensitive habitat?

**We need to be mindful to preserve areas in Napa County that have a rich Native American history:**

As mentioned above, this site has numerous cultural resources, as creek adjacent properties were important areas for indigenous populations. Ample evidence, including evidence of my own, point to this area having significant cultural importance including artifacts. The indigenous people had camps that existed on or near this site including arrowheads, grinding bowls and other native American artifacts.

Do special studies or special considerations need to be made in order to make sure nothing is built on or near a burial ground or something of similar importance? Does the county care about the historical aspect of the Native Americans that inhabited the area? If so, how would that be preserved and honored?

**Where do we get the extra water needed to support this project?**

We are currently experiencing major drought conditions that will continue to intensify with no end in sight. Where will the water come from for this project? The state wants to reduce water usage, yet this project requires extremely high-water demand from an already over-allocated system.
Our property falls within the Milliken-Sarco water deficient zone. Isn’t it counter intuitive to build high density dwelling while right next door we are considered a water deficient zone therefor having to adhere to strict guideline for water usage?

**Location, Location, Location….fire, flood, farming and more. Hedgeside is a TERRIBLE location for this project for additional reasons outlined:**

High density housing is incompatible with the agricultural nature of this area.

This development will infringe on the right to farm. There are many active farms in the area that are under constant attack to reduce noise from regular operations like wind machines.

Adding so many new neighbors threatens the right to farm for existing agriculture operations in the area.

This development is incompatible with 50 plus years of zoning in Napa County, and is incompatible with many of the general plan policies in place today.

An increase in crime is a concern, as Sheriff patrols in our area are infrequent at best. This development will require an increase in police services that are currently inadequate in unincorporated Napa County. Increase property crime and agricultural property thefts are on a steep increase, and urban sprawl projects like this increase crime in rural areas.

This development will have growth inducing impacts that are not adequately addressed in the DEIR and would violate CEQA under normal circumstances. Please explain when these impacts will be assessed? How will they be discussed publicly so we have a chance to raise additional concerns?

Is the requirement to be in an unincorporated area of Napa? But shouldn’t the locations being considered still “make sense”? Are there other locations that have better access to services and conveniences such as a grocery store or target within bike riding or walking distance? Is there a location that is closer to bus routes and other services that are already established and in place for low income?

This Development is located within the 100 year flood plain and significant flooding has occurred on the proposed project site. As Sea Levels and Flood Levels rise with Climate Change, this project is in the wrong location.

During floods, Milliken Creek at Hedgeside Avenue is flooded and impassable. All traffic would have to exit at Monticello Rd. Monticello Rd at Silverado trail is also flooded during these times. Exits are limited during flood periods that are increasingly frequent. How would this be addressed?

Lighting from this project will impact nocturnal species of animals, many of which are endangered. Migrating birds and native bats are sensitive to light pollution similar to what this project will produce. How will this be addressed, especially for the endangered, bat and migratory bird species?

Fire resources in this area are currently unable to support additional development. While this is not in the state mapped high fire severity area, this many additional residents will take away valuable firefighting resources (as seen in the 2017 and 2020 fires) where emergency services personnel have to
focus on evacuations rather than stopping the fire progression. This is an impact that is not addressed in the DEIR. What is the plan?

**Increased development and population in this area puts all neighbors at risk of increased fire incidents and decreased response to emergency services.**

Some neighbors put out small fires on their properties during the 2017 fires from falling embers. This area is not suitable for such high-density housing due to fire risk. The devastation due to fire of similar developments in Sonoma County communities like Fountain Grove, with similarly ill planned urban sprawl, are evidence of this problem.

During the 2017 fires we saw a big increase in car traffic on Hedgeside Ave while people were evacuating the surrounding areas. A High density dwelling project on Hedgeside would create an evacuation hazard for my family! How will this be addressed?

I look forward to hear back from you regarding the questions and concerns I mentioned in this email.

Warm regards,
Jessica McDonald
1023 Hedgeside Ave, Napa
June 14, 2022

I am writing because I have serious concerns about the proposed 125 unit housing development on Hedgeside Avenue at the “Bishop” site.

I live on McKinley Road just around the corner from where Hedgeside meets McKinley Road.

I am concerned that I was not notified about this project, I read about it in an article in the Napa Register. Shouldn’t nearby neighbors have been notified by the county? If I had been notified in time I would have liked to have had the opportunity to comment at the May Board of Supervisors meeting.

I see that this project seeks to circumvent the CEQA process, and I don’t approve of the “bulk zoning changes” mentioned in the DEIR. The DEIR does not address specific site concerns for the Bishop property.

Having been a resident of this neighborhood since 1994 some of my concerns are:

- The site is in the 100-year flood plain and I have seen it flood several times in my 28 years in the area. The Milliken Creek bridge floods regularly and has been damaged in some of the floods.

- Milliken Creek is a year-round waterway and it is a spawning habitat for several species of fish including but not limited to Steelhead and Salmon. The Creek is also home to the western pond turtle. This high-density development should not be near such an important natural resource.

- My neighbor when I moved here was Peggy Meister and she educated me about how Milliken Creek and its surrounding area were habituated by indigenous populations and how artifacts of these populations are evident in the area of the creek.
-The roads in the area that surrounds the project (Hedgeside, Estee and McKinley in particular) are a valuable resource for the residents of the neighborhood and beyond. In the mornings we see a high number of families and individuals walking or cycling the roads for exercise and relaxation. This would not be happening with the much higher level of traffic that the development of the Bishop site would cause, walkers and cyclists would be risking life and limb while hiking and biking the roads.

-I am hearing that this development would add around 1,000 additional vehicle trips per day. This will cause dangerous driving conditions because of many blind corners and challenging sight lines. Increasing traffic at this level on rural roads cannot help but endanger pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

-It seems obvious that a much better location for a high-density development such as this would be one with direct access to a major thoroughfare instead of hidden down a narrow, rural road. Many of the other sites on the list of six have access to better, more directly connected roads (think Atlas Peak and Monticello, Big Ranch Road and Trancas, Foster Road and even Skyline Park).

-There is a risk of wildfires in the area of this project, we have been evacuated in past wildfires. Although the actual fires didn’t reach properties in the area I heard of people on nearby properties finding burning embers in their yards that required extinguishing.

- With 125 possible residences in the proposed project one could easily expect and additional 250 residents and possibly more. This might easily double the number of residents in the neighborhood of Hedgeside, Estee and McKinley Road. This is extreme and would negatively impact the character of the entire area.
-When I read the Public Notice referring to the “notice of availability of a draft update to the Napa County general plan housing development” and I look at the section that refers to the DEIR and the “potentially significant impacts” many of my concerns and some others are mentioned:

1. aesthetics/recreation: this quiet, rural, heavily agricultural, low density neighborhood will be changed forever. These kinds of neighborhoods are becoming rare and are enjoyed not only by residents of the neighborhoods but by others who walk, cycle and visit the area.

2. agricultural resources: This development will remove 5 acres of land that have been used for agricultural purposes and should remain in that use.

3. Air Quality and Greenhouse gas emissions: Because of the huge increase in vehicle traffic this is a serious concern.

4. Biological resources: Think about Milliken Creek and the surrounding riparian habitat.

5. Noise: This is a very quiet and peaceful area and there will be a large increase in noise caused by a huge increase in the number of people and vehicles.

6. Land use and planning: There are so many reasons that this is not the best planning decision (placing such a high density project in a location with so many challenges and that is so out of character for the neighborhood).

7. Cultural and historic resources: Milliken Creek and its history of population by indigenous tribes and the fact that artifacts of these tribes are found in the area of the proposed development.
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8. Transportation and traffic: The nature of the roads in the area does not recommend any possible increase in traffic and the increase will be huge if this development is approved.

In closing I will say that this project in this neighborhood would be a problem for current residents of the neighborhood because it would severely change the character of the area and there would be problems of access for the new residents. I know that I would see it as a tragedy for residents who moved here because of the peaceful, rural atmosphere.

Please consider removing the Bishop property on Hedgeside Avenue from the list of possible sites.

Thank you for your time,
Dan Hurst
1617 McKinley Rd.
June 22, 2022

Mr. Trevor Hawkes
Napa County Planning Director
Napa, California

Dear Mr. Hawkes,

I am writing regarding the 2022 Housing Element Update. Kindly include this letter in public record. I learned about a potential project in my neighborhood from neighbors. The project involves high density housing on a property that is adjacent to mine which folks refer to as Bishop ranch. Our properties are separated by Milliken Creek. It seems odd and unfair to me to have such a project being considered without any formal notice to me.

After doing some research on what is being considered, I wanted to alert you of my strong opposition to considering this site for high density housing. Nothing I see would support high density housing in such a rural area. The list of concerns seems long and should compel the neighbors, planning professionals, and county officials to drop this area as a possible site. The list of concerns includes:

- Unsafe secondary roads that see a growing number of accidents and near accidents.
- Primary roads not built to handle such traffic patterns in this rural area.
- Undue pressure on Milliken Creek and the many wildlife species that would be negatively affected.
- Milliken Creek routinely floods adjacent properties so that such a project would entail a greatly distorted build area, putting other properties at high risk.
- Pressure on existing farms and agriculture in the very near area.
- Noise, crowding, traffic, lighting that all disturb existing residents and wildlife who reside here specifically due to the rural nature of the area.
- Some neighbors put out small fires in their yards during the 2017 fires from falling embers. This area is not suitable for such high-density housing due to fire risk. The devastation due to fire of similar developments in Sonoma County communities like Fountaingrove, with similarly ill planned urban sprawl, are evidence of this problem.

My family and I are 24-year residents of Napa County and are aware of multiple other superior sites for such a project if deemed needed.

Please let me know you received this letter. Also advise me on other steps I might take to oppose the proposed location via the proper channels. I would also appreciate your comments and point of view on the lack of proper notice.

Sincerely,

Teri W. Stevens

Teri W. Stevens
1819 McKinley Road
Napa, CA 94558
Email: teriwstevens@gmail.com
707-224-8616
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

We have been residents of Hedgeside Avenue since 1985 and were dismayed to hear about the possible rezoning of the Bishop property to be considered as a potential site for high density housing. There was no notification regarding this project prior to a letter we received earlier this month. We learned about it from our fellow Hedgeside neighbors. We missed the opportunity to voice our strong opposition to this project during public comment at the May, Board of Supervisors meeting because we were unaware.

We feel there are many obstacles to this site that render Hedgeside Avenue an inappropriate street for this type of project. This rural country road was never intended to handle the traffic that drastically increasing the number of homes would create. Our home is located at the corner of Hedgeside and McKinley and has been here since 1924. In the last thirty-seven years, we have seen an increase in traffic with very little growth on our street. Adding hundreds of cars to this street would exacerbate an already dangerous situation, both at the Hedgeside/McKinley corner and the Hedgeside/Monticello intersection.

After reading the Housing Element Update, we are convinced that the Bishop property is not an acceptable location for many reasons. The site is not accessible to mass transit, jobs, or commercial services (such as shopping and schools), by foot or bicycle. The sewer system, from what we understand, is already close to maximum capacity, with even existing homes in the Monticello Park area unable to access these services as their systems fail.

There are environmental issues that are also of concern to us. Milliken Creek, which dissects Hedgeside Avenue, is a critical habitat for threatened or endangered fish. Additionally, there are many nocturnal and other animals in this area that will be negatively impacted by high density buildings and the lights, traffic and noise associated with them. We are used to seeing or hearing coyotes, skunks, possums, raccoon, deer, hawks, quail and owls in our yard. With the proposed housing, that will be a thing of the past.

As we are all aware, we are experiencing extreme drought. Our well is dangerously low. What will an extra 100 housing units do to an already water starved area?

We have other concerns, regarding fire safety, crime, flooding and the preservation of our agricultural neighborhood, to name a few.

We respectfully ask that you choose another site that will follow your goals of accessibility to services and jobs, while retaining the country lane that we have called home for thirty-seven years.

Please include this letter in the 2022 Housing Element Update.

Sincerely,

Laura and James Gholson

1150 Hedgeside Avenue
June 27th, 2022

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

Dear Mr. Hawkes:

It has recently come to my attention that the City and County are considering designating a portion of Skyline Park for the construction of Housing. I read the Housing Element Update available on your website and I am really appalled.

The proposal is to establish a high-density housing project next to a school, lack of pedestrian access in a highly transited road without any provision for signage, traffic lights or regard for congestion.

The project will also impinge on the availability of space at Skyline Park, a place that was designed to be a public use open space by law and where many of our neighbors use to ride their horses. This is one of the last open spaces left for people to enjoy.

The parks and recreation areas by Napa College (as well as the surrounding areas) have been taken over by homeless encampments and drug abusers. To the point that I cannot take my grandkids to play there anymore, as syringes and broken glass are common findings on the grounds as well as human excrement.

The project at Skyline Park will generate disruption during construction, potential contamination to underground drinking water (which we all use from wells) and chemical pollution.

Hard to understand why this is a location being considered while others like the VA hospital in Yountville is not. That site for example has all the infrastructure in place.
It appears that this will be another attempt by the County to bypass citizen’s concerns and well-being, for political gain.

I strongly oppose this development and will gather our neighbors to do the same in a written fashion. I know they are opposed to it also.

Sincerely,

H. Daniel Perez, MD
2160 Imola Avenue
Napa, CA 94559
From: Janice Woods
To: PlanningCommissionClerk
Cc: Hawkes, Trevor
Subject: STOP THE DEVELOPMENT
Date: Monday, June 27, 2022 11:44:00 AM
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TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN,

I WAS HORRIFIED TO LEARN RECENTLY THAT SEVERAL SITES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED FOR POSSIBLE REZONING FOR RURAL HIGH DENSITY HOUSING. MY HUSBAND AND I MOVED TO NAPA TO GET AWAY FROM THE TRAFFIC & OVER BUILDING ON THE PENINSULA.

AFTER WORKING HARD FOR 40 YEARS, WE RETIRED AT THE END OF 2019 AND BUILT OUR HOME AT 1093 Hedgeside Avenue BECAUSE OF THE QUIET SERENITY OF LIVING IN A RURAL NEIGHBORHOOD THAT FILLED OUR HEARTS AS WE LOOKED OUT AT BISHOP RANCH AND ALL AROUND US. IF BISHOP RANCH IS REZONED AND MULTIPLE UNITS BUILT, IT WILL CHANGE THE AESTHETICS THAT WE ALL LOVE SO MUCH NOT TO MENTION THE MYRIAD OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEMS.

PERSONALLY, I ALSO THINK THE BISHOPS HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THAT THEIR SON IN LAW IS A DEVELOPER SO I'M SURE THERE ARE DOLLAR SIGNS IN THEIR EYES.

I DO NOT FEEL THAT WE WERE PROPERLY NOTIFIED ABOUT THIS AND HAVE TALKED TO MY IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS IN SURROUNDING STREETS TO HEDGESIDE AS WELL AS SILVERADO MEMBERS, HOME OWNERS IN THE SPRINGS, THE HIGHLANDS AND SURROUNDING AREAS. YOU SHOULD NO THAT NO ONE IS HAPPY ABOUT THIS. WE ARE GATHERING TOGETHER AND WE WILL FIGHT THIS AS WELL AS CONSULTING LEGAL REPRESENTATION. SURELY THERE IS ANOTHER PLACE TO PUT THIS TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT THAT DOES NOT IMPACT ALL OF THESE HOMEOWNERS? MY HUSBAND AND I ARE IN OUR 70'S AND NEVER DREAMT SOMETHING LIKE THIS WOULD EVER BE CONSIDERED. WE URGE YOU TO THINK WHAT THIS WILL DO TO NOT ONLY OUR QUIET ENJOYMENT BUT THE EFFECT SUCH A PROJECT WOULD HAVE ENVIRONMENTALLY, INCREASED TRAFFIC AND SO MUCH MORE.

JANICE AND TODD BALLARD
1093 Hedgeside Avenue
NAPA, CA
650-315-4090
Dear Trevor,

We were sickened to hear about the possibility of the County rezoning rural properties for high density use, specifically, the Bishop Ranch site on Hedgeside. It appears to us, this is a loophole on the Bishop's part to increase the value of their land at the cost of the entire neighborhood.

There are many open areas in Napa and we can't understand why this would be the site that would break the long standing tradition that Agricultural lands can convert into Residential. Where would you draw the line for future projects that want to check the State's box for increasing housing? Any vineyard could be considered or what about smaller 5 acre parcels can just decide that they want to be subdivided? We think this would turn into a nightmare for the Planning and Building Departments with an onslaught of property owners trying to increase the values of their land by re-zoning all in the name of "high density housing".

We had to "lend" our neighbor water for their land last fall because their well was no longer producing enough and the wait time for the Well Contractors to dig deeper was about 6 months. This means that many homeowner's in our neighborhood and probably others are experiencing this problem, hence the wait time. This along with fire danger, and the flooding that regularly occurs at the bridge should render this site unacceptable.

If this project goes any further, we would insist that a fire study, water supply study, sewer study, traffic study and flooding study all be completed before any vote could occur. We intend to make our voices heard at the meeting July 6th.

We would respectfully ask to be informed as to any meetings or information going forward.

Thank you,

Chris and Molly Mausser
1551 Estee Ave.
Napa, Ca
650-245-7856
Greetings,

Please include my letter in the record Re: 2022 Housing Element Update

My names is Jessica McDonald. I live at 1023 Hedgeside Ave in Napa with my husband and 12 year old son. We bought our home on Hedgeside Ave to be in a quiet agricultural setting with nature and minimal traffic of both people and vehicles. We have a cat, chickens for selling eggs and a livestock guard dog to protect our livestock.

Once we bought this property we realize there was a tremendous amount of history in this area. Our home was build in 1900 or prior, according to County Records and there is even an old canning basement under the house. We have found many artifacts on this property from old window weights, hand forged nails and stakes and an oxen plow. **We even found a grinding bowl and pestle made from rock on the property believed to be from the Native Americans who lived in this area.** This is an area that has an incredible amount of cultural and sensitive historical importance. Milliken Creek was an important resource for the existence of the Native Americans in the area. This unique area should be preserved. This is one of the few healthy creeks that have water flowing all year in the county so let’s be mindful to preserve this sensitive and important biological resource as well as honor these indigenous cultural sites where Native Americans lived.

Why was I not notified about this project? I was first aware of this when I saw the article in the paper. I am a neighbor within 1000 ft of the project so I consider this a violation of County Code for proper notification about significant projects. To date I have still not received any official notification about this site being included in the recently publish DEIR.

When will I be able to participate in the process to oppose this location as a potential site? I missed the opportunity to comment during the May Board of Supervisors Meeting. What can I do to have my comments be heard?

Since this type of project seeks to circumvent the CEQA process, I object to the "bulk zoning changes" put forth in the DEIR. The DEIR is inadequate and does not address specific site concerns for the Bishop property.

**Major Traffic Safety Issues!**

This project would generate an additional 1,250 or more car trips per day on a rural county road that was never designed for this type of use. It will exasperate accidents in these dangerous intersections.

Access to Hedgeside Ave is dangerous, as there is no left-hand turn lane from Monticello Rd. How will this be addressed?

Sightlines at Monticello Rd do not accommodate safe ingress and egress onto Hedgeside Ave or onto Monticello Rd. due to being at the bottom of a hill. How will this be addressed?

The intersection of Monticello Rd and Hedgeside Ave is currently dangerous (many cars have missed the turn and crashed into the Stahlecker fence). Many cars pass narrowly on the right around stopped vehicles waiting to turn left onto Hedgeside Avenue. With additional traffic, how will this left turn be addressed?
The intersection of Hardman and Estee is VERY dangerous due to limited sightlines and high traffic speed. I personally try to not go that way because of the inherent danger due to the limited sightlines. Adding 1250 or more trips per day in this area creates a clear danger to drivers. How will you address this intersection?

The intersection of McKinley and Atlas Peak is dangerous due to limited sightlines and high traffic speed. Numerous accidents occur at or near this location, including recent fatalities of intoxicated guests of Silverado Country Club.

Increasing traffic in rural areas that do not have city services, violates other policies of the general plan, and is counter to the traffic reduction goals of Napa County and the climate action plan.

Our speed limit was recently raised despite serious opposition

I have major concerns about the ecology of the area:

I am very concerned about sensitive nature of this area. Specifically in regards to the species in Milliken Creek. Milliken Creek is one of a handful of streams in the Napa River Watershed that hold water year-round and are critical spawning habitat for Steelhead, Coho Salmon, Chinook Salmon, 3-spined stickleback, California Roach and other threatened or endangered fish. Ultra-high density housing developments do not belong adjacent to such a sensitive and important biological resource.

The Creek and adjacent uplands around this project are home to western pond turtle, and offer important egg laying habitat for this species.

Why would you choose to put high density dwelling next to an important and sensitive habitat?

We need to be mindful to preserve areas in Napa County that have a rich Native American history:

As mentioned above, this site has numerous cultural resources, as creek adjacent properties were important areas for indigenous populations. Ample evidence, including evidence of my own, point to this area having significant cultural importance including artifacts. The indigenous people had camps that existed on or near this site including arrowheads, grinding bowls and other native American artifacts.

Do special studies or special considerations need to be made in order to make sure nothing is built on or near a burial ground or something of similar importance? Does the county care about the historical aspect of the Native Americans that inhabited the area? If so, how would that be preserved and honored?

Where do we get the extra water needed to support this project?

We are currently experiencing major drought conditions that will continue to intensify with no end in sight. Where will the water come from for this project? The state wants to reduce water usage, yet this project requires extremely high-water demand from an already over-allocated system.
Our property falls within the Milliken-Sarco water deficient zone. Isn’t it counter intuitive to build high density dwelling while right next door we are considered a water deficient zone therefor having to adhere to strict guideline for water usage?

**Location, Location, Location….fire, flood, farming and more. Hedgeside is a TERRIBLE location for this project for additional reasons outlined:**

High density housing is incompatible with the agricultural nature of this area.

This development will infringe on the right to farm. There are many active farms in the area that are under constant attack to reduce noise from regular operations like wind machines.

Adding so many new neighbors threatens the right to farm for existing agriculture operations in the area.

This development is incompatible with 50 plus years of zoning in Napa County, and is incompatible with many of the general plan policies in place today.

An increase in crime is a concern, as Sheriff patrols in our area are infrequent at best. This development will require an increase in police services that are currently inadequate in unincorporated Napa County. Increase property crime and agricultural property thefts are on a steep increase, and urban sprawl projects like this increase crime in rural areas.

This development will have growth inducing impacts that are not adequately addressed in the DEIR and would violate CEQA under normal circumstances. Please explain when these impacts will be assessed? How will they be discussed publicly so we have a chance to raise additional concerns?

Is the requirement to be in an unincorporated area of Napa? But shouldn’t the locations being considered still “make sense”? Are there other locations that have better access to services and conveniences such as a grocery store or target within bike riding or walking distance? Is there a location that is closer to bus routes and other services that are already established and in place for low income?

This Development is located within the 100 year flood plain and significant flooding has occurred on the proposed project site. As Sea Levels and Flood Levels rise with Climate Change, this project is in the wrong location.

During floods, Milliken Creek at Hedgeside Avenue is flooded and impassable. All traffic would have to exit at Monticello Rd. Monticello Rd at Silverado trail is also flooded during these times. Exits are limited during flood periods that are increasingly frequent. How would this be addressed?

Lighting from this project will impact nocturnal species of animals, many of which are endangered. Migrating birds and native bats are sensitive to light pollution similar to what this project will produce. How will this be addresses, especially for the endangered, bat and migratory bird species?

Fire resources in this area are currently unable to support additional development. While this is not in the state mapped high fire severity area, this many additional residents will take away valuable firefighting resources (as seen in the 2017 and 2020 fires) where emergency services personnel have to
focus on evacuations rather than stopping the fire progression. This is an impact that is not addressed in the DEIR. What is the plan?

**Increased development and population in this area puts all neighbors at risk of increased fire incidents and decreased response to emergency services.**

Some neighbors put out small fires on their properties during the 2017 fires from falling embers. This area is not suitable for such high-density housing due to fire risk. The devastation due to fire of similar developments in Sonoma County communities like Fountain Grove, with similarly ill planned urban sprawl, are evidence of this problem.

During the 2017 fires we saw a big increase in car traffic on Hedgeside Ave while people were evacuating the surrounding areas. A High density dwelling project on Hedgeside would create an evacuation hazard for my family! How will this be addressed?

I look forward to hear back from you regarding the questions and concerns I mentioned in this email.

Warm regards,
Jessica McDonald
1023 Hedgeside Ave, Napa
Dear Trevor Hawkes,

My name is Maureen Hewitt and I am the homeowner of 1145 Hedgeside Ave, Napa California 94558. My family and I live within 1000 feet of the proposed Bishop housing development. Unfortunately, we were never notified of this proposed development until just recently. This isn’t normally how a transparent and collegial process would take place. Community relationships are important, and this was completely overlooked and under communicated. This particular development site, should it occur, will create many negative impacts in our neighborhood. I strongly oppose this particular site for development. To be clear, I am not opposed to affordable housing and have developed and built both tax credit and HUD housing in my career. This location, however, is counter intuitive for a very low income and multi-story development. From my professional experience, for an affordable housing develop to be successful, it should be well planned, carefully studied with regard to needed services, access, and safety. Additionally, consideration of the impacts to the current community both environmentally and financially should be examined.

I will summarize below my concerns as well requests for Q&A

1. I believe that Napa county has traffic reduction goals as well as a climate action plan. Increasing traffic in a rural area that doesn’t have city services appears to violate the policies of the General Plan. Can you provide a study that has analyzed traffic conditions and patterns?

2. Safety concerns currently exist on Hedgeside Avenue, to include an allowable speed limit of 40 MPH, narrow road, lack of sidewalks, a bridge and a significant blind curve as it is a rural road. Many residents on Hedgeside include children and seniors. What is the plan to address these safety risks that will only be
compounded by the Bishop development? Is there is a plan for analysis and resident review prior to any decision being made?

3. This particular site is in a high risk area for fire. Has this been analyzed, and what is the plan to ensure adequate resources to include police and fire personnel, as well as how will the markedly increased volume of residents safely evacuate in the event of a fire on a narrow country road?

4. Environmentally the state of California/Napa continue to experience drought conditions. This particular project will require high usage of water from an already over allocated system. What’s the plan for this, and can you provide any analysis to show otherwise?

5. This development infringes on the agricultural operations in the area. What will be the impact, and what studies have been provided for the community to review? To date, I haven’t seen any reports. Additionally, are environmental reports available to residents that assess the impact to and protection of the wildlife and near by Milliken Creek?

I encourage you and the Napa County Planning Commission to reconsider any approvals on this project. While affordable housing is an important component in communities, these projects require much diligence and vigilant planning to be efficacious. I look forward to a response to my questions and joining you at the next public meeting.

Sincerely,

Maureen L. Hewitt.
1145 Hedgeside Ave
Napa, Ca 94558
June 29, 2022

Attention: Trevor Hawkes
Napa County, 1195 Third Street, Napa, CA 94559
trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org

Subject: 2022 High Density Dwelling / Bishop Property Re-Zoning

Dear Minh:

Please know, we support the effort of adding High Density Dwelling housing in Napa, but it must be in the right location, with close access to doctors, shopping, and city transportation.

On behalf of the Hedgeside residences, I want to go on record “objecting the proposed zoning changes” put forth by the DEIR for the Bishop property on Hedgeside Avenue in Napa.

We are disappointed in our Napa County Representatives for not notifying us regarding the possibility of the location of this project! We consider it a violation of County Code for proper notification about significant projects.

CONCERNS
- Traffic Safety - The intersection of Monticello Road and Hedgeside Avenue is very dangerous. We’ve noticed that once some people finally turn on Hedgeside, they speed past our home causing a risk to our child and pets, into the dangerous blind curve.
- Fire Safety - Increased development and population puts all neighbors at risk of increased fire incidents and decreased response to emergency services.
- City Water and Sewer Service – Not available.
- No lighting along Hedgeside – None, very dark at night and increased crime.

QUESTIONS
1. What is the deciding factor of where the development will be built? As the further away from downtown, the higher cost to taxpayers.
2. What is the budget $$ for this project? Including the cost of needed Infrastructure and all other county services.
3. Has an environmental impact study been performed at the Bishop Property?
   o For endangered species that live in this area near the creek.
   o Was this a Native American burial site? Adjacent properties have ample evidence of this area being inhabited by Native Americans.
4. Project Notification – Has the entire Silverado Residential Community been informed?

Thank you and we look forward to your reply.

Curtis McDonald - 707.310.1569
June 29, 2022

Mr. Trevor Hawkes
Napa, California

Dear Mr. Hawkes,

I am writing regarding the 2022 Housing Element Update. Kindly include this letter in public record. I learned about a potential project in my neighborhood from neighbors. The project involves high density housing on a property that is adjacent to mine which folks refer to as Bishop ranch. Our properties are separated by Milliken Creek. It seems odd and unfair to me to have such a project being considered without any formal notice to me.

After doing some research on what is being considered, I wanted to alert you of my strong opposition to considering this site for high density housing. Nothing I see would support high density housing in such a rural area. The list of concerns seems long and should compel the neighbors, planning professionals, and county officials to drop this area as a possible site. The list of concerns includes:

- Unsafe secondary roads that see a growing number of accidents and near accidents.
- Primary roads not built to handle such traffic patterns in this rural area.
- Undue pressure on Milliken Creek and the many wildlife species that would be negatively affected.
- Milliken Creek routinely floods adjacent properties so that such a project would entail a greatly distorted build area, putting other properties at high risk.
- Pressure on existing farms and agriculture in the very near area.
- Noise, crowding, traffic, lighting that all disturb existing residents and wildlife who reside here specifically due to the rural nature of the area.

My family and I are 24-year residents of Napa County and are aware of multiple other superior sites for such a project if deemed needed.

Please let me know you received this letter. Also advise me on other steps I might take to oppose the proposed location via the proper channels. I would also appreciate your comments and point of view on the lack of proper notice.

Sincerely,

William A. Stevens

William A. Stevens
1819 McKinley Road
Napa, CA 94558
[External Email - Use Caution]

Trevor,

Good morning!! I am writing to say that I(we) oppose the development of the Bishop Ranch Property for the following reasons:

THE CURVE

The street is very narrow as it is and dangerous to children, and the many walkers, joggers and bikes near the turn. I saw in one drive down Hedgeside just today, 3 bike riders, 4 joggers and 2 walkers. Some people actually park and walk here from other areas. The curve is extremely dangerous.

OLD ROADS AND BRIDGE

The Bridge is old and narrow to add an additional 300+ or more cars a day would not be good for the bridge or the road. The road is not in good shape now, and is narrow all the way down with no sidewalk. As it is because there is no sidewalk or shoulder, we have to drive on the wrong side many times a day to get around delivery trucks, mail man, garbage man, people collecting their mail, walkers, joggers, bikers. What would an additional 300 cars look like doing this?

With the bridge already in place and narrow how would you widen the road? If you widen the Bridge and the road how much would that cost the City/County. Or should I say tax payers???

What about Estee it is also narrow and extremely dangerous at the top turning onto Hardman. Guaranteed to be many accidents there as well. I am guessing we would also need a Stop Light or Sign at Hedgeside on Monticello as well, because turning there will become a bigger hazard. I have already been rear ended trying to turn onto Hedgeside. With that much traffic we would have to control it some how. With that cost, pile on top the cost to repair and enlarge the sewer and water?

POLLUTION TO THE CREEK AND FIRE DANGER

Lastly, our biggest concern is actually for the creek. The creek as it is, is visited by outsiders using it a swimming hole in the hot weather, they liter, smoke, paint graffiti under the bridge, use it to party in, and bring their animals, kids, etc. We have found broken bottles, chairs, food wrappers, food, and much more on our property and under the bridge. Isn't this contaminating the Creek?? I am guessing cigarette butts and garbage is not great for the wild life. The creek runs all year round,
so hanging out under the bridge is going to contaminate the water. Who is going to clean up under the bridge? They worry about people cutting back vegetation, can you imagine the damage and pollution all the people will create? Not to mention fire hazard, to all the property along the creek. There are many trees that are old and dying along the creek that are pending PG&E removal. What if one caught on fire? How long before it travels?? My guess is pretty quick!!

All owners of property near the creek would have to deal the garbage, noise and fire danger with it becoming a common place for all the kids and adults to hang out. And don’t think they won’t. They will!!! Are they proposing a swimming pool or two for these low income houses?? If not you can bet the kids will be in the creek. They won’t care if it is private property or that they are contaminating the wild life.

I know I don’t just speak for myself. The whole area out here is opposed to this. It just doesn’t make sense to put it here. With all the cost the would incur there has to be a better place than here. It is old and frail, and one of the last places that is like being in the country. We would really like to keep it that way.

Thank you !

Lorri and Brandon Sax
1133 Hedgeside Ave.
Napa, CA 94558

Cell 707-815-4064
From: garrett.premiervit.com
To: Hawkes, Trevor; Morrison, David; Tran, Minh; Pedroza, Alfredo; Cortez, Nelson; andrewmazotti@gmail.com; Wagenknecht, Brad; Gregory, Ryan; Dillon, Diane; Ramos, Belia; joellegPC@gmail.com; Whitmer, David; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; Dameron, Megan; Info@savehedgeside.com
Subject: No to "Bishop Site" Comments on 2022 Housing Element Plan
Date: Friday, July 1, 2022 10:06:54 AM

[External Email - Use Caution]

Trevor,

Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update. I recognize that comments are sent post agenda, but would like these to be included in the record.

I'm a direct neighbor to the Bishop project and am vehemently opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" in the HEU update for many reasons, some of which I will try my best to articulate here:

I also plan to submit additional comments for inclusion into the plan prior to your July 11th deadline.

Traffic:
The increase in traffic (1,250+ car trips per) day on such a small rural county road poses serious safety concerns.

- There is no left hand turn lane on Hedgeside Avenue/Monticello Rd. Does the plan include the State of California installing a left hand turn lane from Monticello onto Hedgeside Ave? If so, will the project applicants pay for that turn lane, or who will be responsible for the cost of this upgrade. If this were any other Project in the County, a left hand turn lane would be a requirement for much less planned traffic than this project would generate.
- The speed limit was recently raised on our street despite numerous public opposition and very real concerns about pedestrian safety.
- There is no bike lane or striping along the shoulder on Hedgeside currently. With so many new proposed residents, is there a plan for widening, inclusion of a bike lane and installation of sidewalks as if this were a development inside city limits? How does the draft HEU account for the cost associated with these needed upgrades if the project were to move forward? Is there enough room to install these upgrades and still be compliant with our road and street standards for fire safety?
- We have an extremely dangerous set of corners right at the proposed project site with very limited sight lines. How does the Draft EIR address this very real concern and mitigate for the increased problems with traffic safety?
- Pulling out of our driveway safely is increasingly challenging to do safely for oncoming traffic. What is the plan to improve safety at this site if it moves forward?
- Estee and Hardman is an extremely dangerous intersection with limited sightlines. How does the HEU and the Draft EIR plan to improve traffic safety for the 1250 new car trips per day generated by the project, most of which will also use this intersection?
- McKinley and Atlas peak is also an extremely dangerous intersection with limited sightlines. How does the HEU and the Draft EIR plan to improve traffic safety for the 1250 new car trips per day generated by the project, many of which will also use this
intersection?

- Has the greenhouse gas emissions been properly accounted for and mitigated in this HEU update? 1,250 new car trips per day from this site alone would be counter to the County policy of reducing greenhouse gas emissions per AB 32 and other directives. Does this traffic plan meet the recent new requirements from the Air Board for greenhouse gas mitigation? How is this addressed properly in the HEU?

**Biological Resources:**
Urban sprawl like this project proposes would place extreme burden on biological resources in the area, especially on a site so close to Milliken Creek.

- Milliken creek runs year round and is critical spawning habitat for endangered Steelhead, endangered Coho Salmon, Chinook salmon, California roach, three spined stickleback, numerous threatened macro-invertebrates, and other special status species. Western Pond Turtle, newts and salamanders all live onsite and frequent the project location. I find the HEU woefully deficient in addressing the impact on biological resources. How will this project and the HEU address and mitigate for the impact on such a sensitive ecosystem? Will there be mitigation measures installed for western Pond Turtle nesting sites? We routinely see turtles nesting in the uplands more than 500 ft from the creek and project site.

- As an avid birdwatcher, there are abundant species in the area, many of which are special status or endangered species that frequent or live on the project site. I’m concerned that the impacts to these birds are not adequately addressed and violate other statutes for protection under California law. How will the HEU and DEIR address this very important area and mitigate for the loss of habitat and disruption to these protected species? **White Tailed Kites** nest in the Eucalyptus tree on the project site and across the creek in tall trees adjacent to the site. They use the open field as very successful hunting grounds. The impact on this protected species will be enormous and is not contained in the current plan. We have been elated that over the past several years **Peregrine Falcon** frequent the project site to hunt, and have nesting locations along eastern hills. How will this habitat be mitigated for the once nearly extinct peregrine falcon?

- This site is prime nesting habitat for Burrowing owl as well. Bank swallows nest and use the creek for habitat, and such an increase in local population will threaten this species further. Tricolored Blackbird, Swainson’s Hawk, Golden Eagle, Northern harrier, San Pablo Song Sparrow, and many other threatened species all frequent this area at different times during the year. How are the impacts to these species being accounted for?

**Growth Inducing impacts:**
This is a very real concern with the Bishop project in particular. This site is in the MST, and as such has major development restrictions in place since 2004. This project, once rezoned, would force
upgrades to the sewer service line running to Silverado country club. These upgrades, once completed, will allow for additional commercial and residential expansion to proceed along the Monticello corridor, at Silverado Country club, and Atlas Peak Road. The upgrading of the sewer line is in itself a growth inducing impact and is not addressed in the HEU DEIR. How does the County plan on rectifying this fact, and account for the future CEQA impacts as a result of the growth inducing impacts this project will initiate?

There are numerous other “projects” in the area that have not been allowed due to sewer capacity. If this project gets approved and sewer upgrades are made with taxpayer dollars, are these other projects going to be allowed to move forward? If so, this would be a major growth inducing impact and violate the CEQA guidelines for the HEU and General Plan EIR.

**Affordable housing:**

- Are these units going to be deed restricted? We are hearing that there is no actual requirement for a project developer to provide accountability with the “affordability” of these units. How does the HEU address this deficiency? Will the County mandate that a portion of these “units” be deed restricted, Section 8, or other mechanisms to stay “affordable”?

**Zoning:**

- The “project site” is to be re-zoned from RC to RM. Will the whole APN be rezoned to RM? If so, what is to stop this owner from developing another 1000 units on the rest of the property? How is this addressed in the HEU or the General plan?
- It is questionable how this property originally became RC zoning. When was it rezoned to RC from AW, and why?
- Rezoning RC properties into RW represents a clear change to historical county policy. RW does not allow for agricultural uses to exist. If this property is not built out in the 10 year timeline of the HEU and General Plan, does it preclude this property from having agricultural uses on it during that time? This would be counter to the main tenet in the General plan of having “agriculture be the highest and best use of the land”. Most or all of the sites in the last general plan update were not converted to this housing use for various reasons, is it possible that this site gets rezoned and not built; then no other agriculture can exist there until the zoning is changed back? Agriculture is under constant threat of development in California and the US. This represents a clear threat to agriculture and the loss of an extremely threatened resource.
- Other sites that are zoned commercial or “surplus Property” are more suited to this intensification of use than one currently zoned to allow for agricultural uses.

**Notifications:**

I have been extremely disappointed that I and most of our neighbors had to hear about this “project” so late in the process. We have been striving to be the best county in the state for notification and inclusion of neighbors in development processes like wineries, hotels, re-zoning, etc. I feel this was a grave mistake by Napa County to not include neighbors in this discussion much earlier on. Some people learned about this and other potential sites just last week with a mailer. It’s
my understanding that this issue is to be completed by August, which would be the fastest pace any
development has ever happened in this County. I understand the complexities of dealing with State
Mandates, but please do not rush to pass this HEU without addressing our neighborhood concerns.
If this project moves forward, it threatens to completely change the face of the Vichy, Monticello,
Silverado, Hedgeside, Estee, McKinley, Atlas Peak area. Smart planning is something that we do
extremely well in this County, and I would hate to see 50 years of that success be foiled by such a
hastily executed process.
Thank you for including my thoughts in the record. I look forward to adding more concerns as this
process moves forward.

Sincerely,

Garrett Buckland
1024 Hedgeside Ave
From: yreznikov@gmail.com
To: Hawkes, Trevor; Morrison, David; Tran, Minh; Pedroza, Alfredo; Cortez, Nelson; andrewmazotti@gmail.com; Wagenknecht, Brad; Gregory, Ryan; Dillon, Diane; Ramos, Bella; joellegPC@gmail.com; Whitmer, David; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; Dameron, Megan; Info@savehedgeside.com
Subject: No to "Bishop Site" Comments on 2022 Housing Element Plan
Date: Friday, July 1, 2022 2:41:39 PM

Dear Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because of several reasons:

1. **Traffic**

   The traffic in the area is already not safe. My car was totaled in the accident when somebody rear ended me on the turn from Monticello to Hedgeside. There is no turning lane. In addition Hedgeside road is narrow and has a blind turn. Therefore it is already unsafe in normal conditions. I only could imagine how situation will deteriorate should you add 1500 car trips per day. And this is not counting force majeure caused by fire (Fire concerns are below) evacuation, which happened in this area on a regular basis. The bridge on Hedgeside is narrow and during flood (Flood concerns are below) is not passable. Adding so many families to already traffic congested school would be a nightmare. Due to schools closing in Napa, morning and afternoon traffic to and from Vichy School, already spread to other areas.

   Please, advise how are you planning to mitigate traffic issue. Roads, turns, bridge, lights.

2. **Flood**

   Our area is located in a flood zone. My house was flooded several times above my floor level. My mortgage company requested from me to purchase flood insurance, which is not cheap. And I wonder how low income residents would be able to afford it. Proposed project will reduce watershed in already flood prone area. During flood bridge on Hedgeside is under 2 feet of water. Reducing watershed will increase properties to be flooded causing tremendous concerns and huge expenses for the property owners.

   Please, advise how are you planning to mitigate flood concerns (Bridge on Hedgeside, widen Millikan Creek channel along the creek to connection with Napa river). How will you protect existing properties from flood and how will you compensate residents should you fail to do so?

3. **Fire**

   In resent years area was evacuated during fires. Granted that you may bring city water to water deficient area to deal with fires. But surge in traffic will be extremely high. Any bottle neck on the road will jeopardize all residents as far as Lake Berryessa. This could put a lot of lives in danger. It would be problematic to evacuate all the residents
in proposed development. Due to time constrains and sheer number of people.

Please, advise how are you planning to mitigate fire concerns.

4. **Environmental and Social**

I believe that Napa positioning itself as a wine country. Putting such development in a rural area, where tourists are visiting to admire nature, will diminish this image. I also believe that some social events so cherished by community and visitors, might be affected. Traffic will deter people from visiting Silverado Golf Course and eventually kill Fortinet Golf Championship in Silverado Golf Club which Napa is so famous for. Development will change rural community to urban. Effecting a lot of lives and tourists perception. Proposed site is a transitional home to some wild life during migration and development will eliminate their habitat.

Please, advise how will you accommodate migratory birds losing habitat. How do you perceive change from rural to urban will be affecting community and tourists.

5. **General Low Income housing requirements**

Low income communities have certain requirements to flourish. First of all they need a developed infrastructure reachable by foot. Area where proposed development is located has no infrastructure. It is 100% car dependent. There is no stores, medical or any other facilities required for families. In order to mitigate this issue, public transportation have to be brought. However, besides expense to do it, traffic will interfere and negate this solution.

I perfectly understand the need for low income housing. However the chosen site have to be adequate to accommodate such development. Based on all of the above I do not see that any site on or around Hedgeside will be acceptable.

Regards,
Yakov Reznikov
1101 Hedgeside Ave., Napa CA
We received a flyer today notifying us of this proposed development and we want to go on record as opposing this very strongly for the following reasons. We have lived in our home located at 1059 Monticello Rd. so feel qualified to offer our input.

1. Traffic - we have to wait on many occasions up to five minutes to exit our driveway onto Monticello Road. The speed limit of 40 mph is for the most part ignored. Police speed patrols are very rare if non-existent. This is an extremely busy and dangerous road as it is right now.
2. There is no public transportation in this area so at 2 cars per proposed household how many additional autos will this development dump onto Monticello Rd?
3. Traffic noise is loud from 6am until 8pm as it is - more cars, more noise, & increased danger for pedestrians and bicyclists.
4. Sewage: the majority of homeowners in this area are on septic systems. The Silverado septic line runs along Monticello Rd. on the opposite side of the road from our house and we have been told since this line is running at capacity we cannot tap into it. How is sewage & wastewater disposal proposed for this development?

The concerns of watershed health and increased greenhouse gas emissions are also of concern.

Regards,
Jay & Thina Brooks

--
Jay Brooks
707-570-8353
jaybrooks09@gmail.com
Mr. Hawkes:
Please present the information in the attached link to the County supervisors.
Is clearly an abomination to allow building within Skyline Park and a slap in the
face for the community.

https://www.sierraclub.org/redwood/napa/blog/2022/05/red-flag-warning-
save-skyline-wilderness-park-development-roland-dumas-phd

Please acknowledge receipt of this email for our records.

H. Daniel Perez, MD
2160 Imola Avenue
Napa, CA 94559
(415)465-4070
dperez@naiapharma.com
Red Flag Warning: Save Skyline Wilderness Park from Development, by Roland Dumas, PhD

May 24, 2022

The integrity of Skyline Wilderness Park is at risk. The county and the state need to know that taking this parkland for housing development of any kind is unthinkable, and it is not available to even be considered for development. It is an extremely valuable community shared resource and is in no way “surplus” undeveloped land to be considered any time there is a need for a for a list of available sites.

The state has mandated development of low income (affordable) housing in Napa County and provided rules as to where such development might happen. There is a set of locations where this development may happen, and it becomes the responsibility of the Board of Supervisors to select the site or sites. The Housing Element Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission review the sites and makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

One of those sites is Skyline Wilderness Park. Each of our supervisors should know better than to put development in this (or any) park, but given that there has been no statement to that effect, we need to let them know individually and as a group, that this park should never appear on a list of potential development sites. Never.
Skyline park is owned by the state and leased to the county for use as a public park. The county delegates the operation of the park to the Skyline Park Citizens Association. Since its opening in 1983, the number of visitors and communities has increased dramatically. Currently, there are hiking, biking, equestrian, native plant, disc golf, and archery clubs that call Skyline Park home, and the park is used for activities ranging from RV camping, tent camping, 4H activities, scouting, fishing, and large group events, not to mention picnicking and wildlife. Maintenance and enhancement of the park is funded by user fees, supplemented by volunteer groups; no public monies go to the support of the operation of the park.

Skyline is one of those rare places where people of different interests and backgrounds come together and share the resource with everyone else. You will encounter every demographic in the valley, and everyone is sharing smiles and respecting each other’s use and activities. “Skyline Park is unique in the region both in the breadth of its activities and facilities offered, the beauty of its vistas, and the friendliness and warmth of its regular users and visitors. People here are having a good time and getting along with one another in a way that we just don’t see elsewhere” says Andrew Brooks, the park’s president.

During the pandemic lockdown, the number of visitors skyrocketed, increasing almost three times; the park was one of the very few places where people could unwind, exercise, destress, and take in the beauty of nature that the park preserves.

There is no comparable park in Napa County. There are parks with great hiking and camping opportunities, but nothing that comes close to the every-citizen park. In New York City, there is Central Park. In Los Angeles, there is Griffith Park, in Napa Valley, there is Skyline Park.

There is motion to transfer ownership of the park from the state to Napa County, which involves a series of bureaucratic steps and a purchase. That would preserve the park in perpetuity and protect it from development or subdivision. In the steps, the state needs to declare the property as “surplus”, which was done in 2019. As “surplus”, however, it becomes eligible for designation as a low-income housing site. In the process of conserving the park, it goes through a designation that
makes it vulnerable to development. We, as citizens of Napa County, need to let the county and state know that they should not even think about chopping parts of the park off for development.

While it will be difficult for our elected officials to select the eventual site, with various advantages and problems associated with each option, we need to be very clear. Under no circumstance should Skyline Park be considered as a site for development. Not a large piece. Not a small sliver. Never should that be considered. It is irreplaceable. It is already being used at its highest potential as a community and open space asset. Encroachment into Skyline Wilderness Park sets a very bad precedent that shared parklands are open to development, and additional slices of Skyline Park would become more likely. If Skyline stays on the list of potential development sites, it will become easier and easier to destroy the park, bit by bit.

Skyline Park has two topographical segments. There are the hiking, biking, and equestrian trails in the hilly area and there is a relatively flat section along Impala. The County is eyeing a slice of the flat section for development. The flat areas are the greater source of revenue that funds park maintenance. More importantly, they are the spaces that accommodate large group and community activities. They are important to the integrity of the park.


We might also note that the particular area under consideration is in the path of silica dust that plumes from Syar quarry operations when they do blasting. Creating permanent residences in that plume constitutes a health hazard which could be protested in the name of environmental equity.
and justice. We don’t think we need to invoke that consideration because the overarching principle should prevail: **do not put housing development in a park.**

We encourage all citizens of Napa County to write to members of the Housing Element Advisory Committee, members of the Planning Commission, and their Board of Supervisors representative and to our State Senator, Bill Dodd and to our representative to the State Assembly, Cecilia Aguiar-Curry. They should know that the citizens of Napa support keeping Skyline Park as a park in perpetuity, and not be subject to consideration for development for any purposes.

We are not against affordable housing. We need that. We also need to protect open spaces, parks, and wilderness areas. Development should be placed in underutilized locations that are not being fully enjoyed as community and environmental resources.

Please write or call to tell our representatives, **“Do not even think about it.”:**

**District 1: Brand Wagenknecht:** brand.wagenknecht@countyofnapa.org
(mailto:brand.wagenknecht@countyofnapa.org) 707-253-4828

**District 2: Ryan Gregory:** ryan.gregory@countyofnapa.org
(mailto:ryan.gregory@countyofnapa.org) 707-259-8276

**District 3: Diane Dillon:** Diane.Dillon@countyofnapa.org (mailto:Diane.Dillon@countyofnapa.org) 707-253-4827

**District 4: Alfredo Pedroza:** alfredo.pedroza@countyofnapa.org
(mailto:alfredo.pedroza@countyofnapa.org) 707-259-8278

**District 5: Belia Ramos:** belia.ramos@countyofnapa.org (mailto:belia.ramos@countyofnapa.org) 707-259-8277

**State Senator Bill Dodd:** https://sd03.senate.ca.gov/contact
(https://sd03.senate.ca.gov/contact)

**State Assembly Representative Cecilia Aguiar-Curry:** https://a04.asmdc.org/contact
(https://a04.asmdc.org/contact)

Signed:
The Conservation Committee of the Sierra Club Napa Group.

Frequently Asked Questions

The park is 850 acres. Losing a 5 acre slice won't harm it much, will it?
The largest section of the park is the hilly trail area. The flat area along Imola is much smaller. Taking a 5 acre slice of the flat area will impair the ability of the park to host large group activities. It also impairs the revenue that supports the park. It is significant.

Most importantly, the state has designated 20 acres as “surplus” and eligible for housing. This is just the first slice. If the county uses it, the next slices are inevitable. When the full 20 acres has been subtracted from the park, the park’s viability is at risk. It will not be able to host large group activities. No BottleRock camping, scout camps, horse camping and events, Suscol Intertribal events. The list of events that will go away is long.

What activities happen on the area designated as “surplus”?
Just as is the case with the county fairgrounds, on any day, you might drive by and see nothing going on. Then, the site might be full of tents, cars, horses and horse trailers, or large groups of people in training activities or celebrations.

I'm a hiker, this won't affect me, will it?
The park has a lot of synergy. There are areas designated for archery, disc golf, RV camping, native plant gardens, etc. There are many hikers and bikers who move through the flat area right to the trails. They may not realize that the excellent trail maintenance is supported by revenue from activities on the flat areas. It affects you.

How soon will decisions be made?
The County Planning Commission will discuss this on July 6 at 9AM.

The Housing Element Advisory Committee will meet on July 14. Written public comments must be received by 4PM July 11.

What are the alternative locations for affordable housing?
There are many suitable locations. Skyline is being considered as one of the sites not in the city, though it is just across the street from Napa City.

The other sites being considered are:

- Spanish Flat
- Bishop, NE of Napa
- Altamura, NE of Napa
- Big Ranch Rd
- Foster Rd

We think there are sites in addition to these. Right next to the park is the large state hospital grounds, most of which is unused. A 5 acre parcel can easily be carved out of that without disrupting any activities and beneficial services. Our job is not to scout locations, though. That is the job of the state and county specialists.

**Didn’t the state and county know that this is a park? Why would they designate a park for housing?**

In the various documents, Skyline is referred to as “state owned land on Imola.” The actual name and importance of the location is not mentioned. In the selection criteria, the study is supposed to describe the current use of the properties. There is no evidence that anyone looked at the park or talked to the Skyline Citizens Council to find out how important this property is. It is discussed just as a piece of land and not its value to the community as is.

Inspiring/Provoking (/napa-sierra-club-group-taxonomy/inspiring-provoking)

---

**Our Skyline Park Is at Risk. Please Help!**

The state and county are poised to damage Skyline Park forever by selling off pieces of it to build housing. While there is no question that affordable housing is a critically important need in Napa, meeting that need should not come at the expense of losing this environmental and community jewel. The financial viability of Skyline depends upon it remaining whole, and your voice is needed to protect it and to help create affordable housing elsewhere.

Please tell your county officials to protect our park, and to steer development to areas not currently used for beneficial community and environmental activities. *And be sure to add your own voice to the letter.*

For more detailed information on this issue, including FAQs, please read our previous article, *Red Flag*
Warning, Save Skyline Wilderness Park from Development,
(https://www.sierraclub.org/redwood/napa/blog/2022/05/red-flag-warning-save-skyline-wilderness-
park-development-roland-dumas-phd) by Roland Dumas, PhD
(https://www.sierraclub.org/redwood/napa/blog/2022/05/red-flag-warning-save-skyline-wilderness-
park-development-roland-dumas-phd). Thank you for all you do for our environment and our community.

Send Your Message Today (https://act.sierraclub.org/actions/Redwood?actionId=AR0362975)

Please sign up below to receive the Napa Group’s

*eNewsletter*

Sign Up for CA Redwood Napa County Group Updates Email

Email  
email

First Name  Last Name  
first name  last name

City  Zip Code  
city  zip code

Sign Up!
Join and/or Donate to the Sierra Club’s Napa Group Today!

We are working tirelessly to ensure clean air and water for all, to protect wildlife and wild places, and fight for environmental justice here in Napa County. Best of all, 100% of your gift stays local and gives us the resources to work on the issues you care about. Thank you!

[Donate](https://act.sieraclub.org/gp/votit_campaign_designform_id=7013q0000008yobb&formcampainid=701310000008mUKjcmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=SZK87QJ95GLS4&source)

Napa Home ([http://www.sierraclub.org/redwood/napa](http://www.sierraclub.org/redwood/napa))
Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because of the negative impact to this neighborhood, we live at 1093 Hedgeside as well as our neighbors at Silverado. Rezoning Bishop ranch would be a huge mistake. Hedgeside is a narrow and dangerous street to drive as it is. Adding another 1200+ cars to this road does not make any rational sense. High density housing would change this rural neighborhood into an urban neighborhood which again makes no sense. There are plenty of other places in Napa this could be accomplished without the devastating impact to other neighbors. We have been dealing with fires and have had to evacuate. Adding high density housing would make this more dangerous as the main road out would be Monticello. Bishop ranch and Hedgeside has also had to deal with flooding which would be another problem. We don’t even know what the environmental impact would be. So I urge you to consider all of these things and do not rezone Bishop ranch.

Janice and Todd Ballard...
Dear All,

Sending a brief note for your consideration regarding potential development activity at Skyline PARK.

Problem:
I do not believe this is a good site for ANY Residential development because:

1. Infrastructure can not support:
   A. There are no sidewalks down the entire Imola road on this section. Walking is hazardous on Imola because there are also many cars travelling 45 miles per hour down this road. Unsafe.
   B. The road is already fairly high traffic. I can not believe adding 500+ round trips a day on this road would end well. Surely there will be many more accidents, including possibly within the School Zone.

2. We are blessed to have this park and open space available to the community. This is the only park within Napa that I visit on a weekly basis. The lower area that is up for proposal is the income generating area that further supports the maintenance and the EXISTENCE of the entire park. I believe the park will not be able to exist as we know it if this development is to proceed.

Suggestion:
Please consider building affordable housing much closer to City Center. There is still a lot of undeveloped land, like the Gasser Land that was recently developed for beautiful apartment buildings (Stoddart West Apartment Development). Such an area provides a much more walkable and appropriate place for people to live, close to services, resources, grocery, etc. These thoroughfares can easily support more traffic and walkers. This makes more sense. For illustration, there is a saying in Hawaii; "Keep City City, and Country Country" which I believe is very appropriate for this important decision. A location closer to City Center makes more sense.

So this plot of land is "free," a gift from the State.... If this decision is being made purely from a financial perspective, I would personally donate to help fund purchase of more appropriate land, and I believe other Napans would do the same. I do understand our treasury has had great financial success under investments that James Hudak led. This surplus could also be used to fund a more appropriate location.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ryan Georgian
105 Willowbend Ct., Napa, CA 94559
Supplemental points:

- **It's a Park. It's not unused.** It's surplus only in a legal sense, but in a community sense, it's the best park around. A beneficial use. Its use is increasing, demonstrating the importance and value of Skyline to the Napa community.
- We need affordable and low income housing. We need parks. Those should not be a conflict. **Just don't put housing in the park.**
- **The park is community.** It's where community happens. It is home to several activity and sports communities and is the best, sometimes, only, location for large group gatherings. Revenue from some parts (flat areas) fund the maintenance of trails for bikers, hikers, and equestrians. Large group activities expose visitors to other areas of the park and stimulate repeat visits.
- **It's for our health.** For healthy getaways, people from the Bay Area come to Napa for the wine experience. Napans get away to Skyline. During the pandemic lockdown, napa went to skyline park.
- **It's about equity:** There are few places where people of all backgrounds and wealth come to enjoy nature, together. Income, language, interest, age are all mixed and healthy visits engender positive encounters with neighbors.
- **Skyline Wilderness park is an environmental asset.** It is home to wildlife and fauna that deserves conservation. Being close to Napa City, it is an educational asset; school children come to learn about plants and animals native to our area.
- **Destroying Skyline is easy.** It's an easy decision to put housing in the park. **Protecting it will take vigilance.** it will take the voices of the community and strong leadership to protect it. It's easy because the state makes it free. It's easy because it doesn't have affluent NIMBY neighbors. It's easy because it's basically an extension of Napa City.
- **We expect our leaders to step up and protect what is valuable to Napans.**
- **It is in the wildland urban interface,** though the state has designated it not to be (you can't change reality with committee votes.)
- **It is in a fire hazard area.** Recent wildfires came well into the park. The park was a buffer to protect the Napa City neighborhoods on the north side of Imola. Placing housing in the buffer zone puts those residents at heightened risk.
- The listing of Skyline Wilderness Park as a housing site would attract attention. It was, instead, listed as "State property on Imola." That does raise some questions about the intent.
- Some think of Skyline as just the hiking trails in the hilly areas. They pass through the flat areas to get to what they consider the park. The flat areas host a great many groups and activities for large numbers of people. In fact, the flat areas financially support maintenance of the trails.
- "When I drive by, the western area along Imola is empty". Sometimes it is. Other times it teams with activity. When you drive by the county fairgrounds, most of the time there is nothing going on. Does that make it eligible for housing development? No. It has many beneficial uses.

CC: david.morrison@countyofnapa.org
meetingclerk@countyofnapa.org
trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org
tkscottco@aol.com
1kerirealtor707@gmail.com
megan.dameron@countyofnapa.org
anne.cotrell@lucene.com
tzimny62@gmail.com
tom@gablefamilyvineyards.com
heatherstanton3@gmail.com
rcr@interx.net
jbolyarde@adobeservices.org
joellegPC@gmail.com
dave.whitmer@countyofnapa.org
andrewmazotti@gmail.com
brad.wagenknecht@countyofnapa.org
ryan.gregory@countyofnapa.org
diane.dillon@countyofnapa.org
alfredo.pedroza@countyofnapa.org
belia.ramos@countyofnapa.org
From: diane slade
To: Hawkes, Trevor
Subject: Skyline Wilderness Park Proposed Housing Site-Housing Element Advisory Committee Meeting 7/14/22
Date: Saturday, July 2, 2022 1:50:53 PM

[External Email - Use Caution]

Please share this with the Housing Element Advisory Committee

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 species of birds and animals. The proposed building site is an integral part of this amazing 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 for your time,

Sincerely,  Diane Slade
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ....
It doesn't have proper infrastructure. I just waited before the bridge for a lady with an unruly dog to cross and further up the road for a bicyclist on a curve. I have no idea how more houses could possibly be considered a good thing Absolutely NO!

Sent from my iPhone
housing so close to where the inhabitants would put the inhabitants' health at risk. Essentially, this would be an act of environmental racism and degradation of open space.

We need affordable housing in structures that already exist and can be repurposed.

Thank you.

Julia "Kew"

Dear Person With Power,

Thank you so much for NOT using Skyline Park as a site for affordable housing! Not only do we desperately need open space with an abundance of trees, building affordable
Dear Mr. Morrison,

I am an active hiker and have logged many happy miles at Skyline Wilderness Park over the past 20 years. I was dismayed when I found out recently that the County of Napa is considering designating a portion of the park for housing. While housing is important, so is the park. Skyline Park is a unique treasure and should be protected for the use and benefit of the community now and in the future.

The park provides healthy opportunities for the community. The options include hiking, bicycling, horseback riding,archery, disc golf and camping. The flat, open space provides a rare location for large outdoor community gatherings for a variety of groups and events such as 4H shows, bike races and tube melts. This area also provides key adjacent revenue from camping. This synergy allows the park to be self-sufficient and continue its legacy of financial sustainability.

July 2, 2022
Skyline Wilderness Park is a critical resource and valuable environmental asset, home to a variety of wildlife and native plants. Once lost, Skyline can never be replaced. Please help save this one-of-a-kind park for all Napaans to enjoy.

Best,

Kendall Heckendorn
4076 E 3rd Ave.
Napa, CA 94558
707-815-3046
Dear David and Board Members,
Sending a brief note for your consideration regarding potential development activity at Skyline PARK.

Problem:
I do not believe this is a good site for ANY Residential development because:

1. Infrastructure cannot support:
   A. There are no sidewalks down the entire Imola road on this section. Walking is hazardous on Imola because there are also many cars travelling 45 miles per hour down this road. Unsafe.
   B. The road is already fairly high traffic. I cannot believe adding 500+ round trips a day on this road would end well. Surely there will be many more accidents, including possibly within the School Zone.

2. We are blessed to have this park and open space available to the community. This is the only park within Napa that I visit on a weekly basis. The lower area that is up for proposal is the income generating area that further supports the maintenance and the EXISTENCE of the entire park. I believe the park will not be able to exist as we know it if this development is to proceed.

Suggestion:
Please consider building affordable housing much closer to City Center. There is still a lot of undeveloped land, like the Gasser Land that was recently developed for beautiful apartment buildings (Stoddart West Apartment Development). Such an area provides a much more walkable and appropriate place for people to live, close to services, resources, grocery, etc. These thoroughfares can easily support more traffic and walkers. This makes more sense. For illustration, there is a saying in Hawaii; "Keep City City, and Country Country" which I believe is very appropriate for this important decision. A location closer to City Center makes more sense.

So this plot of land is "free," a gift from the State.... If this decision is being made purely from a financial perspective, I would personally donate to help fund purchase of more appropriate land, and I believe other Napans would do the same. I do understand our treasury has had great financial success under investments that James Hudak led. This surplus could also be used to fund a more appropriate location.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ryan Georgian
Constance Georgian
105 Willowbend Ct., Napa, CA 94559
Supervisor District 1
City Council District 3

Constance Georgian
7/12/2022
Supplemental points:

- **It’s a Park. It’s not unused.** It's surplus only in a legal sense, but in a community sense, it's the best park around. A beneficial use. Its use is increasing, demonstrating the importance and value of Skyline to the Napa community.

- We need affordable and low income housing. We need parks. Those should not be a conflict. **Just don't put housing in the park.**

- **The park is community.** It's where community happens. It is home to several activity and sports communities and is the best, sometimes, only, location for large group gatherings. Revenue from some parts (flat areas) fund the maintenance of trails for bikers, hikers, and equestrians. Large group activities expose visitors to other areas of the park and stimulate repeat visits.

- **It's for our health.** For healthy getaways, people from the Bay Area come to Napa for the wine experience. Napans get away to Skyline. During the pandemic lockdown, napa went to skyline park.

- **It's about equity:** There are few places where people of all backgrounds and wealth come to enjoy nature, together. Income, language, interest, age are all mixed and healthy visits engender positive encounters with neighbors.

- **Skyline Wilderness park is an environmental asset.** It is home to wildlife and fauna that deserves conservation. Being close to Napa City, it is an educational asset; school children come to learn about plants and animals native to our area.

- **Destroying Skyline is easy.** It's an easy decision to put housing in the park. **Protecting it will take vigilance.** It will take the voices of the community and strong leadership to protect it. It's easy because the state makes it free. It's easy because it doesn't have affluent NIMBY neighbors. It's easy because it's basically an extension of Napa City.

- **We expect our leaders to step up and protect what is valuable to Napans.**

- **It is in the wildland urban interface,** though the state has designated it not to be (you can't change reality with committee votes.)

- **It is in a fire hazard area.** Recent wildfires came well into the park. The park was a buffer to protect the Napa City neighborhoods on the north side of Imola. Placing housing in the buffer zone puts those residents at heightened risk.

- The listing of Skyline Wilderness Park as a housing site would attract attention. It was, instead, listed as "State property on Imola." That does raise some questions about the intent.

- Some think of Skyline as just the hiking trails in the hilly areas. They pass through the flat areas to get to what they consider the park. The flat areas host a great many groups and activities for large numbers of people. In fact, the flat areas financially support maintenance of the trails.

- "When I drive by, the western area along Imola is empty". Sometimes it is. Other times it teams with activity. When you drive by the county fairgrounds, most of the time there is nothing going on. Does that make it eligible for housing development? No. It has many beneficial uses.
Attention Planning Commission:

Dear Mr. Morrison,

I was shocked and dismayed to learn about the proposal to develop affordable housing on Skyline Park. Affordable housing is very important to me, however, this cannot be at the expense of access to open space.

I have lived in Napa for 23 years. When I first moved here, I was surprised by the beautiful, seemingly open spaces, yet lack of accessible places for citizens to enjoy. So much of the beauty of Napa County is private property, "no tresspassing"! That is why Skyline is an absolute gem to our community. I have raised my children, building forts in the woods below Lake Marie, learning about botany in the Native Plant Garden, and challenging ourselves to hike to higher viewpoints.

Please take Skyline Park off the list of options for affordable housing. Napa needs affordable housing, but we also need parks. The pandemic proved just how valuable safe, outdoor places to recreate and build community truly are.

Sincerely, Julia Rock
To the Napa Planning Commission

Skyline Park is a treasure!
The area under consideration for housing is the only area in the County where very large groups can (and do) convene for an outdoor social experience. At the same time it is a revenue generator that allows Skyline Park to maintain itself without additional County funds. There are so many beneficial uses of this park for the entire community, and every part of the park contributes to the whole. The County should not consider separating any part of the park for housing, as every part of the park is in use now and part of the benefit of nature in our lives.

Sincerely,

Kawena Korelli, M.D.
citizen of Napa
Skyline Park is a really important asset for not only our community of Napa but surrounding County who use the park. Huge groups, use the park including equestrian, Scout group, mountain bikers, runs, etc.

The 5 acres that is located is used by all these areas.

The revenue that those 5 acres get are used to keep up the trail system as a whole.

There are not enough places that have the beauty of Skyline, Napa and the surrounding areas.

Need this open space for all the services it provides.

Chris Young
Napa, CA
Dear Director Morrison and Members of the Commission:

Skyline Park provides an important recreation site for Napa County residents and visitors from around the country and world. The COVID epidemic showed us how critical outdoor recreation is for peoples’ health. The area, listed as a possible site for affordable housing in Skyline Park, 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.

Please support protecting all of Skyline Park’s acreage for the critical recreation area that it provides and is economically self sustaining.

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

[Signature] Lynn Wyman
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 Finley directly across from the Park and have enjoyed this path for over 27 years. Finley 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 and the school.

Please look for another site. I would hate to find Skyline diminished in size. If anything, I would like it to increase.
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
[External Email - Use Caution]

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because as home owners in Monticello Park for the last five years, my wife and I have seen a huge increase in the amount of traffic on Monticello Road. Allowing a high density housing project on Hedgeside Avenue will result in adverse effects to the local environment as well as increased automobile collisions and other traffic issues. It’s already so difficult and dangerous to exit Monticello Park heading west as an example of our daily traffic concerns. Further, passing this re-zoning is concerning for a native Napa resident, as it will open the door for future re-zoning projects proposed in our area.

Concerned,

Matt Buoncristiani
Co-Founder/Managing Partner
Buoncristiani Wine Co., LLC
PO Box 6946
Napa, CA 94581
707-259-1681 O
707-738-0712 C
707-259-1740 F
matt@buonwine.com
www.buonwine.com
Hello Mr Hawkes,

I will be unable to attend the meeting on July 6 due to my work hours. I want to make my voice and concerns heard. I am very much against any rezoning of the Hedge side area. I live on Estee Ave. This would have a very negative safety impact for me and my family.  
1) We had to quickly evacuate during the 2017 fire and the traffic to evacuate was very problematic. This East side of Napa is already a fire alert area. If you rezone this area to allow high density housing, you are placing all of us at additional risk for fires starting and for fire evacuation. The bottle neck will cause deaths in the numbers seen in the Paradise fire! 
2) You will also impact our water availability. We are often on the verge of our water resources running out. We already had to lower our well.  
3) In addition, you will over burden an already over burdened county fire department. During the 2017 fire, Cal Fire had to leave the fire at our next door neighbor’s house in order to rush to the Atlas Peak home fires. We still had a live electric wire on the ground. We had to finish tending the fire site until WE could get a PGE truck to turn off our electricity. With no electricity-we had no water. (We have electric pumps for our wells.) Then we had to quickly evacuate because the Atlas Peak fire was moving in on us. We left our property, not knowing if our newly put out fire would reignite.  
4) This does not even begin to address the fact that an earthquake hazard risk also causes fire and water risks.  
You have plenty of options to provide additional Napa county housing from the NVJC to the Napa airport. There is far easier access to fast exiting for high density housing on that side of Napa County in the event of fire or earthquake.  
I would really like to know who’s pockets are being enriched and/or which elected officials are benefitting from this clearly outrageous rezoning proposal that is definitely NOT in the best interest of Napa County. 

Kathleen Kinda and family
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because there is already traffic that is problematic in this area. This area is also very close to a high risk fire area (Atlas Peak) with limited ability for entry and exit.

Please do all you can to stop this potential construction.

Sincerely,

John Diana, MD
1019 Ross Circle
Napa, CA

Sent from my iPhone
Good morning decision makers regarding the affordable housing development possibility at Skyline Park Napa.

I am a local resident here in Napa and have been for 12 years. I come to Skyline park a few times a week to be in nature and hike.

I would like you to please take into consideration that this is one of our last beautiful parks we have around us and it should really be treasured and kept as safe as possible from being destroyed.

The flat areas are being used constantly for the well being of our community. A place for us all to gather in groups and enjoy the outdoors and introduce nature to those who don't get to see it enough. Friends bring their horses and use this area to teach and share with others important equestrian information and tools.

Building in this area is the worst idea and can only lead to the destruction of a fine park that deserves to be protected. We have lost so much of nature already and many animals depend on what is left - especially Skyline Park.

Please consider the long term effect loosing part of Skyline will have on our community at large and the wellbeing of the voiceless creatures. We need to protect more of Nature not destroy it!

Thank you

Ann West Ph.D
224 Cardwell Court
Napa
CA 94559
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ....

July 3, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the high-density housing development proposed on Hedgeside Ave (Bishop property). I am asking for the Bishop’s site along Hedgeside to be removed from the Housing Element Update and not rezoned Residential Multiple (RM). This letter specifically addresses my concerns regarding additional traffic and the safety hazards this brings to our rural community.

Hedgeside Avenue and the surrounding community, including, but not limited to, Estee Avenue, McKinley Road, Atlas Peak Road, Hardman Avenue, Vichy Avenue, and Monticello Road, are rural family communities. Homesites are built on a least an acre and in many instances several acres. The community is made up of rural residents, agriculture operations, hobby farms, and is home to the Milliken Creek and its watershed. It’s labyrinth of small country roads were never designed to handle the traffic that high-density homes would bring. An estimated 1,250+ vehicle trips would be added to our roads daily.

As a resident of this community for ten years, it is not uncommon for me to see cyclists, runners, walkers, children on bikes or in strollers, and dog-walkers enjoying the quiet neighborhoods among this community. My family and I regularly bike, run, and walk on these country roads. It also is not uncommon to see tractors, four-wheelers, and agriculture equipment moving along these roads to tend to the agriculture farms and ranches that have a presence in this rural region and the fertile valley. As such, the additional traffic alone brought to our country roads due to a high-density housing development would pose a significant safety hazard to residents, community members, and workers in this region. Because of this, I pose the following questions to the planning department:
• What would be your plan in the immediate future and for the long term to mitigate traffic brought about due to this proposed project? How are any proposals to mitigate traffic intended to be paid for in the short term and for the long-term upkeep (this includes added wear and tear on roadways)? Some neighbor’s driveways are positioned causing them to have to back out into traffic on blind corner curves; similarly, delivery vehicles must do the same. How are these neighborhood risks to be addressed?

• How will roadway safety measures be constructed so that the community can continue to enjoy their neighbor in a safe manner? How will safety measures be constructed without loss to the rural aesthetics of the community, including several mature trees that line the roads of ingress and egress? This is not just limited to Hedgeside Avenue – several other communities are affected, and I have cited those above.

• How will extreme safety roadway infrastructure hazards be mitigated? Specifically, “killer curve” along Hedgeside Avenue; the blind curve pulling out of McKinley Road onto Atlas Peak Road; the blind hill pulling out from Estee Avenue onto Hardman Avenue; the turn off of Monticello Road onto Hedgeside Avenue given that there is no turn lane; and the same would be asked of the lack of turn lane at Atlas Peak onto Hardman or McKinley, and from Silverado Trail to Hardman. All of these routes are the ONLY routes into and out of this proposed high-density site and must be addressed as a significant traffic safety hazard. Myself, I have narrowly avoided being rear-ended numerous times while waiting to turn onto Hedgeside Avenue from Monticello; I have neighbors who have been rear-ended. There are no shoulders and a rear-end collision will push a motorist into head on traffic. The additional traffic will bring significant safety risk to residents, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic alike.

• Has a full traffic study been conducted on Hedgeside Avenue and the surrounding community roadways cited above, but also at the stop sign of Monticello Road and Silverado Trail? With the addition of this traffic many will sit idle waiting to turn onto the major artery roads (Monticello, Silverado Trail) from the Avenues backing up during commute times in front of properties and causing major transportation delays? These idle delays will cause added tail pipe greenhouse gas emissions.

• Has any consideration been given to the impact this would have on Vichy School and the increased traffic on roadways that are used by children to walk to and from school? Similarly, could Vichy School even support the local population growth this high-density housing project would bring given that they have absorbed students from regional school closures (Berryessa, Gordon Valley, Mount George)?

Having lived in this community for a decade, I know the ways of country life and the hardships and emergency situations that you must stand prepared for. There are
very little resources in these rural regions. There are times our community is
without power due to storms, down trees, and due to fire safety shut off’s. There
have also been several instances that we have received rain events that cause
flooding and close Hedgeside Avenue because Milliken Creek bridge
is impassable, and the roadways and Bishop’s field is flooded. There is also a dip in
the pavement along Hedgeside Avenue directly across from 1055 Hedgeside that
channels the flood water from the Bishop’s property (proposed building site). The
proposed building site sits squarely where this flooding occurs. Milliken Creek is a
natural tributary that runs year-round and serves as an important habitat to a
diversity of species. The following are questions I pose:

• Has a full accounting of all the species that depend on Milliken Creek as their
  habitat been completed? Have considerations been made as to the nesting and
  spawning habitat Milliken Creek provides as home to a diversity of species
  with fish species depending on the water flows?

• Has a full analysis of traffic increase and displacement of land been conducted
to understand the impact this high-density housing proposal would have to
wildlife and water flows of Milliken Creek?

• If Milliken Creek was accounted for in this proposed site, what would that
  mean for the rest of the flows entering Napa River and the calculations for
  those flood mitigations?

• How do you address the flood area that these homes are proposed to be built
  upon? How would those mitigations affect neighbors where water would
  be immediately displaced?

Finally, I expect this project to take full accounting of the fire danger risks that are
real in this neighborhood. As a resident of this community, I have had to evacuate
my family numerous times. The worst incident was in 2017, but the other more
recent years were not far behind. It would be irresponsible not to fully evaluate the
impacts of putting a high-density housing complex into a rural area known to
evacuate regularly due to wildfires. We have seen death in
many recent fires (Napa’s included) because communities could not evacuate fast
enough or major roadways were clogged with traffic because it was the ONLY way
out. A high-density housing site is now proposed to be built in a corridor that has a
deadly trifecta: a high fire risk, one major artery to escape an already populated
area, and residents that may need to be assisted in order to escape. If
this site is rezoned and approved for high-density housing, I lay the
negligence, irresponsibility and the poor planning decisions being made on behalf
of a community at the feet of the County planning department and the Napa Board
of Supervisors for allowing a project with this level of risk to be approved. Have we
not learned from the after-action reports of the Camp(Paradise) fire, the Tubbs
fire, the Atlas Complex fire, the Lightning Complex fire, and Glass
fire…and sadly, the list goes on? Wildfires of the magnitude that we experience
today cannot be ignored and must be acknowledged and accounted for in future
planning of housing developments.

I am asking for the Bishop’s site along Hedgeside to be removed from the Housing Element Update and not rezoned RM.

Thank you,

Natalie Greenberg
Resident, 1033 Hedgeside Ave

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Trevor,

I wanted to share that I received nearly 90 emails from local Napa County community members with concerns regarding housing on or near Skyline Park. Please see below. I replied to each of them with a general response inviting them to attend future H.E.A.C. meetings and offer public comments.

Kindest Regards,

~ Keri

Keri Akemi-Hernandez
Cell 707.235.4963

Dear Vice-Chairperson,

Preserve Skyline Park for ALL citizens of Napa. Housing on a pristine site is contrary to environmental preservation. Other sites for housing development are closer to the core areas of the city and are closer to transportation. Using the old Napa County mental health site on Old Sonoma Road would provide lost cost housing and would be at a convenient site.

Skyline Wilderness Park is a unique asset that provides a host of beneficial uses to the greater Napa Community; uses that nowhere else in the county can be accommodated. We need affordable and low-income housing. We need parks. Those should not be in conflict. Just don’t put housing in Skyline.

Skyline Wilderness Park is community. It is home to many activities and sports communities and is the best, sometimes only, location for large group gatherings. These include Scouts, Suscol Intertribal council, camping events, horse camping and search and rescue training. The list of large groups and large events that make their home in the park is long.

The park works as a whole. Revenue from some parts (flat areas) fund the maintenance of trails for bikers, hikers, and equestrians. Large group activities introduce visitors to other areas of the park and stimulate repeat visits.

It’s about equity: there are few places where people of all backgrounds and economic status
come to enjoy nature together. Income, language, interests, ages are all mixed with healthy
visits that create positive encounters with neighbors who are different.

Please do not damage the park by slicing parts off for housing. Housing is important, but not
at the expense of a uniquely successful park.

Sincerely,

Greg Matsumoto
3116 Vichy Ave
Napa, CA 94558
gregmatsumoto@sbcglobal.net
(707) 226-2100

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual
associated with Napa Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Nick
Cheranich at Napa Sierra Club at napavalleysierraclub@gmail.com or (415) 977-5500.
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

I am an avid hiker and have logged many happy miles at Skyline Wilderness Park over the last twenty years. I was dismayed when I found out recently that the County of Napa is considering designating five acres in the park for housing. While housing is very important, so is the park. Skyline Park is a unique treasure and should be protected for the use and benefit of the community now and into the future.

The park provides healthy opportunities for the community. The options include hiking, biking, horseback riding, archery, disc golf, and camping. The flat, open space provides a rare location for large community gatherings for a variety of groups and events such as 4H shows, bike races, and tribal meets. This area also provides key adjacent revenue from camping. This synergy allows the Park to be self-sufficient and continue its legacy of financial sustainability.

Skyline Wilderness Park is a critical resource and valuable environmental asset, home to a variety of wildlife and native plants. Once lost, Skyline can never be replaced. Please help save this one of a kind park for all Napans to enjoy.

Best,

Kendall Heckendorn
707-815-3046
4076 East 3rd Avenue
Napa, CA 94558
Trevor,

I had an opportunity to review the rezoning details for the Bishop Site along Hedgeside. Both Site 2 and Site 3 are close to my current residence.

The existing traffic along Monticello Road is already too high and extremely dangerous as no one abides by the speed limit. I am requesting you look elsewhere for your rezoning initiative.

Thank you,

Shawn Vandergriff
(209) 485-7446
shawnvgriff@gmail.com
[External Email - Use Caution]

Trevor Hawkes,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ....

To whom it may concern:

Eastern Napa, Monticello area is a target for wildland fire destruction and a constant exercise of resident evacuations. Just recently, on May 31, 2022, a wildland fire started off the lower Atlas Peak Road (Old Soda Springs) and quickly spread to 570 acres into the Soda Canyon region. Our Napa climate has adversely changed over the past ten years and continues to fuel wildland fire devastation. The same fire off Old Soda Springs had it occurred under our “new norm” of dry North winds, would have swept into the Hardman, Estee, McKinley and Hedgeside neighborhoods. Thankfully the North winds were not the predominant weather influence on May 31, 2022.

Since the 2017 Atlas Complex, our Hedgeside neighborhood has been evacuated for numerous weeks on end and stranded residents without power or water, all related to wildland fire impacts. These strong winds produced an ember cast range greater than 2 miles and spot fires occurred in the Hedgeside neighborhood that threatened homes. Reminders of these threats continued with both subsequent 2020 Lightning Complex and Glass fires.

My background expands 23 years working for CAL FIRE and Napa County Fire. My fire suppression experience is coupled with vast efforts and leadership in fire prevention with our Napa Firewise organization to reduce impacts of future wildland fires and protect resident evacuation routes.

Hedgeside is located at the basin of larger regions including Soda Canyon, Atlas Peak and Mount George. Napa County is limited on evacuation routes, especially on the Atlas Peak and Monticello Road/Hwy 121, primary and secondary routes. Lessons learned of the fatalities occurring on Atlas Peak Road of residents trying to evacuate and getting trapped should never be forgotten and therefore be included during the planning process of adding 125 homes (nearly 500 residents) into an area threatened by fire, and congestion of traffic during evacuations. What mitigation factors has Napa County included to expand roadways to accommodate funneling of evacuation traffic off Atlas Peak, Hwy 121, Hedgeside Ave, Estee Ave, McKinley Road, Silverado Country Club, Silverado Trail, and Monticello Road?

Napa County expanding high density housing onto the Bishop site will further exhaust
First Responders needed to assist with non-ambulatory residents and those with special requirements. How is Napa County going to provide emergency evacuation transportation for these residents living in high density housing? Many of these occupants move to high density housing and do not own a vehicle and depend on public transit. Now factor in emergency evacuations and ensuring residents have a dependable ride to safety; how do we manage this expectation and execute for their safety? Is the County of Napa going to provide a shuttle bus on standby to evacuate these folks at 2am on a Sunday? Where is the County going to shelter these folks when evacuated? Country living comes with a level of independence including dealing with power outages, what measures are in place to care for the needs of these residents?

Napa County Planning needs to further calculate the High-Density Housing in our Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) in terms of max number of units per acre (i.e., 2 max/acre), rather than a minimum of 20-25 homes/acre, as stated in this Cycle 6 Housing Element Update. The Hedgeside area is already built out with parcels having one primary home with an optional Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). This draft proposal includes 125 homes on five acres, further complicating the wildland fire threat and congested evacuation of residents.

The Board of Supervisors and Planning Department of Napa County need to extensively analyze the wildland threat we’ve experienced locally and provide resiliency through appropriate housing development. Rezoning of the Bishop lands on Hedgeside will complicate efforts of First Responders during emergency events. This added population will shift priorities of fire suppression to that of assisted resident evacuations. Our resiliency in Napa County needs a focused attention that does not complicate our response efforts and endanger residents any further than the current problem exists.

Voters of Napa County sent a clear message in recent polls by voting “NO” on Measure L, which would have provided a sustained funding source to provide resilience against wildland fires. The County of Napa has provided small injects of one-time funds, but a stable revenue stream towards fuel mitigation must be achieved for future improvement of wildland fire resiliency. While funding for wildfire prevention is one avenue for progress, 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 Bishops property located along Hedgeside Avenue. The Planning Department and our Board of Supervisors needs to aggressively pursue removal of the Bishop site (Hedgeside Ave) from the Cycle 6 Housing Element Update. This is incumbent of our elected officials to hold above all, the safety of our community.

Thank you,

JC Greenberg

Resident – 1033 Hedgeside Ave

(707)738-7100
I support the State of California’s House Building Mandate for 2023-2031, but oppose the Altamura and Bishop sites for the following reasons:

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 1,000 extra car trips per day. Imagine the effect on the three-way Trancas-Monticello-Silverado Trail intersection on a day to day basis.

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.

Our limited number of access roads already complicates fire evacuation, and this would exacerbate the problem.

Thank you,

Frank Grange
209 Wintergreen Cir
Napa CA, 94558

T: (707) 251-5513
E: fdgrange@gmail.com
Sirs:
As a long time resident of Napa, having grown up and attended schools here and now a home owner in Monticello Park with children in public school we are strongly opposed to the development of the land on Hedgeside for high density/low income housing. This is inappropriate on multiple levels. Other than changing the beautiful rural landscape of the area it would also impact the natural wildlife environment in a negative way. Outside of environmental and wildlife concerns it would immediately add to the ALREADY HIGH volumes of FAST traffic in the area. This rural area has already suffered from the effects of this traffic. It is difficult and consequently often time consuming to take a left hand turn onto Monticello Road especially for vehicles like the local yellow school bus. Many families with children live in this area. My 16 year old daughter and 75 year old mother find it scary and difficult to get onto Monticello due to the fast and high volumes of constant traffic. A development of this high density housing will only add to the already crowded and dangerous roads. My children are not able to walk to Vichy elementary because of the traffic concerns. Further these roads are not equipped to handle that level of traffic, many already require repair and are very narrow.
I'm also concerned about water resources and how that would impact our community and ability to add to existing properties. Finally, if you really wanted to assist low income folks with housing you would build the housing within walking distance of schools, stores and libraries, etc. and near other community services that they can get to without a vehicle.
Why are we closing schools like Harvest that serve this type of community purpose only to displace folks in a rural area not close to community services or jobs??
If the intent is to also have a new bus line on these roads to serve the residents of this housing, that only perpetuates the hazards of
the conditions already expressed. Who stands to gain from this development at this location? That is the question we will need to dive into to understand the motives of using this particular land that is so ill suited for this particular purpose and stands to forever change the landscape of this part of Napa. 
WE ARE STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THIS IDEA on HEDGESIDE.
Lisa O'Connor
Monticello Park Homeowner
As a resident condo owner of Silverado resort I am opposed to proposed housing being built at the Bishop and Altamira sites as sewer lines are at their capacity. Pls do not jeopardize our properties. It is bad enough we worry about fires in the existing area let alone water scarcity!

Mary L Donnici
676 Cottage Drive
Napa CA. 94558

Sent from my iPad
Mary Louise Donnici
Sr. Loan Officer
Pacific Bay Lending, Inc.
CA Bureau of Real Estate #1375656, 01874818
NMLS# 237617, 318011
Direct 415-794-4554
Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because there are already too many cars in the area making it dangerous and difficult to drive in and out of our home as it is. It would drastically change the landscape of a quiet, rural community. Importantly, there is no sidewalk for walking on the road on headgeside nor to the closes, necessary stores that the occupants would need. Additionally, there is no transit to the area to accommodate the large increase in occupants. At minimum, for these reasons it seems totally inappropriate to propose housing at this site.

Best,
Elicia Penuel
Hi Trevor,

My name is Robert Creamer, and my wife Nancy and I live at 126 Bonnie Brook Drive, Napa. We’re 18 year residents of Napa. My phone number is 707-738-5023. We are writing to submit our opposition to build additional dense housing along Monticello near the Silverado Resort area.

This area has had a substantially difficult five years as a result of the Atlas Fire in 2017. In addition to losing our home in the fire, many of our neighbors suffered the same loss. We have endured five straight years of construction, which is far from completed in this area. It has resulted in disruption including increased traffic by construction crews, heavy machinery, material providers, and vendors delivering everything from building materials, to appliances, and to home furnishing. It has also resulted in dirt and dust, and a high number of flat tires. We’ve suffered enough of this, but understand the County may decide to begin another building project, with all it will bring.

In addition to the above, our objection includes the following concerns:

1. Building additional housing, and the other construction which will follow will substantially compound the traffic on a two lane road that is now seeing large numbers of vehicles. Workers are now traveling east and west in the morning and afternoon as they travel to jobs in Napa County. This includes drivers leaving the Trail at Hartman, and turning onto Atlas Peak and clogging the intersection at Atlas Peak and Monticello. Adding 100 more homes, and the related traffic would make Monticello, and the intersection Monticello and Trancas even more crowded. This increase will also complicate fire evacuation in the surrounding area, which has only two exits from a very high fire prone area;

2. In addition to the new housing, it will likely create an addition requirement for more commercial development, including markets and gas stations, with its increase in traffic;

3. There is no public transportation;

4. The construction created by upgrading the sewage system will added delays and traffic, having yet another negative impact on traffic along Monticello.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider this, Robert Creamer
[External Email - Use Caution]

Trevor,

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

July 4, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the high-density housing development proposed on Hedgeside Ave (Bishop property). I am asking for the Bishop’s site along Hedgeside to be removed from the Housing Element Update and not rezoned Residential Multiple (RM). This letter specifically addresses my concerns about equity and inclusivity for Napa Valley citizens regarding selection of high-density housing sites and their affordability and accessibly for all in keeping with the spirit of the law, specifically Senate Bill (SB) 330, (Statues of 2019) and later extending the sunset provision through SB 8 (Statues of 2021).

Hedgeside Avenue and the surrounding community, including, but not limited to, Estee Avenue, McKinley Road, Atlas Peak Road, Hardman Avenue, Vichy Avenue, and Monticello Road, are rural family communities. Resources are slim to none in this rural area and based on Zillow reports my personal address on 1033 Hedgeside Ave has a walk score of 30 (car dependent) and a transit score of 0 (no nearby transit).

When SB 330 was passed, Housing Crisis Act of 2019, and subsequently amended in 2021 by SB 8, the Legislature was very specific with their intentions and declarations. Section 65589.5 of the Government Code (GC) was amended to read that the Legislature finds and declares all of the following. Key sections are pulled out for reference because they cannot be ignored, they include:

GC 65589.5. (a) (2) (H) When Californians have access to safe and affordable housing, they have more money for food and health care; they are less likely to become homeless and in need of government-subsidized services; their children do better in school; and businesses have an easier time recruiting and retaining employees.

GC 65589.5 (c) The Legislature also recognizes that premature and
unnecessary development of agricultural lands for urban uses continues to have adverse effects on the availability of those lands for food and fiber production and on the economy of the state. Furthermore, it is the policy of the state that development should be guided away from prime agricultural lands; therefore, in implementing this section, local jurisdictions should encourage, to the maximum extent practicable, in filling existing urban areas. While high-density housing and affordable housing intends to help solve one element of financial challenges, the purpose of the law has to be read in concert with other means – that there would be access to other important aspects of life: social quality of life being one of them. Food is a fundamental human need and influences health and quality of life. Access to affordable and nutritious food is a public health priority and requires broader, community-based interventions focused on addressing the social determinants of health and eliminating health disparities. While I completely appreciate that affordable housing must happen, preparation for it cannot dismiss the full accounting of elements essential for individuals to thrive. This perspective begins in the early stages of planning for communities, especially high-density communities that depend on the wrap-around services to support healthful, thriving lives, including ones that achieve benefit economically, environmentally, and socially. I serve on a working group for Healthy People 2030; a government organized effort to set goals and progress to building a healthier future for all. My perspective and comments are reflective of my experience and passion to bring healthy, affordable, accessible food to the tables of everyone in our great state. By doing this, we are also supporting our farmers and ranchers in the state and building local, resilient economies with a lens toward environmental stewardship and socially thriving communities. Today in California, 1 in 5 individuals are food insecure. Napa county’s food insecurity numbers are consist with this state average (source: County Food Insecurity Rates - 2020 (cafoodbanks.org). The proposed high-density housing site of Bishop’s (Hedgeside Ave) is a car dependent site. Currently, there is no public transit that would allow a person access to a grocery store. I would strongly encourage the Planning Department to assess the feasibility of the Bishop’s site and address the following questions related to social well-being:

- How would this planning site achieve the social goals of food security, access to medical needs, including pharmacies, regular commute needs as a condition of employment?
- Has an evaluation of the criteria used to determine low-income status and access to supermarkets for this location been conducted? This includes measures of access to food including travel duration and mode to a supermarket of affordability.
- How does the proposed project on Hedgeside Avenue intend to address the
transportation barrier for the high-density housing community? How will transportation measures be constructed without loss to the rural aesthetics of the community, including several mature trees that line the roads of ingress and egress?

The 2020 report on Healthy People evaluated barriers to food access. Food access goals are benchmarked and tracked with the aim to decrease barriers and improve food security through access. Healthy People 2030 has an **objective** to reduce household food insecurity and hunger from 11.1% to 6.0% of households (national objective). In 2021, California had a national value of 9.9%. However, more work needs to continue as the California Association of Food Banks reports that 1 in 5 individuals, including children are food insecure. Healthy People reports identified barriers to food access, some include:

- Neighborhood conditions may affect physical access to food. For example, people living in some urban areas, rural areas, and low-income neighborhoods may have limited access to full-service supermarkets or grocery stores.
- Convenience stores and small independent stores are more common in food deserts than full-service supermarkets or grocery stores. These stores may have higher food prices, lower quality foods, and less variety of foods than supermarkets or grocery stores.
- Access to healthy foods is also affected by lack of transportation and long distances between residences and supermarkets or grocery stores.
- Residents are at risk for food insecurity in neighborhoods where transportation options are limited, the travel distance to stores is greater, and there are fewer supermarkets.
- Lack of access to public transportation or a personal vehicle limits access to food.
- Groups who may lack transportation to healthy food sources include those with chronic diseases or disabilities, residents of rural areas, and some minority groups.

Based on the barriers identified above, I would urge the Planning Department to fully assess whether this proposed rezoning and high-density building site is carrying out the legislative intent of SB 330 and SB 8 considering that it poses serious limitations to social wellbeing for residents who are car dependent, including directly limiting their access to food. I ask that you please provide the Housing Element Update solutions to the issues I raised above referencing the legislative intent and the questions I have posed.

Second, in addition to my concerns outlined above, the legislature was very specific in GC 65589.5 (c) to state, (in part), *that premature development of agriculture lands for urban uses have adverse effects on the availability of those lands for food and fiber production and on the economy of the state and...development should be guided away from agriculture lands.*

- Has the Planning Department done an extensive site search to evaluate other potential sites, including those that are underutilized, available for
repurposing, and/or formerly zoned for housing development, yet the project(s) weren’t completed?

• Has the Planning Department taken into consideration that the Bishop property site serves as an important natural and working land in Napa County? Specifically, the Bishop site is flanked on one side by Milliken Creek, which serves as an important year-round tributary, species habitat, and watershed, and is flanked on the west side by agriculture land (vineyards)? Working lands such as Bishop’s site provide key benefits such as erosion control, carbon sequestration, and provides waterway buffers, especially during flooding events. The Bishop ranch has served as a working cattle ranch and grazing pasture for many decades.

Natural and Working lands play an important role to meet California’s ambitious goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions needed to avoid the most catastrophic impacts of climate change. In order to do this, the State (of which, Napa is a predominate agricultural county) must increase its efforts to conserve, restore, and manage California's rangelands, farms, urban green spaces, wetlands, forests, and soils. As such, consideration must be given to the proposed rezoning of the Bishop site on Hedgeside Avenue along with the high-density housing plan that would follow.

I am asking for the Bishop’s site along Hedgeside to be removed from the Housing Element Update and not rezoned RM. This is not an appropriate location for a high-density housing project.

Thank you,

Natalie Greenberg
Resident, 1033 Hedgeside Avenue

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it may concern:

I am opposed to the considered proposal of building high density residencies in the area of Silverado. The increased traffic will add to congestion in the area. Silverado itself could have increased its capacity in the past and declined. I can imagine the commercial properties to follow which will only add to the problem.

Register me as opposed to this proposal.

Respectfully,

James Shapiro
17 Tamarack Drive
Napa, Ca. 94558
I vehemently oppose a project at skyline. This area needs to stay untouched. We need to protect our wild areas!

Sincerely,
Judy Donovan

Sent from my iPhone
I oppose the proposed housing element

Fred Karren
168 Canyon Place
Napa, CA
Mr Hawkes, I would like to voice strong objection to the possible housing developments in the sites called "Altamura" and "Bishop".
I would appreciate your opposition to opening up those projects. There are many reasons for this, among them, safety and traffic, but also a great concern that if the "sewer" project does not fulfill its promises, that the County could face significant law suits and thereby costs, if the safety of the sewers are considered by some as problematic.
Please oppose these areas for housing development.
Sincerely,
S. Joseph Aita, M. D.
282 Kaanapali Drive, Napa, CA 94558
FYI…

Dave

From: Samanda Dorger (samue@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message
Sent: Saturday, July 2, 2022 7:17 AM
To: Whitmer, David <Dave.Whitmer@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Please do not damage Skyline Park by slicing parts off for housing.

[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Commissioner,

Please do not even consider putting any kind of housing in Skyline Park. It is a PARK, a valuable natural and community resource. People of all ages use this park for a multitude of healthy activities and is an important site for wildlife.

This kind of action shows no insight or understanding of what makes communities. If we build housing on parks, there would be no quality of life for those in the housing. Please don’t let this happen.

Skyline Wilderness Park is a unique asset that provides a host of beneficial uses to the greater Napa Community; uses that nowhere else in the county can be accommodated. We need affordable and low-income housing. We need parks. Those should not be in conflict. Just don’t put housing in Skyline.

Skyline Wilderness Park is community. It is home to many activities and sports communities and is the best, sometimes only, location for large group gatherings. These include Scouts, Suscol Intertribal council, camping events, horse camping and search and rescue training. The list of large groups and large events that make their home in the park is long.

The park works as a whole. Revenue from some parts (flat areas) fund the maintenance of trails for bikers, hikers, and equestrians. Large group activities introduce visitors to other areas of the park and stimulate repeat visits.

It’s about equity: there are few places where people of all backgrounds and economic status come to enjoy nature together. Income, language, interests, ages are all mixed with healthy visits that create positive encounters with neighbors who are different.

Please do not damage the park by slicing parts off for housing. Housing is important, but not at the expense of a uniquely successful park.

Sincerely,
This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Napa Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Nick Cheranich at Napa Sierra Club at napavalleysierraclub@gmail.com or (415) 977-5500.
Dear Planning Commission,

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 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

cell 707.255.6550

web www.jillhough.com

email jill@jillhough.com

kitchen wisdom www.jillhough.com/blog

facebook Jill Silverman Hough

twitter @JillSHough

pinterest @JillSHough

instagram @JillSHough

linkedin @JillSHough

my books on Amazon
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because high density housing in a rural environment is a big mistake. There are no city or county services to support such a development (namely sewer), this type of development will destroy the historical culture of the area, the two lane roads that service this area are already congested with traffic avoiding the southern exits of the Napa Valley.

This is the wrong location for such a development - find a different location that has the infrastructure to support a development of this nature. The states requirement to build such high density properties in a County environment makes no sense - push back on the state requiring this ridiculous type of development which a merely attempt to expand city limits…or develop properties consistent with the historical use to meet the requirement.

Rich Harbison
Napa, CA
Dear Trevor I would like to record my opposition to the proposed housing project. I own units 481 and 482 at 1600 Atlas Peak road. My basic concern is one of fire safety. The roads surrounding the project are two lane and already often near capacity. Adding a hundred new homes and perhaps 150 cars to be evacuated basically across the street from a resort full of guests is irresponsible. These roads are dangerous, with no traffic controls and limited sight lines. Also the aesthetics of the current area are really quite bucolic which is why so many flock to the Silverado resort and the surrounding areas. The increased housing density will bring increased commercial activity around Monticello road and atlas peak changing the nature and perhaps the desirability of the region for tourists. I understand there may also be flood plain issues. All and all increased housing in this region is a very bad idea that I sincerely hope will be rejected.
Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ....

Patrick Felde: 1771 McKinley Road

My property shares a property line in the middle of Milliken Creek, an environmentally sensitive watershed, with the Bishop Property. Development of this property is of great concern to me and our community. I’m sure you have seen many communications from our fellow neighbors expressing those very valid concerns.

We have one of the most unique “hidden” agricultural and residential areas in Napa Valley. Originally “developed” on Oct. 13th 1909 as the Map of Mount & Son’s Subdivision of Hedgeside. McKinley Road was known as Yajome at that time. There were only 14 lots in the initial split. The entirety of this subdivision was part of a Spanish land grant to Gov. Vallejo and included many hundreds of acres including all of the land surrounding the The Silverado Country Club. Again, this is a very unique and historic area bound by 3 external roads, Monticello, Hardman, and Atlas Peak, 2 of which have dead ends. There are 3 internal roads Hedgeside, McKinley and Estee all of which have dead ends. Ingress and egress is, already, a concern for life and safety during emergency situations. Development of the Bishop Property will only complicate this already serious situation with a huge additional amount of daily traffic as well as all of the environmental and cultural changes that will affect this wonderful community forever.

Please reconsider your decision on the Bishop Property.

Thank you.

Patrick & Miranda Felde
From: Teresa Vandal <teresavandal@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Teresa Vandal at Yahoo <teresavandal@yahoo.com>
Subject: Save Skyline Wilderness Park

[External Email - Use Caution]

From: Teresa Vandal, 2473 Carriage Place, Napa, California 94558 ~ (707) 486-3079
To: City of Napa, County of Napa and State of California Representatives
Re: Skyline Wilderness Park

Dear Representatives:

I am writing in support of Skyline Wilderness Park and in strong opposition to any part of the park being converted to urban development.

It is recognized that there is a need for affordable housing in our county, but there are other areas that would serve this need without taking from the park.

The park is serving a critical need for the community and visitors from all walks of life as an environmental resource, outdoor recreation space, 20 miles of trails, a native plants garden, archery range, two disc golf courses, tent and RV camping, an equestrian camping area, arena, round pen and obstacle course.

In addition, the park provides ample space for picnicking and family gatherings, and most importantly, has the capacity to host large community events such as running races, Search and Rescue trainings, tribal gatherings/pow wows, equestrian events with large trailer parking and other gatherings with participants numbering in the hundreds or even more.

I urge you to do everything in your power to protect and enhance this critical community resource.

Sincerely,

Teresa L. Vandal
To the Board of Supervisors,

I wish to express my opposition to further increasing the housing density in the Silverado neighborhood (Altamura site and Bishop site).

The Silverado neighborhood development growth has been purposefully constrained for many years to promote a semi-rural neighborhood that is in balance with local agriculture and wildlife. In fact, high density housing is incompatible with long established zoning ordinances under the Agricultural Preserve. Consequently, building significant new housing units, especially high density housing structures, risks destroying the quality of our Silverado ecosystem.

I kindly ask that you consider other undeveloped sites for the construction of new housing units.

Thank you,

Charles Swain
160 Canyon Place
Napa, CA 94558
FROM: ROB and CAROL HEYWOOD
210 WINTERGREEN CIRCLE
NAPA, CA 94558

I would like to place on record our opposition to the Draft House Element Update and the plans to build more houses in the Silverado area, which is currently being discussed by the county.

1: Our local two-lane roads carry more than enough traffic as it is along Monticello Road. With more than 100 new homes in a small area is estimated to produce more than 1000 car trips per day. This will cause chaos at the three-way Trancas-Monticello-Silverado Trail intersection on a daily basis.

2: Turn off to Hedgeside via Monticello Road or Hardman are dangerous as it is, with no traffic controls or turn off lanes, limited sight lines entailing a sharp turn off a two-lane road.

3: With the fire dangers that we are all going to be facing in the future, it seems irresponsible to add extra housing when we have a limited number of access roads for evacuation purposes. This will only exacerbate the problem during the long fire season we are facing.

4: Lack of sewer capacity is another problem. Hedgeside site is situated on a flood plain where substantial new construction is inadvisable.

5: High density house is incompatible with more than 50 years of zoning under the Agricultural Preserve.

6: And finally, this project is simply pushed on residents with no showing of demand, at a time of little or no growth in Napa.

We sincerely hope that common sense will prevail and will ensure this project will never take place.

Signed: Carol Heywood.
Dangerous Blind Curve: Besides general concerns of traffic, I would like to bring to your attention the very real concern regarding the blind curve on Hedgeside Avenue. This curve is very dangerous and is an obvious indicator when you see the high number of dead wildlife hit by vehicles. In addition, some neighbors have lost their pets who were hit and killed there as well.

This is because drivers can’t see the animal in the road due to the blind curve—what if it is a small child walking to school or bike riding on Hedgeside Avenue from the high density dwelling project? It is not safe for our family to walk Hedgeside due to this blind curve so we avoid that area.

Our driveway sits just at the peak of the first curve before you get to the second more deadly blind curve so drivers can see our home before entering it. As you mentioned when this road came into existence it was for a small community around Hedgeside, Estee and McKinley roads so traffic was not a big issue back then. Any person that lives near this blind curve has to take extreme caution to avoid an accident.

This blind curve is deadly, but also extremely challenging for vehicles to safely enter or exit Hedgeside Avenue. It is particularly dangerous for young children coming together at this very dangerous curve on Hedgeside. Clearly, this curve was not engineered and designed with high density dwelling in mind. I ask that this is an important consideration when choosing a site for development.

Will this blind curve be an important consideration when choosing the site? Why or why not?

What safety precautions would you put in place for our children and those who would reside at the new development and utilize this deadly blind curve?

How would you mitigate the higher risk of injury increased traffic would create?

At our section of Hedgeside the speed limit is 40 mph on the county road. Cars race by our house while we get our mail from the mailbox. It’s concerning to send my son out to get the mail even with the current amount of traffic, but increase that by possibly 1,200 more vehicles passing by is frightening. Please see the photo of him close to the road when at the mailbox.

Can you ensure that the speed limits along ALL of Hedgeside will be adjusted to reflect a safe speed due to the increase in traffic?

Would the high density housing development alter this 40 mph speed limit in front of our house?

Can you ensure that the speed limits will be enforced? How will the speed limits be enforced?

Post construction waste containment and treatment, via a Final Report: Due to the flooding nature of this area, how would the developer handle post-construction waste containment and treatment in a flood zone? If this understanding that they need to manage the flow of impervious surfaces to prevent issues from going into consideration. How can that be done in an area that floods frequently?

All of these concerns will be back in touch.

Thank you for including this in the public comments for the draft housing element update.

Thank you,
Jessica Schiff McDonald
1023 Hedgeside Ave, Napa
Mr. Hawkes,

My name is Mark Homer and my residence is at 1023 Ross Circle in Monticello Park. My wife and I have lived here 24 years. This weekend I received a notice from SaveHedgeside.com concerning the rezoning of the Hedgeside Avenue Bishop Cattle Property down the street from us. I know this property well as 20 years ago one of their steers got loose, stomped up my front yard leaving massive piles of manure all over our yard. The mailman chased the steer down the street in his van until it was eventually caught. It makes for a good story.

Aside from one transient cow, I've always thought the cattle ranch was a good use of that property being it's in a floodplain. So I was taken back by the word of a possible rezoning on the property. Napa County has a long history of preserving agriculture land and any changes to this zoning usually involve a lot of public discourse. The SaveHedgeside.com folks are fairly vague about the issue, mostly just raising concern. On the other hand, I've heard nothing from the County on the matter and usually there is some transparency on these issues. I would greatly appreciate any information you can relate on this matter.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Mark Homer
Trevor,

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

July 5, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

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 216 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.

Many residents have written letters expressing safety concerns and posed various questions about the impacts of the Bishop site. Below is a short list for documented review:

Traffic:
- Hedgeside Avenue is not built for 1,250+ additional car trips per day.
- The Blind "Killer" Curve adjacent to the proposed project site is currently dangerous, and poses a major danger when traffic volume increases with this project. Many cyclist, runners and recreationist use this road and this increased amount of traffic poses life risk, especially on "Killer" curve.
- Ingress and egress off Monticello Road (Hwy 121) onto Hedgeside is dangerous as
there is no left hand turn lane. Additional traffic will put left had turn vehicles in danger without improvements.
- Traffic exiting from Estee Ave onto Hardman inhibits vision of a blind hill and traffic speeds averaging 50mph.
- ***Blind driveways around "Killer" curve poses great danger for current residents exiting and entering onto Hedgeside.

Fires
- Hedgeside has been evacuated numerous times and for weeks on end since 2017. Napa's wildfire problem has drastically increased over the past 10 years and Napa planning projects for housing need to be appropriately placed to not put current and future residents at risk. Especially low-income residents that are dependent on public transportation for safety and evacuations.

Floods
- Milliken Creek floods over the bridge even on mild annual rain fall years. This makes our Hedgeside Ave impassible and residents are forced to use alternate routes. This flood event last occurred on February 7th, 2017. Subsequently, the same year the Atlas Complex required residents of Hedgeside to evacuate from wildland fires.

- The Bishop field is a flood plain that holds water and recharges aquifer's. If this site is approved, 5 acres of annual rain will need diverted elsewhere to accommodate the surface area once held and absorbed. This displacement of 5 acres of water will be sent downstream to Milliken, further complicating the flood issue. Additionally the Bishop field is located at a higher elevation than Hedgeside and this 5 acres of displaced water will flood homes located below grade of Hedgeside Ave. How will these issues be mitigated?

Food Desert
- Low income residents do not have access to affordable food sources or daily services within walking distances.
- Lack of school access and proximity (K-12 grades)
- Walk score requires private transportation and no public options available.

This is only a partial list of concerns and safety issues the Bishop site presents. We as a neighborhood group are requesting the Bishop site to be removed from the Draft HEU Plan.

Thank you,

JC Greenberg
1033 Hedgeside Ave
(707)738-7100
STOP THE RE-ZONING OF THE RURAL "BISHOP SITE" TO HIGH-DENSITY HOUSING

216 have signed. Let’s get to 500!

At 500 signatures, this petition is more

Take the next step!
July 6, 2022

Mr. Hawkes,

I am writing because I have serious concerns about the proposed 125 unit housing development on Hedgeside Avenue at the “Bishop” site.

My stepdad lives on McKinley Road, near the corner of Hedgeside Avenue and McKinley Road. My children play on McKinley Road. Our family walks McKinley Road, as do so many other Napa residents.

In alignment with some of the city of Napa’s priorities (safety, city resources, and agricultural balance), please reevaluate the “Bishop” site on Hedgeside Avenue.

Pedestrian Safety - This development impacts the safety of this walking-friendly neighborhood. Traffic would increase with the 125 units proposed, and yet there are no sidewalks. Because the safety of Napa residents is a priority, sidewalks along both Hedgeside Avenue and McKinley Road are a must if this project moves forward.

Traffic Light - In addition, there is no left turn lane off Monticello Road onto Hedgeside Avenue. A traffic light would be needed to not impact the traffic on Monticello Road, one of the main arteries of Napa.

Water Impact - Finally, as noted in the environmental study, the water table and creeks would be impacted. I know Napa prioritizes water resources and agricultural balance. Milliken Creek is a site for several species’ reproduction (including the Steelhead, Coho Salmon, Chinook Salmon, all of which are decreasing in populous). Ultra-high density housing developments do not belong adjacent to such a sensitive and important biological resource.

Please consider removing the Bishop property on Hedgeside Avenue from the list of possible sites.

Thank you for your time,

Kelly Meadows
Mr. Hawkes,

I'm writing to you to express my concerns about the potential Bishop and Altamura developments. I have lived on Silver Trail for 16 years. My concerns are as follows:

1. Atlas Peak road currently has too much traffic. It is difficult to pull out of Silver Trail safely due to the speeding traffic headed for Hardman Ave and Silverado Trail. Not to mention the speeding traffic headed up Atlas Peak. Multiple events at the Silverado Resort already make the roads difficult to navigate safely.

2. During the evening of October 8, 2017, I had to evacuate my elderly mother on Kannapali Drive and evacuate my own home on Silver Trail. Driving back and forth between the two streets, while the entire area was evacuating during the fire, was almost impossible due to the sheer number of cars on Atlas Peak and Hillcrest. My daughter and I left our animals to get my wheelchair bound mother first and then tried to return back to our house to get the animals and then leave the area. The traffic congestion that night was terrifying. Adding even a few more residents with vehicles to this area would put us in even more danger during disaster evacuations. The roads simply cannot accommodate the current residents in emergency evacuations as it is.

3. We have a significant amount of bicycle traffic on Atlas Peak road. During the school year, parents and children on bikes go to and from Vichy elementary school. We also have a significant number of tourists from Silverado resort on bicycles on Atlas Peak road. These bicyclists are distracted and often don't know where they are going, seemingly unaware of the dangers of riding a bike on busy Atlas Peak. Again, more residents with more cars will put the bicyclist on Atlas Peak Road in more danger than currently exists.

4. The automobile traffic on Atlas Peak is already bad for wildlife and domestic animals. Dead animals are frequently seen on the side of the road. More cars will increase the roadkill in the area.

5. Lastly, the exhaust fumes from Atlas Peak are a problem for Silver Trail. Cars, service vehicles, winery trucks all contribute to the exhaust fumes in our area. I have learned to keep my south and west facing windows closed to cut down on the exhaust fumes entering my house. We on Silver Trail do not want more exhaust fumes in our neighborhood. Either one of the Bishop or Altamura developments would increase our exposure to toxic vehicle fumes and have negative effects on our families.

I hope you will share my concerns with your colleagues. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jacqueline Williams, Ph.D.
1518 Silver Trail
Napa. 94558

Sent from my iPhone
Hello Napa County Planning Department,

Here are the Institute for Conservation Advocacy, Research and Education’s comments regarding this item for tomorrow’s Planning Commission public hearing.

I would like this distributed to the public.

In Collective Protection of Mother Earth, So All May Live,

Chris Malan  
Executive Director  
Institute for Conservation Advocacy, Research and Education  
707.322.8677
Dear Planning Commission,

The Institute for Conservation, Advocacy, Research and Education offers these comments about the 6 sites the County has chosen out of 230 parcels that could fit the County needs to comply with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation/RHNA of the Bay Area for lower 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 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.
Will the current wastewater treatment plant be able to handle 100-125 new households?

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.

Additionally, ICARE notes that there is little to no transportation to services such as: Medical, dental, groceries, schools. This site is too isolated for this population of people who need easy access to care and services.

Site #2-Bishop:

This site is a wrong location for 100-125 low income housing 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/AW. The current use has been used for farming/grazing for decades and is the best use of this land and soil. To convert these soils to concrete is a tragic waste of this high value natural resource, soil, natural resource in drastic decline Statewide.
• Agricultural Watershed/AW is not allowed to be rezoned to meet RHNA housing demands.
• 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.
• Steelhead trout migrate, spawn and live for 2 years in Milliken Creek running through this property. This specie is vulnerable to pollution and human interference with their habitat. A healthy riparian buffer must be maintained to keep the fish in good condition.
• No increased rate of stormwater runoff can enter Milliken Creek via a culvert due to habitat destruction caused by erosion of the bed and banks of Milliken Creek at point of stormwater discharge to the creek.
• This increased rate stormwater runoff, (caused by 100-125 housing units) will scour the steelhead eggs and destroy these egg nest/redds.
• 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 2017, Milliken Creek has been at the top of the bridge going over the creek on Hedgeside Road.
• 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.
Site #3- Altamura:
Same comments about the MST groundwater aquifer as for Site #2.

Site #4: Big Ranch Rd.
• This site includes Agricultural Watershed zoning therefore RHNA housing needs is not allowed here.
• Steelhead and Chinook salmon use Salvador Creek to migrate spawn and rear. The Salvador Creek is on and near this site. Pollution and increased rate of stormwater runoff will harm these endangered and threatened species.

Site #5-Imola
• Same comments about the MST groundwater comments here as well.
• Marie Creek has steelhead trout. This project will harm migration, spawning and rearing habitat. Same comments as Bishop site regarding the specie harm due to increased rate of stormwater runoff.
• Riparian protection is necessary.

Site #6-Foster Rd.
• Sacramental splittail is a protected specie 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.
• The current zoning includes Agricultural Watershed, therefore, RHNA housing demands can not be used here.

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

Please accept my comments and questions below. I have copied statements, programs and policies from the draft here which require additional information or further investigation.

1) "Program H-2j had limited effectiveness in preventing the conversion of mobilehome parks to other uses. This program will be modified for the 6th Cycle Housing Element."

"Policy H-2i: Encourage the rehabilitation of mobile home parks to retain existing affordable units and/or provide new affordable units. To the extent allowed by law, prohibit the conversion of mobile home parks for replacement by housing for vacation use, second homes, or transient occupancy."

No effectiveness occurred at all during the last housing cycle. Vineland Vista and Glass Mtn Mobile Parks may be lost to proposed other uses. How is this happening? Why is Staff not engaging mobile park owners at least annually to explore programs to retain mobile homes?

2)" During the interactive workshop, members of the public were asked about what they like about housing in their community, what housing challenges they have faced in their community, and what the County could do to meet the community’s housing needs. Attendance for the workshop was consistent with attendance at other County public events, with roughly 40 participants."

Yet...."Meeting participants provided County staff with some feedback on Housing Element outreach activities. They indicated that information is not reaching the Hispanic community and the community does not feel included, that meetings are not set up to reach them, and that there is a generation gap in terms of who will participate."

When did outreach to under represented populations actually happen? Is there a list of the participants? The community engagement has been inadequate.

3)"The outreach process also included a range of types of activities, including scheduled meetings and community workshop, County staff attendance at community events to involve members of the public that might not attend a community meeting, and opportunities to provide extensive feedback online."

What community events did staff attend? Who, what, when, where?
4) "With respect to its housing rehabilitation objectives for the 5th Cycle, Napa County worked with Habitat for Humanity to assist one mobilehome owner whose unit was in need of replacement and is currently in the process of assisting with a second mobilehome unit. With respect to the County’s housing conservation objectives, the County was successful in conserving and maintaining its three farmworker housing centers; however, it was not as successful with its objective of conserving mobilehome units. The County has lost a number of mobilehome units due to fire (58 units, including 44 units in Spanish Flat Mobile Villa, 13 units in Mund Mobile Home Park, and one unit in Capell Valley Mobile Homes Park). The County has considered the effectiveness of the 5th Cycle Housing Element goals, policies, and programs in completing updates to incorporate into the 6th Cycle Housing Element Update, which are presented in the chapter that follows."

Why is the loss of Vineland Vista Mobile Home Park south of St. Helena for proposed Hall Hotel not mentioned? This is disingenuous to omit this proposed conversion and blame the loss of mobile homes entirely on fires.

Why is the conversion of the Glass Mountain Mobile Home Park omitted? This Draft must be corrected to include the County's failure to prevent conversion of these mobile home parks!

5) "Program H-2j: Maintain the affordable housing provided in existing mobile home parks to the extent permitted by State law. Existing mobile home parks may be redeveloped, including adding up to 25 percent more units than the number of units allowed by their underlying zoning, provided that the adverse impact of such redevelopment on existing residents, including impact to housing affordability and displacement, is fully analyzed and mitigated. Rezone sites to allow MHP use only. Objective H-2j: Discourage conversion of existing mobilehome parks to other uses. Conversion density bonus – Ongoing; rezone for exclusive MHP use by December, 2025. PBES"

Why not say preclude conversion of existing mobile home parks rather than discourage?

5) "Program H-2k: Continue to allow infrastructure improvements as an eligible cost under the Affordable Housing Ordinance, and work with affected agencies to pursue grant money to improve water and sewer infrastructure on the 6th cycle sites within the inventory and other sites that accommodate lower-income housing to address RHNA requirements."

"Objective H-2k: Assist in application for at least one grant for water and/or sewer improvements on a site identified in the 6th Cycle Housing Sites Inventory. Ongoing; work to pursue grant funding to assist at least one project during the planning period. CEO, Housing and Homeless Services Division"

This program could help to upgrade sewer capacity for Bishop and Altamira sites.

6) "Program H-4e: No Net Loss Monitoring. If sites are developed during the planning period at lower density or at a different income level than shown in this Housing Element, make findings required by Section 65863 to determine whether adequate sites exist at all income levels. If sites are inadequate, take action to make adequate sites available within 180 days."

"Objective H-4e: Ensure that adequate sites are available throughout the planning period to accommodate the County's RHNA at all income levels."
Ongoing; whenever entitlements are granted for development on Sites Inventory parcels at a lower density or at a different income level than shown in the sites PBES

"The prior identified sites, as listed in Table 5 above, were not considered adequate to accommodate lower income needs for the 6th cycle and were not carried forward for this 6th cycle sites inventory. However, to make these sites more attractive for development in the 6th Cycle, the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Update includes Program H-2g which calls for evaluating and modifying (i.e., reducing) the affordable housing requirements on the AHCD sites established in the 5th Cycle or earlier."

Why do we allow sites to be rezoned with the AHCD overlay and then allow them to be developed at market rate? Does it make sense? Why would we reduce the AH requirement?

7)"For rehabilitation, the County’s quantified objectives for are tied to the County’s objectives for Program H-1a, which call for assisting with the rehabilitation of two units occupied by extremely low-income households, four units occupied by very low-income households, and four units occupied by low-income households."

"Napa County’s housing conservation objectives include three very low-income units, ten low-income units, and ten moderate-income units."

Where are the details of these programs? I have observed several vacant red tagged housing units in Angwin. How can we engage property owners to resolve violations effectively and get these units back in service? The objectives noted lack a mechanism to initiate and complete rehabilitation, and the proposed number of units is insignificant.

8) "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."

Has Spanish Flat been 'recommended?' As Spanish Flat Mobile Villa and nearly all homes in the area were lost in the LNU Fire and three lives were lost, the inclusion of Spanish Flat relies on a cruel loophole in fire severity ranking and it is an unacceptable location due to fire risk.

9) "3. Proximate to transit routes and/or employment opportunities and services (e.g., groceries) where possible."

Does Spanish Flat meet this criteria?

10)"Potential Use of the Adequate Sites Alternative (65583.1(c))
As a possible approach, there are some conditions under which the County could address up to 25 percent of its adequate sites requirement by substantially rehabilitating existing units, converting existing units to affordable units, or where existing unit affordability is preserved (including mobile home spaces). Examples include conversion of hotels or motels to residential use and making them available for people experiencing homelessness or by preserving a mobile home park via acquiring spaces. While this option was considered as part of the site evaluation process, the County determined that this alternative approach would not be viable in meeting the general evaluation considerations or needed to accommodate the County’s RHNA."
Given the imminent threat the an existing hotel on Lodi Lane, currently housing approximately a dozen working families, and the potential for conversion of the mobile Home park at Moskowhite Corner, the Adequate Sites Alternative is dismissed without adequate exploration by Committee or public. This Alternative should be included in the Housing Element.

11) "Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development: The parcel is privately owned and is located at the intersection of Trancas and Big Ranch Road. The owner expressed interest in developing housing in the past and rezoning a 1.5-acre portion of the parcel fronting on Big Ranch Road to RM would allow for housing development at a minimum of 20 dwelling units per acre on that site unless constrained by site characteristics. Based on the expectation that an existing single-family home on the property may be retained, the anticipated development would provide 25 units. The housing development would obtain City of Napa and Napa Sanitation District water and wastewater services."

Site #4 Big Ranch Corner. Why would existing unit be retained? It is very small vacant, single story home and could be relocated and rehabilitated off site? Could this site support a larger number of units?

My brief thoughts for now.

Respectfully,

Kellie Anderson
Angwin
From: Eva Vincenti
To: Hawkes, Trevor
Subject: Draft Housing Element Update
Date: Wednesday, July 6, 2022 9:10:48 AM

[External Email - Use Caution]

We, residents of 1822 Hardman Ave. are strongly opposed to the proposed high density development on the Altamura site for the following reasons:

Traffic on Monticello Rd. is already considerable with narrow, blind curbs and vehicles entering, exiting.

The intersection of Monticello, Silverado Trail and Trancas is congested most of the day, making emergency evacuations difficult during fire danger. More people to evacuate will add to the danger. We were here witnessing the 2 previous fires in the Atlas Peak area and know first hand the dangers.

The sewer situation is dire without the addition of more housing. Upgrading the sewer line will be a long and disruptive process to the neighborhood, if it ever goes forward.

Please note our strong opposition,
Respectfully,
Flavio and Eva Vincenti
Mr. Hawkes,

I’m writing to you to express my concerns about the potential Bishop and Altamura developments. I have lived on Silver Trail for 16 years. My concerns are as follows:

1. Atlas Peak Road currently has too much traffic. It is difficult to pull out of silver trail safely due to the speeding traffic headed for Hardman Ave and Silverado Trail. Not to mention the speeding traffic headed up Atlas Peak. Multiple events at the Silverado Resort already make the roads difficult to navigate safely.

2. During the evening of October 8, 2017, my family had to evacuate our elderly mother on Kannapali Drive and evacuate our own home on Silver Trail. Driving back and forth between the two streets, while the entire area was evacuating during the fire, was almost impossible due to the sheer number of cars on Atlas Peak and Hillcrest. My family left our animals to get my wheelchair bound mother first and then tried to return back to our house to get the animals and then leave the area. The traffic congestion that night was terrifying. Adding even a few more residents with vehicles to this area would put us in even more danger during disaster evacuations. The roads simply cannot accommodate the current residents in emergency evacuations as it is.

3. We have a significant amount of bicycle traffic on Atlas Peak road. During the school year, parents and children on bikes go to and from Vichy elementary school. We also have a significant number of tourists from Silverado resort on bicycles on Atlas Peak road. These bicyclists are distracted and often don’t know where they are going, seemingly unaware of the dangers of riding a bike on busy Atlas Peak. Again, more residents with more cars will put the bicyclists on Atlas Peak Road in more danger.

4. The automobile traffic on Atlas Peak is already bad for wildlife and domestic animals. Dead animals are frequently seen on the side of the road. More cars will increase the roadkill in the area.

I hope you will share my concerns with your colleagues. Thank you for your time and consideration.

David Carlson
1518 Silver Trail
Napa, CA. 94558

Sent from my iPhone
Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ....

We do not believe it is consistent with the surrounding uses. 
There are no public services, public transportation, no stores and certainly no safe pedestrian walkways. 
There is already a lot of traffic on Monticello Rd all day and night much of it at higher speeds than limits posted. 
Because of the increased traffic from the east to Napa we often have to wait for the stop light at Atlas Peak (which is about one mile away) to turn red just to exit our driveway. 
The same is true for making left hand turns to get back home with impatient drivers passing on the right shoulders (An added danger for bikers who share the road). 
Traffic issues would increase even before any building was complete with construction vehicle noise and damage to the existing roads. 
We agree with the key concerns for water health and greenhouse gas emissions. 
Therefore we do not believe that the "Bishop Site" is the right location for Ultra High-density housing and oppose the re-zoning.

Thank you,
Bill and Carol Tucker

Bill Tucker
bill@billtuckerstudio.com
1188 Monticello Rd
Napa, CA 94558
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

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
jdodd@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.
For you. 😊

Terri Abraham
Planner

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
1195 Third St., Suite 210
Napa CA 94559
707.299.1331 direct line
707.299.4075 direct fax
707.253.4417 office #

County Web site www.countyofnapa.org

The happiest people don’t have the best of everything. They just make the best of everything they have. Live simply, love generously, care deeply, and speak kindly.

From: PHIL T DULLE <forgivingangel2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 6, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Planning <planning@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Draft housing element

[External Email - Use Caution]

I live on Penny Lane, I am opposed to developing land for housing site 5 of the plan. I have lived here for 55 years, used to have a much more country feel, not like it used to be. We already deal with traffic from the school sites and office buildings on Imola Ave. Groups of troubled kids walking the streets, passing by our residence sometimes causing trouble. Watching Syar rip into the mountains for rock (ugly) and the noise and dust from them blasting more land to get the rock. We deal with hearing gun shots from the quarry, our peaceful life is not so peaceful anymore. We definitely do not need a housing track put in this area! I don't have a problem with the other sites listed, I do with this one. There is so much land between Napa and Jamison Canyon that needs developing, wouldn't affect those of us living our quiet country life that we do not want to lose. I say NO to developing site 5.

Sincerely Debra Weakley (and entire family).

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
From: John Comisky  
To: Hawkes, Trevor  
Subject: Draft Housing Element Update  
Date: Wednesday, July 6, 2022 1:09:48 PM

[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Trevor Hawkes,

I am writing about a matter that was scheduled to be discussed in a public meeting today 7/6/22 at 9 AM, regarding Napa County’s response to the California house-building mandate for 2023-31. I learned about the meeting late and couldn’t attend in person. If my understanding is correct, the topic included a discussion about whether two sites near my residence, one near the intersection of Atlas Peak and Monticello and another called the Bishop site along Hedgeside Avenue, should be included as potential candidates for high-density housing development as part of the County’s response to the State. I had understood that both had been excluded from consideration previously, due to our local sewerage system being at capacity, but now could be in the mix if the sewerage system was improved/expanded. Please include these written comments as part of the record.

I am deeply opposed to these two sites being included in the County’s response to the State. We purchased our current home at 358 Saint Andrews Drive in the Silverado Residence Area, in large part because of the quality of the neighborhood. Its semi-rural feel, with quality homes spaced part from each other and a low traffic profile appealed to us. We purchased the property and have invested significantly in it within that context and have paid premiums on County and City services as an acceptable offset to maintain it. I believe that the Silverado Residence neighborhood was conceived, as a negotiated outcome in a dispute opposing a much broader development proposal decades ago. We purchased here in part, on the premise that this was a settled position with a decades-long history. We see the inclusion of these sites as being a direct contradiction to it.

There are also several other factors concerning Infrastructure and support which are current problems for this area beyond the sewerage system, making the two sites inappropriate inclusions in the County’s proposal. They include but are not limited to:

- **Ingress and egress** – We have only two points to enter and exit, Monticello and Harden. In an incidence of high volume need e.g. an evacuation from fire, neither is adequate to handle a concentrated pulse of traffic from a much larger population, increasing the risk congestion with dangerous outcomes.
- **Traffic** - More and more, traffic is delayed or slowed on Monticello as vehicles pause for oncoming traffic to pass before making turns, causing backups and/or the decisions of impatient drivers to pass on the shoulder. The latter, daily, increases the potential of unadvisable maneuvers that can lead to accidents, perimeter damage, and danger to
runners, bikers, and walkers. Increasing the number of cars on the road (Monticello) and those needing to turn onto or out from Hedgeside, would require mitigation such widening the road to provide for turning and onramp lanes.

- The traffic at the Monticello – Trancas – Silverado intersection, is already a growing problem. This would exacerbate it.

- Power System – In recent years, our area has struggled with multiple planned and unplanned power outages, leading to speculation that the system is close to capacity.

- Potential flooding - I believe that at least one of the sites is in the flood zone and has flooded in the past.

- Law enforcement – When we first moved here, the sight of a Sheriff’s car doing a routine patrol was common. I can’t remember the last time I saw a patrol, leading me to believe that the force is stretched. Our neighborhood has recently seen a rise in crime, causing us to begin meeting to discuss a neighborhood watch program. An increased density neighborhood would aggravate the issue.

- Road Maintenance – Our roads/streets have already suffered damage from increased traffic associated to construction. Holes, cracks, patches and oil stains have abounded from more and heavier vehicles. The current infrastructure support has not kept up with it.

In summary, there appears to be only downsides to our neighborhood and quality of life if these sites are included in the County’s response. I urge that they not be.

Sincerely,

John Comisky
358 Saint Andrews Dr
Napa, CA 94558

qualjohn@hotmail.com
[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Mr. Hawkes,

In a happy accident in February, we stumbled upon the Planning Commission meeting on proposed new housing. And, thanks to a petition notice, we discovered that Planning was having another meeting today. There was lots in that session that I found illuminating. First, my comments back in February were reiterated countless times with new negative impacts that I failed to recognize.

What I heard over and over again was surprised neighbors just learning about something so impactful on their community. While Mr. Morrison announced he had extended notification to affected neighbors to 1000 yards, it made me chuckle. It seems disingenuous to not recognize the effects this has on the entire community’s ability to evacuate for fire and flood as well as added traffic related accidents and delays. It affects all of Monticello, Atlas Peak, Hedgeside, and Silverado residents. Between seemingly “hush/hush” meetings and purposeful omission of notification, I have concluded transparency is so yesterday.

As in February, I strongly object to these sites along Monticello. We are 2017 fire survivors. To say this area isn’t high fire risk seems like you’re in denial. Please let our insurance company know that so our rates could be reduced. I totally appreciate your predicament but find your solutions questionable. One participant asked if you searched these sites out or did owners approach you to purchase or provide a gift of their land. It’s a good question.

I find it interesting that where the Planning Commission is appointed and have no direct accountability to taxpayer citizens, they’re being given this conflict to resolve. As “public servants” elected to their positions, why aren’t the Supervisors involved? I understand they will be if there is an appeal. However, based upon today’s attendance and positions of oppositions, it might be best for them to become enlightened on the multitude of complaints and concerns of voting citizens.

With regards and strong opposition to your plan,

Jill Alexander
[External Email - Use Caution]

From: Bob and Bonnie Schlieman, 221 Westgate Dr., Napa CA 94558.

Adding residents in quantity to either the Altamira or Bishop site will stress already overused infrastructure even beyond the sewer issue. In addition to local resident traffic, we get an unending stream of folks using the Hardman / Atlas Peak short-cut to bypass the three way stop when commuting to and from the valley across Route 121. Additional traffic will necessitate, at a minimum, the installation of stop lights at Hardman and at the three way stop at Trancas and the Trail. The Bishop site would require additional lights for safer access to and from Monticello.

If the plan is to increase the residential density of this area, where is the long term plan to develop supporting infrastructure to accommodate the new residents and why is this area preferable to other areas under consideration.
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: DANIELLE DULLE <pdrmatyka@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 6, 2022 9:00 AM
To: PlanningCommissionClerk <planningcommissionclerk@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Imola Ave project (APN-046-450-041)

[External Email - Use Caution]

To whom it may concern,
Skyline has been a state park and it needs to stay a state park. There's enough property out where Syar used to be as well as Industrial Park. As a homeowner here in Napa we need to keep areas the same and quit trying to change Napa. I am totally against this project going in. This is just wrong. I don't appreciate not being notified that this was going on, I found out by accident and I'm not happy. Thank you,
Danielle Dulle.
Public Comment

Wednesday, July 6, 2022 Napa County Planning Commission Meeting
Regarding: Agenda #8 Administrative Items – 22-1261
Napa County Draft 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
Section 9: Housing Sites Analysis

From:
Johanna O’Kelley
1126 Hedgeside Avenue  
Napa, CA 94558  

My property is just across the creek from the Bishop property. I have lived here for 24 years. I am asking that the Hedgeside Bishop property be taken off of this list.

I do understand the pressure from the state to provide housing and how a high-density project may be a way to meet the state-mandated numbers, but at what expense?

- Once city water and sewer is put in, which it would have to be for this project, then it opens the floodgate to extensive development that has been held at bay for years. It creates a situation that increases sprawl and other growth-inducing impacts.
- Changes the entire nature of this rural community to a more urban area automatically by increasing the # of residents/cars 4-6 fold+ on this one street.
- Endangering adults, children, and animals that use this narrow road to walk, bike, play, etc. (no sidewalk) especially around the killer curve in between Monticello and the Bishop property.
- We are all also worried about this development creating a bottleneck of traffic and a dangerous situation when we need to evacuate quickly onto Monticello Rd. due to wildfires. (impacting residents on Hedgeside, McKinley, Estee, and residents from Atlas Peak Rd and Silverado Country Club).
- Putting more people in a dangerous wildfire living situation with high insurance costs.
- Taking prime agricultural land and turning it into an urban area.
- Increasing GHG emissions in this more rural area due to the massive increase in traffic. Especially with the new air quality/GHG emission standards the EIR will need to be reevaluated.
- Stranding people in the complex in this rural area with no public transportation.
- Negatively impacting a sensitive habitat area in and around the creek, which can also turn into a powerful, fast-moving, and dangerous body of water. Also, creating an attractive nuisance for children.

**Setting:**

Hedgeside Avenue is a rural, street with a narrow 2-lane road and a killer-curve in between Monticello Road and the proposed high-density project. People of all ages walk with their kids and pets, or bicycle in the road, and children play since there is no sidewalk. The telephone poles and cable poles sit close to the road as well.

There is no public transportation.

There are approx. 20 single-family homes along this rural street – we chose to live here in the country rather than living in the city or even a more populated and dense area like the Silverado Country Club. This high-density project would increase the number of people 4-6
fold instantly and traffic as well increasing the GHG emissions due to increased traffic.

**Septic and Well:**
The properties have septic systems and wells and the city would need to bring in sewer and water to accommodate this as well, opening the entire area to a tremendous growth impact and sprawl once city water and sewer are brought in. It would be just an extension of the City of Napa.

**NOTE:** Currently, I have noticed that the Bishop property has some type of underground pipe that is open at the creek and is pumping a tremendous amount of water into the creek (about 100 ft. up from the bridge). The Fish and Wildlife department has come to test the water for possible pollutants. Haven't heard back on the results. But where is this massive amount of water coming from – our collective groundwater upon which our wells in the neighborhood depend? And why is this massive amount of water being pumped continuously into the creek when we desperately need the groundwater in the ground to reduce the impacts of wildfires and on trees, etc.?

And, the creek creates an attractive nuisance and is unsafe for children, it often provides a place for drug users or others under the bridge, and which can also turn into a powerful, fast-moving, dangerous body of water. This is a sensitive habitat area and should not be harmed.

**Wildfire & Evacuations:**
This area is a high-wildfire area where insurance costs have gone up dramatically in the past few years with some people unable to get fire insurance.

Hedgeside does provide a crucial evacuation route during wildfires not only for the people on Hedgeside to get onto Monticello Rd. but also for the residents on McKinley Rd., on Estee Rd (whose exit may be blocked on Hardman due to the usual path of fires), and also for many people in Silverado Country Club when Atlas Peak invariably gets backed up at Monticello during a rapid exit due to wildfires.

To build a high-density apartment building with 100-200 cars in a high fire zone such as the Atlas Peak area and on Hedgeside will certainly cause a bottleneck for all of us to get out quickly and will create a very dangerous and even deadly situation if we are again in need of a rapid evacuation due to a wildfire – which we inevitably will be.

**Flooding:**
Even though the 100-year flood plain has been officially right at the top of the Milliken creek bed, many times throughout my 24 years of living on my property the creek has significantly surpassed this 100-year flood plain line by 100 ft or more on both sides of the creek and on occasions has flooded my living room with 2-14” of water even though it is
125+ft from that flood plain line.

On multiple occasions this 25-30 ft wide lovely creek has turned into an approx. 250+ ft. wide, incredibly powerful, fast-moving, dangerous, river-like body of water. As an example, on one of those occasions this powerful body of water ripped a 12X14ft decking platform on my property, out of the ground and wedged it whole under the bridge, it totaled my car and 3 other cars on the Bishop side of the bridge, it ripped up about a 20-foot section of the road on the Bishop side of the creek and threw the entire section of the road onto the property at 1105 Hedgeside. The 2 residents of that house had to be rescued by the fire department as the water was up to the top of their mattress.

With this proposed development there will be increased runoff with the hardscape of the proposed buildings and parking lots and moreso if that area will be built up at all, and I worry about increased flooding on my property and that of my neighbor across the street from me, as well as at least 3 of the neighbors who live across from the Bishop property and others.

As an example, below are pictures of how the water from the creek rose in February 2017 to flood my yard all the way to my house as well as the Bishop property. The flooding on the Bishop property is worse than on my side, saving my property from even more flooding. Again, any increased elevation of the ground or changes there with more hardscape and buildings will increase the runoff leading to increased flooding on my property and others.

In closing, I ask that you please remove Hedgeside from this list. Do not drastically change the rural nature and safety of the residents on this street and neighboring streets. Do not pave the way for these growth-inducing impacts. Please build where there is already a certain amount of density and services.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Johanna O’Kelley
1126 Hedgeside Avenue
Napa, CA 94558

This is the progression of the flooding in a very short period of time (approx 30-40 minutes) in Feb. 2017, looking from my property across the creek to the Bishop property. I had to quickly move my car from the driveway to avoid it being flooded. There will be extra runoff from the buildings and parking lots, and certainly, if the ground is built up on the property it will increase flooding for my property, the house across the street from me, and at least the 3 houses across the street from the Bishop property.
Shown below: February 2017 rain and flooding at 1126 Hedgeside and across the creek at the Bishop property.

- Raining/creek is high
- Even higher flooding
- Creek overflows on Bishop property
- Creek floods Bishop property and my property
- See it at tree line
- Moves up sidewalk to my house.
Good afternoon,

My name is Daniela Bazán and 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
This came in the wrong inbox so I’m not sure if you received it yet or not.

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: Dean Alm <usalmosa@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 6:07 PM
To: MeetingClerk <MeetingClerk@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Skyline Park should be promoted not chopped up into pieces.

[External Email - Use Caution]

I have lived in Napa since 2008 and one of the first places I found to enjoy what Napa really is was Skyline Park.
Of the thousands of acres of vines, rolling hills and wooded trails Skyline was special and cheap entertainment.
It’s close to where I first lived so it became an easy place to bike, hike or just sit and read a book.
There are fewer open spaces every year in the Bay Area as the world discovers us & populations grow.
I believe people should be able to live in the community they work in.
I understand the need for affordable housing and was a supporter years ago when that became an issue here.
However we cannot sacrifice the affordable recreation sites for the sake of urban sprawl.
Skyline is managed and sustained free of any financial contribution from the City, State or the County.
Volunteers and staff maintain the trails, clear the deadwood, control the security, clean up, host travelers, and so much more at no cost to the taxpayer.
Please don’t take part or all of the park away from the very people you are looking to help with housing.
Large complexes of affordable housing built quickly for cheap tend to end badly; please come up with a better plan.
Is there the services required for a large influx of people? Families?
Corner Stores, Pharmacy, school, daycare, parking, bus service, how many cars do you need to park???

Almosa Home & Garden
Dean Alm 707-363-2633
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 healthcare worker. My job is stressful and demanding. 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 don't know 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 got to see a horse show, a Medieval day where people
We're 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 Toro
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 hike and 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. It's a community-driven park 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, horse riders, disc golfers, bikers, birders, bikers, RV folks, fire training staff and youth will

"RECEIVED"
Jul 07 2022
Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services
Dear David Morrison,

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.
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
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" for many reasons but primarily because Hedgeside and Monticello Rd. cannot support additional traffic. I live at 1021 Ross Circle and it is dangerous enough to exit Lorraine as it is. You have commercial trucks and SUV’s pulling boats on trailers bound for Berryessa all day long and it is sketchy. More cars will be a disaster and we don’t need more stop signs or stop lights. This area is rural and let’s keep it that way. We need green space.

Additionally, Napa has major drought concerns with Coombsville wells drying up and increasing demands from wineries, so I don’t see how more home can be supported until the drought has ended. I also saw the creek on Hedgeside flood this past winter and this will continue and could be significantly worse. Let’s not build housing in flood zones only to have to literally bail them out in future years. Lastly, the fire risk is significant here. Both sides of Hedgeside are considered extremely high fire risk per the WUI map below and having seen what the winds did in Coffee Park in Santa Rosa, this area would be devastated in a fire.

Equally important, there is plenty of suitable parcels closer to downtown on Soscol or Hwy 29 that can support higher density (multifamily and condos) and can utilize transit (less cars). That type of housing is more affordable (and more needed than a bunch of luxury homes) and more environmentally and societally beneficial.
Warmly,

John Fruehe
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: John Vulk <jovu7@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 1:56 PM
To: MeetingClerk <MeetingClerk@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Placement of housing within Skyline Parks Boundaries

[External Email - Use Caution]

To Housing Element Advisory Committee:

I am writing to support the Wholeness of Skyline Park. How many Parks are as unique as Skyline? Or as diversified? A Park where people come to enjoy Nature and the many activities it offers. Hiking, biking, walking, and running, camping, disc golf, picnicking, nature gardens, grasses, trees and fresh air.

The area mentioned for affordable housing, 5 flat acres, is an intricate part of our operations, a structure that houses our equipment, supplies and vehicles. A staging area for large events such as hiking, biking, equestrian, Boys and Girls Scouts, nature studies camps for children, camping, medieval events, music festival, large family reunions and open space, "activities for the community".

Affordable housing is needed in the county but not at the expense of losing 5 flat acres that is crucial in the management of Skyline Park.

There is only 1 Skyline Park, where there are many locations for housing.
PROTECT SKYLINE PARK AND KEEP IT WHOLE.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Vulk, 1195 4th Avenue, Napa  jouv7@aol.com
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 David 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,

[Signature]

J. David Hakman
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
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 Kristi Nyhus.

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,

Kristi Nyhus
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 Eric Nyhus.

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,

Eric Nyhus
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
S. 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 outwith the immediate area make use of this linacre 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 Californian 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 retrieved.

I hope you will take all the above into account, and also, most importantly, remind yourself 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 viewpoint, 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 gay 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, untapped area that would make a better development area.

It would also allow home owners/renters to access the local commercial areas without having to rely on a vehicle.

7/2/22
Today the park is full of young children enjoying the garden and story trail. As a retired educator, it fills me with horror to think that such an educational asset would be removed for ever. 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 Path and to find it as beautiful, peaceful and unspoilt as ever.

Generations will thank you.

Sandra Taylor
1 Beacon Lane
Little Bealings
Woodbridge
Suffolk
19/13 6LT
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 Fonda directly across from the Park and have enjoyed this path for over 27 years. Fonda 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 and the school.

Please look for another site. I would hate to find Skyline diminished in size. If anything I would like it to increase.
We appreciate your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Margaret Kostin
2160 Penny Lane
Napa, Ca.
94559
Dear David Morrison,

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 & 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
Coth 1/00
321-537-9058
July 7, 2022

This letter is sent as an addition to my letter that I sent previously (that letter is dated June 14, 2022)

I live on McKinley Rd. and I have concerns about the proposed housing development on the Bishop property on Hegdeside Ave.

I know that you folks must be overwhelmed with the task that the state has handed to you so I will try to keep this letter short and to the point.

Please refer to my previous letter for details of my concerns about flooding, that Milliken Creek as a valuable resource for wildlife, the presence of indigenous people’s artifacts in the area surrounding Milliken Creek, the current walkability of Hedgeside, Estee and Mckinley and the high usage of these roads for recreation and exercise, the danger and congestion that will be caused by the addition of up to 1,000 more vehicle trips per day, the fact that the Bishop property is close to a burn zone and has been evacuated multiple times and the removal of 5 acres from agricultural use.

Since writing my last letter I have become concerned about water issues. As we are all aware the residents of this neighborhood depend on wells for water and we also see flooding of Milliken Creek several times in most winters. My backyard floods a bit and when I first moved here it bothered me but now I hope for it because it can’t help but recharge the aquifer. The first problem that I see this development causing is that 5 acres will be hardscaped and that will prevent water that lands on those 5 acres from percolating into the aquifer. Water that does run off of the parking lots will be contaminated with petroleum products and other substances that should not be absorbed into the soil or the aquifer.

I imagine that the 5 acres will be raised and sloped for water management and this will cause the adjacent neighbors to experience increased flooding.
If you don’t live in this area you may not be aware of the extent of the flooding. The Milliken Creek Bridge on Hedgeside and the road near the bridge have been severely damaged in past flood events sometimes requiring extensive repairs and loss of use.

On the other (south?) side of the 5 acres is a natural swale that also floods a bit. If the developer attempts to address the flooding of the creek or the swale it will only make flooding worse for those who are neighbors to the development.

Please consider removing the Bishop site from the list of properties to be considered for development.

Thanks again for your time,

Dan Hurst
1617 McKinley Rd.
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
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
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
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
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,
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
[External Email - Use Caution]

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
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
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
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 finically 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
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
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
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 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
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

Could I trouble you to redistribute the below letter to the Housing Element Advisory Committee? I would greatly appreciate it! Thank you so much.

Paul

29 Montecito Blvd.
Napa, CA. 94559

July 9, 2022

Housing Element Advisory Committee
Napa, CA

Dear Housing Element Advisory Committee 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 an 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 descendants 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, MACP
29 Montecito Blvd, Napa

Health Sciences Clinical Professor of Medicine
Department of Medicine
UC Davis Health
Sacramento, CA
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,

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
pjroberts@sbcglobal.net
415 608-3351
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 Dave Whitmer,

I have personal experience with the traffic and rural road dangers of Hedgeside Ave.

My son is now 12 and through the years one of his favorite tasks has been to get the mail. During his younger, supervised years he would accidentally leave our mail key inserted into our locked mailbox that sits at the road of Hedgeside Ave or “trail the mail” all the way back to the house. I would help him watch for cars passing by. Now my older, more capable and independent 12 year old grabs the mail key and heads out the door to get the mail on his own. The simple task of getting the mail shouldn’t spark fear in me, right?

Unfortunately it does because Hedgeside is a small rural road that can be dangerous.

The ingress onto Hedgeside Road from Monticello can be a tough one to maneuver. There isn’t a turn lane for cars to safely wait for a break in the traffic to make the turn onto Hedgeside. People behind you on Monticello don’t want to wait for you to turn so they try to go around my car, so close it looks like they are going to side swipe my
car or hit the power pole that’s at the shoulder where you wait. I’m not a road and traffic engineer so I can’t explain this, but for some reason people mis-judge the turn and run into the fence of our neighbor (photos available). In December of 2021 someone turned onto Hedgeside from Monticello, lost control, fish tailed, swirved past the opposing lane, ran over 2 of our large bushes, narrowly missed my fence only because our tree stopped it just in time (photos available). The concern is not our bushes or our fence, but for our full of life, happy son out there getting the mail and something unexpected and tragic happening. This accident happened about 50 feet of our mail box!

In addition, a month or two ago the caution sign on Hedgeside that warns of a stop sign ahead was laying on the ground, the wood post in slivers. A car was going fast enough to hit and completely break it off of where it was set in concrete. Our mailbox and the road sign are literally 85 feet apart. 85 feet sounds like a lot but not when you’re traveling 40 miles/hour.

*The county had to come out and replace it so there should be a record of this incident.

Another common chore for any 12 year old, including our son, is bringing the garbage cans to the road for collection. “Garbage Day” brings the same concerns as retrieving the mail for all of us on this rural county road. We literally stand on Hedgeside Avenue to get our garbage cans in position for collection and again when we retrieve them.

Now consider increasing traffic by 1200+ additional vehicles per day coupled with more pedestrian activity.

*USPS said that the mailbox should be 6”-8” inches from the edge of the sidewalk or if you don’t have a sidewalk then the edge of the road. Per USPS, our mailbox is set to code so we literally stand on Hedgeside Ave to get the mail as do many other neighbors.
Is Hedgeside the only “neighborhood” type zoning on the list? If so, why is this?

Are the other potential build sites directly off a small country road with homes and mailboxes in very close proximity to the road?

Do the other locations affect the safety of existing families to the same degree during the simple act of getting the mail or taking the garbage cans to the road for collection?

What is the zoning of the other potential sites?

Are the other sites designed better to handle high density type activity and traffic in a safer way?

Thank you for your time,
Jessica McDonald
1023 Hedgeside Ave, Napa

2022 Housing Element Update
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, it's 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!
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
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/
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
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
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
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
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 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 rely 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
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 phytocides 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
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!!!
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
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.
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
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
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 specie 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 bore 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.
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
[External Email - Use Caution]

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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
[External Email - Use Caution]

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 some how 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
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
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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.
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 Planner’s 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
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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
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
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), deliberately 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 dread 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 Hedgeside, 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 predicable “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
Hi Trevor,

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

Best,

Ricardo Graf
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Hi Trevor,

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

Best,

Ricardo Graf

Sent from Mail for Windows

---

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
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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 as 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
From: ruralangwin
To: Hawkes, Trevor
Subject: #4 Comments Draft Housing Element Update
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 3:33:27 PM
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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 band width 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
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
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!
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 us a 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 home owners 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 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
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
Opposition to ultra high-density housing units

We are opposed to having ultra high-density housing units on the Altamura property (Monticello and Atlas Peak Road) and the proposed Hedgegide site.

Unfortunately, the county is being forced by a state, unfunded, mandate to provide ultra high density low income in a high-income area for no particular reason except for political purposes.

We suggest that the state donate sufficient land at its Napa State Hospital site, which has 138 acres available of mostly vacant land to the County of Napa to satisfy the state mandate.

I was a member of the 20-member Steering Committee for the 2008 County of Napa 20-year General Plan. The plan, approved 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.
3. The County of Napa 20-year General Plan is all about preserving our historical culture of an agricultural 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 ultra high-density, low-income units is incompatible with over 90 years of zoning for Ag Preserve.
4. Further, the state mandate to have 106 units in high income areas is not necessary or wanted by anyone.
5. Some real problems and barriers to have any residential or commercial rezoning at the Altamura site include:
   1. The sewer line is at capacity and would require 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 ultra high-density units on the Altamura property facing Monticello Blvd. and Atlas Peak Road will create additional heavy traffic congestion and challenges for an easy fire evacuation route. Also, the amount of traffic on both roads will increase substantially on a daily basis.
   4. Silverado has always opposed increasing density in our rural neighborhood, including a quality of life which we have chosen to live because of its location, culture, rural setting and lifestyle.
   5. The entrances to the sites are dangerous.
   6. There will definitely be more crime in our neighborhoods.
   7. The ultra high-density units will be extremely costly to build because of the building codes, cost of construction, etc.-maybe a $1 million per unit.
   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 currently being built in Napa should be sufficient to accommodate the need for additional housing. We have a declining population in the County of Napa.

In summary, there are just a few of the reasons to oppose this unfunded state mandate to have ultra high density units in high income areas.

We hope that the Planning Commission and its staff will realistically and objectively consider all the reasons to oppose the Altamura property and the Hedgegide site as not appropriate sites for any ultra high density low income housing units.

Conrad and Linda Hewitt
Napa
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
To whom it may concern;

We are writing in regards to the recent proposed Low Cost Housing Initiative that is being planned near the Silverado Community. Specifically it will impact residents in the Silverado Trail, Hedgeside, Monticello, Atlas Peak, Vichy, East Avenue and Lake Berrysea as well as Up Valley. When I moved to Napa in 1991, the emphasis was on slow growth and preserving Napa’s beautiful outdoor space. The past several years our town has seen exponential housing growth and it has impacted the residents quality of life. There are only so many people that can fit in a defined area. Our roads can only be expanded so far, and there is only so much water to name several obvious issues. Presently to get across town during certain times of the day can take nearly 30 minutes. Getting in and out of Silverado at the crossing of Monticello/Trancas and Silverado Trail is becoming more and more onerous and time consuming. Being a resident that was impacted by the fire, the addition of 100 plus new homes on Monticello/Atlas Peak will exacerbate the problem of evacuation from a fire or other natural catastrophe. In addition, the issue of available water is already a huge concern. The water problem, as we know, will only get worse in the near future.

Of course, this Initiative would be a bonanza for developers, who in general don’t care about what the effect our town or its residents. It appears that this project is being forced on us, by wealthy, deep pocket developers.

Lastly, our town has limited ability to expand - due to its topography as a valley. Let’s keep the very nature of “Napa Valley” safe.

Sincerely,

Julie Cohen
550 Westgate Dr
Napa, CA  94558
juliecohen2@me.com
707-479-8049
Dear Mr. Hawkes,

The information Kellie Anderson has laid out here is an excellent example of opportunities we have to ensure we do not repeat previous mistakes.

When well-financed hotel and other tourist-serving projects have been approved, we have, in some instances lost the housing for the people who work for these tourist-serving businesses. And now we are in the trouble that some were warning about. Virtually every business I know upvalley is suffering from staffing shortages, due primarily to housing shortage for workers. What sense does this all make? Especially in light of the fact that decisions could be made along the way that would not contribute to this serious problem.

Please make every effort to save this housing on Lodi. Please do not act as if your hands are tied. They are not. Do what you can – and if you do, every county resident can applaud.

Foresight: an ability most have and few practice. Time to resuscitate, sharpen, value and employ this skill.

Noun – the ability to judge correctly what is going to happen in the future and plan your actions based on this knowledge.

Cambridge dictionary.

Sincerely,
Gayle Davies
St Helena
gayleddavies@gmail.com

****************************************************************************************************************

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 band width 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
Please see the article below. We agree wholeheartedly with the issues Mr. Hewitt addresses in his editorial letter. As a Realtor, I am very aware of plenty of other more practical sites for this project in the city of Napa. Either of these sites makes no sense.

Nancy and Paul Feldman
835 Augusta Cr.
Napa, CA 94558

https://napavalleyregister.com/opinion/letters/letter-opposition-to-ultra-high-density-housing-units/article_542a5dd8-ffe9-11ec-99fb-eff6227ff0ed.html
Opposition to ultra high-density housing units

We are opposed to having ultra high-density housing units on the Altamura property (Monticello and Atlas Peak Road) and the proposed Hedgecide site.

Unfortunately, the county is being forced by a state, un-funded mandate to provide ultra high density low income in a high-income area for no particular reason except for political purposes.

We suggest that the state donate sufficient land at its Napa State Hospital site, which has 138 acres available of mostly vacant land to the County of Napa to satisfy the state mandate.

I was a member of the 20-member Steering Committee for the 2008 County of Napa 20-year General Plan. The plan, approved 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.
3. The County of Napa 20-year General Plan is all about preserving our historical culture of an agricultural community and quality of life in a rural setting, not to be invaded and changed by high cost developers, and rezoning from ag to high density. The rezoning for the ultra high-density, low-income units is incompatible with over 90 years of zoning for Ag Preserve.
4. Further, the state mandate to have 106 units in high income areas is not necessary or wanted by anyone.
5. Some real problems and barriers to have any residential or commercial rezoning at the Altamura site include:
   1. The sewer line is at capacity and would require 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 ultra high-density units on the Altamura property facing Monticello Blvd. and Atlas Peak Road will create additional heavy traffic congestion and challenges for an easy fire evacuation route. Also, the amount of traffic on both roads will increase substantially on a daily basis.
6. Silverado has always opposed increasing density in our rural neighborhood, including a quality of life which we have chosen to live because of its location, culture, rural setting and lifestyle.
7. The entrances to the sites are dangerous.
8. There will definitely be more crime in our neighborhoods.
9. The ultra high-density units will be extremely costly to build because of the building codes, cost of construction, etc—maybe a $1 million per unit.
10. Milliken Creek has flooded more than once and the ecosystem of Milliken Creek will be impacted with these ultra high-density units.

A big consideration as more people choose to leave the State of California, the amount of housing currently being built in Napa should be sufficient to accommodate the need for additional housing. We have a declining population in the County of Napa.

In summary, there are just a few of the reasons to oppose this unfunded state mandate to have ultra high density units in high income areas.

We hope that the Planning Commission and its staff will realistically and objectively consider all the reasons to oppose the Altamura property and the Hedgecide site as not appropriate sites for any ultra high density low income housing units.

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

Dear members of the Housing Element Advisory Committee,

As a resident of Napa and a frequent user of Skyline Wilderness Park, I oppose the plans under consideration to build housing within the park.

While I understand the dire need for housing in Napa County, the park is an extremely valuable community resource for many County residents. Building housing will impact the enjoyment of the park, thus impacting the well being of many residents.

There are certainly other more suitable sites within the county and city, including the very large and underutilized grounds of the state hospital, as well as space along Fester Road or Big Ranch Road.

Additionally, encroachment into Skyline Wilderness Park will set a very bad precedent that shared parklands are open to development, which will have a detrimental effect on the environment. (It's called a “Wilderness Park” for a reason!)

Under no circumstance should Skyline Wilderness Park be considered as a site for development.

I urge you to take action to protect the park from development.

Thank you for your time.

David Begler  
1011 McCormick Lane  
Napa, CA 94558  
415-307-1362
Trevor,

Please forward my email to all HEAC members and staff, and include in the HEU public comments.

Thank you all for your hard work on this process. I was hoping to comment on Item 7A at the July 14th HEAC meeting, so please include this in your considerations about that agenda item. In addition to requesting that the Bishop site be dropped from consideration due to the myriad of problems outlined in previous letters; I wanted to pose a few questions and offer some comments regarding the discussion today.

- Those concerned with specific sites have been labeled NIMBY's. I offer that we are not privy to the location and conditions of the other 224 sites, and thus have only the opportunity to comment on the inadequacies of said sites. This fact can only make us NIMBY by design but it is terribly derogatory and detracts from the really clear problems some of these locations pose for this type of development. We are all very concerned about the "Urban Sprawl" bills directed by the State and understand the challenges to meet the requirements of these poorly written mandates. We do care about a good outcome to this process and those of us next to a bad site can help you think about other sites and do much needed outreach to property owners in more suitable locations.

- Landowners:
  Is there a letter of intent, or just conversation with identified landowners? If so, how can we see those details so you are not caught offguard last minute like with 11-11?

- Municipal system requirements:
  We construct municipal wastewater systems all of the time for on-site wastewater, both blackwater and process wastewater for wineries. If we are replacing the whole line to Silverado Country Club for the bishop property, I offer that there are many other locations that can construct their own system at less potential cost as it's done by private landowners all of the time in this County, quite inexpensively as well.

- High opportunity or high resource?
  How was this data gathered? In California, Home pricing is often not reflective of income level. For example, in the Proximity of the Bishop site, income levels are quite low, despite home values being high. Many of our residents are retired and original homeowners on fixed income, and by very definition qualified as "low income". Does the resource area designation offer this level of analysis, and if not, it should be noted in the plan about the deficiencies in mis-identifying these areas. Defining resource area designations by lumping planned developments like Silverado with RC zoning areas is problematic for this analysis. The area should be segregated in its analysis to stay consistent with its zoning.

- Ron and Kellie brought up important points about preserving current affordable units. The owners of the Bishop site are currently Demolishing a rental unit on the adjacent property,
after evicting the Latino family living there, to built a massive Spec home! Their company is very successful at doing exactly this, like so many others in this area. The irony here is deafening.

-Napa Jail site and feed restrictions
Since the current plan is being put together without deed restriction requirements or other affordable housing zoning overlays and there is no guarantee that anything affordable will be built, what options have been explored about building County owned and funded projects? The future Jail site has plenty of property, has walking access to tremendous amenities including Napa college, and Skyline park right behind it. A site like this is exactly what the State is proposing for Skyline. Why wouldn't this site be included, and also carry "real affordable housing" commitments. At the very least it should be included in the plan in case the Jail project fails to move forward.

-Once the Jail is moved the downtown space becomes available for affordable projects. Why can't that be included in this plan as well.
The current units in the old Napa Register housing development are going for $1.8 million and $1.4 million based on bedrooms, and offer no actual "affordability" at all. Other jurisdictions are successfully negotiating land swaps like this.

Thank you for your consideration and response to questions posed.

Garrett Buckland
Dear Housing Element Advisory Committee 
Planning Commission  c/o David Morrison-

In writing today to express my concern regarding the possibility of parts of Skyline Park being converted into housing area. I oppose this for several reasons while also recognizing that housing in the Valley is of dire need. I'm not opposed to housing - just not at Skyline.

I frequent the park trails, disc golf courses and maintain bikerip several times per week and would recommend visitors to go. It's a beautiful natural resource that will be threatened if they are unable to generate revenue from parks at the park that housing is proposed to be built. If Cams has taught us anything, it's that we need outdoor spaces to recreate for our physical and mental health... this area is where our community can achieve that. We must be stewards of the land... I am reminded of attending Native American Pow-wows there and think... what would they say? Build more houses on our precious natural resource land? No. Please.

There are other areas in Napa to be used that don't already supply these valuable resources.

Thanks for your consideration. - Damian
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: Dan Hurst <dfromn@att.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 3:39 PM  
To: MeetingClerk <MeetingClerk@countyofnapa.org>  
Subject: July 14th Housing Element Advisory Committee Meeting: Bishop site

[External Email - Use Caution]

Good afternoon,

Regarding the proposed rezoning and development of the 5 acre Bishop site on Hedgeside Ave.:

I am sending this email because of my concerns about the challenges and difficulties that the development of the Bishop site on Hedgeside Ave.

-I am hearing that one of the advantages of the Bishop site is that a sewer line runs close to or under the site. This existing sewer line serves Silverado Country Club and it is already at or near capacity. Homeowners in the Monticello Park neighborhood are on septic and some have requested to have their properties added to the existing sewer line and their requests have been denied because the sewer line does not have the capacity. This sewer line is not an advantage to the Bishop site, it is at capacity so a new sewer line will have to be added even though there is an existing line close by.
- The Bishop site is bordered by Milliken Creek and in my 27 years in the neighborhood I have seen Milliken Creek flood the area several times. A couple of times the flooding was so extreme that it damaged the bridge over Milliken Creek and also the roadway leading to the bridge. If the 5 acres proposed for development is paved and sloped when it is developed this will certainly exacerbate the flooding for neighboring properties.

- When the 5 acres are developed water that lands on the property will not be able to percolate into the aquifer and any runoff will be polluted with petroleum products from the parking areas, some of this polluted runoff will make its way into Milliken Creek which is a habitat for several species of fish, frogs, salamanders, etc. This is a pristine area and any pollution will have a noticeable detrimental effect on the ecology of the area.

- The roads in the area that surrounds the proposed development (Hedgeside, Estee and Mckinley in particular) are a valuable resource for the residents of the neighborhood and beyond. We live on McKinley Rd. and every day we see a high number of families and individuals walking or cycling the roads for exercise and relaxation. This would not be happening with the much higher level of traffic that the development of the Bishop site would cause. Walkers and cyclists would be risking life and limb while walking and biking the roads. The high level of traffic caused by the development would also be challenging and dangerous for residents of the proposed development.

- I am hearing that the development would add around 1,000 additional vehicle trips per day. This will cause dangerous driving conditions because of many blind corners and challenging sight lines. Increasing traffic at this level on rural roads cannot help but endanger pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

- The Bishop site is close to the burn zone of several recent fires and we have been evacuated several times and we are further from the burn zone than the Bishop site. The added population caused by this high density development will cause evacuations to be even more challenging. Also, insurance for the site will be either unattainable or very costly if it is available.

- With 125 possible residences in the proposed project one could easily expect and additional 250 residents and possibly more. This might easily double the number of residents in the neighborhood of Hedgeside, Estee and McKinley Road. This is extreme and would negatively impact the character of the entire area.

- This quiet, rural, heavily agricultural, low density neighborhood will be changed forever. These kinds of neighborhoods are becoming rare and are enjoyed not only by residents but also by others who walk, cycle and visit the area.

- This development removes 5 acres from agricultural use.

- The proposed development is quite a distance from grocery stores, doctor's offices, banks and other services and there is no public transit in the area so residents will need to drive their cars to these services.

Please consider removing the Hedgeside (Bishop) site from the list of potential sites for development.

Thank you for your time,
Dan Hurst
1617 McKinley Rd.
Napa, Ca 94558
Dear Trevor,

Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update. (Trevor I sent this to you already) just making sure everyone gets it.

Good morning!! I am writing to say that I (we) oppose the development and rezoning of the Bishop Ranch Property for the following reasons:

**THE CURVE**

The street is very narrow as it is and dangerous to children, and the many walkers, joggers and bikes near the turn. I saw in one drive down Hedgeside just today, 3 bike riders, 4 joggers and 2 walkers. Some people actually park and walk here from other areas. The curve is extremely dangerous.

**OLD ROADS AND BRIDGE**

The Bridge is old and narrow to add an additional 300+ or more cars a day would not be good for the bridge or the road. The road is not in good shape now, and is narrow all the way down with no sidewalk. As it is because there is no sidewalk or shoulder, we have to drive on the wrong side many times a day to get around delivery trucks, mail man, garbage man, people collecting their mail, walkers, joggers, bikers. What would an additional 300 cars look like doing this?

With the bridge already in place and narrow how would you widen the road? If you widen the Bridge and the road how much would that cost the City/County. Or should I say tax payers???

What about Estee it is also narrow and extremely dangerous at the top turning onto Hardman. Guaranteed to be many accidents there as well. I am guessing we would also need a Stop Light or Sign at Hedgeside on Monticello as well, because turning there will become a bigger hazard. **I have already been rear ended trying to turn onto Hedgeside.** With that much traffic we would have to control it some how. With that cost, pile on top the cost to repair and enlarge the sewer and water?

**POLLUTION TO THE CREEK AND FIRE DANGER**
Lastly, our biggest concern is actually for the creek. The creek as it is, is visited by outsiders using it a swimming hole in the hot weather, they liter, smoke, paint graffiti under the bridge, use it to party in, and bring their animals, kids, etc. We have found broken bottles, chairs, food wrappers, food, and much more on our property and under the bridge. Isn't this contaminating the Creek?? I am guessing cigarette butts and garbage is not great for the wild life. The creek runs all year round, so hanging out under the bridge is going to contaminate the water. Who is going to clean up under the bridge? They worry about people cutting back vegetation, can you imagine the damage and pollution all the people will create? Not to mention fire hazard, to all the property along the creek. There are many trees that are old and dying along the creek that are pending PG&E removal. What if one caught on fire? How long before it travels?? My guess is pretty quick!!

All owners of property near the creek would have to deal the garbage, noise and fire danger with it becoming a common place for all the kids and adults to hang out. And don’t think they won’t. They will!!! Are they proposing a swimming pool or two for these High Density Houses?? If not you can bet the kids will be in the creek. They won't care if it is private property or that they are contaminating the wild life.

I know I don't just speak for myself. The whole area out here is opposed to this. It just doesn't make sense to put it here. With all the cost the would incur there has to be a better place than here. It is old and frail, and one of the last places that is like being in the country. We would really like to keep it that way.

Thank you!!

Lorri and Brandon Sax
1133 Hedgeside Ave.
Napa, CA  94558

Cell 707-815-4064
TO  Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department
    1195 Third Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 210
    Napa, California 94559
    Attn:  Trevor Hawkes, Project Planner
    trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org

RE:  DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Skyline Wilderness Park

FR:  Teresa Vandal
    2473 Carriage Place
    Napa, CA  94558
    (707) 486-3079
    teresavandal@yahoo.com

I am writing in support of Skyline Wilderness Park and in strong opposition to any part of the
park being converted to urban development.

As an equestrian, I enjoy the park regularly with my horses and friends. The park is a safe place
for us to get out and enjoy nature along with several other groups, disc golfers, mountain bikers,
hikers and visitors from all walks of life!

Skyline Wilderness Park is a magical area that so many people need for their mental health! The
park serves the locals and well as people from all over the world. I recently was riding and came
upon a group of young ladies from Brooklyn, NY and S. Africa. They were hiking up Lake
Marie Road and were excited to meet the horses and tell me about their hike.

We would suffer as a community to lose this park with the area in question being used for so
many important functions.

The need for housing is recognized, the area to build is not in the park. There are other areas
better suited for low density housing. The state hospital sits empty with infrastructure in place,
that space should be considered before the open space of the community park.

Please do everything in your power to save the park, do not allow Skyline Wilderness Park to be
used for this project.

Sincerely,

Teresa Vandal
Dear Mr. Morrison & Planning Commission:

Planning for housing is an admirable thing but removing part of Skyline Park to do it, is not.

As the population of Napa increases, open space will continue to contribute to “quality of life.” People can live in apartments, condos, houses, boats, trailers - many diverse places. However, the gatherings currently held at Skyline on those 20 acres cannot be held in apartments, condos, houses, boats and trailers. Removing the 20 acres will greatly impact the ability of the Skyline Park Association to support the Park.

Henry David Thoreau wrote “…in wildness lies the preservation of the world.”

Please do not allow Napa wilderness to be taken - it will not come back.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Weboj Hamilton
Good morning,

My name is Dan Hurst and I am retired so I have lots of time and lately I have been hearing and reading about the 6 potential sites for developing housing in Napa County.

I decided to get out and see some of the areas and the sites and to also do some research into the history and the details of the sites. Quite a bit of info was available on some sites (with a little digging) and some not so much.

I know that you all have been under pressure to figure this out and that you have been working hard to get it done. I truly appreciate your efforts. While doing my research and forming an opinion I tried to consider the people who would be living in the development when it’s done. Important items would be easy access to retail services such as groceries, retail stores, public transit, schools; location on major roads, walkability, etc. Safety of residents is of primary concern.

1. Skyline Park: First, I should let you know that I have been going to Skyline Wilderness Park since it first opened, and it is one of my favorite places to hike and mountain bike. I have an annual pass to Skyline and I’m there at least 3 times a week. I donated labor and materials many years ago to rehab one of the buildings, I think it was a snack bar. I love Skyline and I was concerned about the proposed development.

I found that there are a lot of people objecting to this location being on the list, even the Sierra Club so I thought that I should have an open mind and educate myself about the location of the proposed development. I went and saw the area that is being considered for development and, although Skyline Park is beautiful and has many trails available for recreation, the 5 acres that are being considered are not anywhere near the trails, the archery area, the frisbee golf course or the camping area. In fact there is a sign at the east end of the 5 acres that says “Keep Out! Park employees only” (see attached photos) so there is no loss of use to the public and the 5 acres are not anywhere near the trails. The 5 acres are next to the Board of Education building and a couple of schools so there’s already development and infrastructure in the immediate area, in fact it would be possible for children living in the proposed development to walk to school. The 5 acres that are proposed for development are across Imola Ave. from a long time residential neighborhood. Nearby on Imola within easy walking or bicycling distance are a bank, a 7-11 convenience store, a laundromat and a neighborhood grocery store. Within a mile is South Napa Marketplace which has chain restaurants, a gas station, a Raley’s grocery store, a Home Depot store, a movie theater, a Target store and more. There is also availability of public transportation near the site, there is a transit stop at the Camille School which is next to the site. Another interesting future plan is for a bike path to be built along Imola Ave. This would improve accessibility to services even more and with no negative effect on congestion or air quality.

I found an article in the Napa Valley Register by Barry Eberling dated May 3, 2022 and the subject was the 6 sites being considered. In the section about Skyline park it states that the state Department of General Services told county officials that housing will likely be built on the 5 acres within 8 years and that the state does not have to wait for any zoning changes. This sounds like the housing will be built with or without Napa County’s involvement. We need to keep this site on the list and also to work with the State so that this will get done and so that Napa County gets credit for the housing.
This would be an easy site to develop and, more importantly, residents of the housing will find it a very convenient location to live and to raise families.

2. Foster Rd.: This site possesses many of the same advantages for the future residents that the Skyline site has. The site is less than a half mile from Irene Snow Elementary School. There is a transit stop ½ mile away at Foster Rd. and Imola Ave. and I imagine it would be easy for them to extend the route to the proposed development. It’s approximately 1.3 miles from River Park Shopping Center and a little over one mile from Lola’s Market on Old Sonoma Rd. The site also has easy access to Hwy. 29 and also to Hwy 12. This access to two major highways would make for an easy commute to jobs in the airport industrial area and to jobs upvalley. The site is within the City of Napa RUL line and the City anticipates annexation and development of the parcel. With annexation, water and sewer will be available. It seems that if the County and the City work together this could be a very good candidate for development. (it would be interesting to explore the possibility of residents having the option of using Foster Rd. or Golden Gate Dr.)

3. Big Ranch Rd. and Trancas: This site provides access to shopping, transit and other services such as medical care within easy walking distance. It is also located close to major thoroughfares for easy commuting to jobs. Water and sewer service are present at the street so any development would be easy. This is another site that would serve residents well.

4. Bishop property: This site has issues with access because it is on a narrow road with a couple of blind turns, Hedgeside is already a road that requires caution when driving, walking or cycling, the extreme increase in traffic caused by the development will make Hedgeside a dangerous road for everyone. I also see that it is close to a burn zone from recent wildfires, this poses a risk for residents and obtaining insurance coverage could be a challenge. Milliken Creek is very near the Bishop site and I know that it floods. The area to be developed would need to be raised which would make the flooding worse for properties nearby. This is not a walkable site and there are no transit stops within walking distance so access to any shopping or services would require a trip in a car. There is a small deli on Monticello Rd. but it is pricey and doesn’t have the groceries that families need. I also have found that although a sewer line runs close to the property the sewer line is at capacity so seeing the sewer line’s location as an advantage is questionable since it is already at full capacity. Milliken Creek is a year round waterway and it supports many species of fish and other wildlife, the light, the pollution and the contaminated water runoff from the development site will negatively affect the creek and the surrounding area which will cause challenges for the wildlife.

5. Altamura site: This site has frontage on two major thoroughfares, Monticello Rd. and Atlas Peak Rd. making for easy exit and entrance which is good for residents. The location has the same issues as the Bishop site regarding access to public transportation and services but doesn’t appear to have flooding issues. This site is also close to a burn zone. It is curious that although the Altamura site is .8 acres larger than the Bishop site it is planned for a much smaller number of residences.

6. Spanish Flat site: Similar to Skyline Park I spend time recreating at Lake Berryessa and I enjoy hiking the area and I love the pristine nature surrounding the lake. Although the site is far from the City of Napa it’s possible that this development could prove to be a shot in the arm for Lake Berryessa which is a wonderful recreational resource that is underutilized. I hear that the County is working with a private developer and the Bureau of Reclamation to get resorts at the lake open and running again. This will create opportunities for employment in the near future.
The area also has sewer and water services provided by the Spanish Flat Water District. That said, currently this site is challenging because of distance from services and employment but in the near future it could prove to be beneficial to the area, an area with potential that has felt neglected for many years.

I’m sure that you all worked hard on the list, it just seems that a couple of the sites stand out as great locations for residents where others present challenges.

Skyline Park seems the most likely to succeed especially since it has no zoning (it’s surplus land) and it is likely to be developed by the State in the near future but also because of easy access to services for residents.

Foster Rd. is a site that is ripe for annexation and development. It is already adjacent to a higher density developed area. The Foster Rd. site also has the advantages of being next to existing infrastructure and proximity to major thoroughfares. It is also reasonably close to shopping and services. If the City and the County are able to work together this could be a great place for future residents.

Big Ranch Rd at Trancas is walking distance to shopping and services, it is on major roads and it has infrastructure at the street. This is another good site for residents.

The Altamura site has some challenges with infrastructure and distance from services but the location on two major roads makes entrance and exit easy. It is close to a burn zone. If the Altamura site is on the list it would be good if it could have more housing.

Spanish Flat is already zoned commercial and it could be a much needed stimulus for the area if the redevelopment of Berryessa resorts is going to go forward in the next several years.

The Bishop site seems like it presents quite a few challenges for development and that future residents would be inconvenienced by distance from services, lack of public transit and dangerous roads. There are also environmental issues of flooding, the development polluting a pristine meadow and waterway and the fact that it is close to a burn zone.

I appreciate the hard work that you have been doing on this challenging task and I know that you will continue to do so. You may have already considered other sites but I think of the Napa Pipe area, the open area surrounding American Canyon, existing structures and open areas at Napa State, Carneros School and some others as possibilities.

Keep up the hard work, it is important to make sure that residents of the developments are safe and comfortable.

Thank you for your time,
Dan Hurst
KEEP OUT
PARK EMPLOYEES ONLY!
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Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ....

This site is inappropriate for a number of reasons.

When another fire, as happened in 2017, or other catastrophic situation should occur, it will be a nightmare evacuating with the increase of traffic.

Its in a flood zone.

Traffic safety will be at risk with the narrow winding blind killer curve. We walk this area every morning and stop well before the curve as it is so dangerous. There have been many drivers who have taken that curve to fast and ended up going through bishop’s fence and ending up in his field. I’d hesitate to think about a child on a bike or walking getting hit along route.

There is no grocery store or pharmacy near by.

The nearest elementary school is very small and at capacity. There is no school bus transportation for middle or high schools.

This area is all on septic systems and well water. No sidewalks, sewer or city water and few street lights.

No lefthand turn from Monticello onto Hedgeside. God help you when you try and do it now.

There has to be other properties more situated for this kind of development. What about the old Red Hen property or farther up valley?

You’re setting a precedent for other landowners to follow in Bishop’s footsteps.

This will cost millions and millions of dollars if this proposal goes through. So much for “affordable housing”.

This is a quiet country setting with mainly retired people who have lived here for years.

Affordable housing at this site is totally inappropriate.

We strongly oppose this proposal.

Barry and Sharon Shaw
1133 Atlas Peak Rd. Corner of Atlas Peak and McKinley Rd.
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because . . .

PLEASE SAVE OUR AREA. My husband and I moved to Mckinley Road 10 years ago from high density, crowded and congested Southern California. We found that McKinley, Hedgeside and Estee form a unique niche in Napa that few know about. It is a quiet area of horses, goats, chickens and vineyards. Neighbors wave and talk to each other. However, due to our rural setting, there are many reasons why high density housing of any kind cannot be built here.

1. We are all on wells and septic systems. the cost to put in the infrastructure for the high density housing would be exorbitant.
2. Our streets are narrow with no streetlights, sidewalks or curbs. Another very pricey issue.
3. There is no public transportation to take residents to work, shopping or schools. Another pricey cost to consider.
4. Hedgeside is a narrow road with a dangerous curve where vehicles have gone into the fence and have narrowly missed walkers.
5. Many of the residents, including us, walk daily. Some people drive from other areas just to walk here.

Traffic has already increased as people have learned that they can use our streets to avoid Silverado, Atlas Peak and Monticello. The additional traffic from high density housing would only make this more dangerous.

6. The left turn onto Hedgeside from Monticello is always iffy and it's hard to imagine the difficulty with more vehicles.
7. Our area is in a flood zone and yes, it does happen.
8. There is no convenient shopping nearby. That means more vehicles, more congestion and more traffic.
9. Evacuation during fires or earthquakes would be nearly impossible as everyone tries to get out on Monticello through Hedgeside. It was difficult enough in 2017 and its hard to imagine what an additional 300 vehicles (100-125 apts) will cause while trying to exit.

10. Milliken Creek is a natural habitat and it will be polluted by additional housing.

HAVE ANY OF YOU WALKED OUR AREA?
HAVE ANY OF YOU VISITED?
HAVE ANY OF YOU GONE TO THE RESIDENTS WHOSE HOUSES WILL BE ACROSS FROM THIS HIGH DENSITY HOUSING?

Please take our concerns very seriously. It almost makes us nauseous thinking of the disaster that could happen here.

Jim and Gloria Fohrman
1668 McKinley Road
Hi Trevor,

Once again workers and families without generational wealth are getting priced out of the valley.

Housing is a human right. Allowing “the market” to displace families is cruel and disgusting.

2 bedroom apartments in Napa are nearing 3k a month. Where are we supposed to live?

The restaurant where my husband works has 2 servers who were given move out notices and there’s nothing reasonable for the two of them and their daughter.

They have workers who commute in from Sacramento where they could buy. With fuel costs rising, workers can’t commute in either.

Napa is gonna price itself out of existence. Families are fleeing which leaves fewer workers. Wonder why you can’t find cooks? Who’s gonna pour that coffee? Who will work at the hotel?

There’s plenty of luxury housing. Yay for them. But when y’all clutch your pearls and wonder why “nObOdY wANTs tO wOrK aNyMoRe,” ask yourselves WHERE can workers live? Cuz it ain’t here.

-Laura Arisman
Napa.

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Reader,

I understand there are several locations being considered for development. I am a long time resident and know Napa well. I've watched as new developments were intelligently designed to serve Napa's needs. Consideration of transportation needs, convenient shopping, local schools, parks, and entertainment have all added to the quality of life in Napa.

Under consideration are six sites; three appear logical, one possibly premature, and two unsuited to the goals set forth.

- Skyline Park is especially suited as it has no zoning; the State is likely to start development in the near future, and the site has easy access to services for residents.

- Foster Rd. is already adjacent to a higher density developed area, is next to existing infrastructure, has proximity to major thoroughfare, and is reasonably close to shopping and services.

- Big Ranch Rd at Trancas is walking distance to shopping and services; it is on major roads and it has infrastructure at the street.

- Spanish Flat is already zoned commercial and if the redevelopment of Berryessa resorts is going to go forward in the next several years, it could be a much needed stimulus for the area.

- The Altamura site has some challenges with infrastructure and distance from services, but the location on two major roads makes entrance and exit easy. However, it is close to a burn zone.

- The Bishop site has environmental issues of flooding, a large parking lot will create toxic runoff during the rainy season, would require additional water and sewer lines, wider roads, sidewalks, is not near services and is close to a burn zone.

We are fortunate to have intelligent options.

Thank you for your hard work.

Kim Donnelly
1617 McKinley Road
Napa, Ca

--

Kim
From: Todd Ballard
To: Hawkes, Trevor; Morrison, David; Tran, Minh; Pedroza, Alfredo; Cortez, Nelson; andrewmazotti@gmail.com; Wagenknecht, Brad; Gregory, Ryan; Dillon, Diane; Ramos, Bella; joellegPC@gmail.com; Whitmer, David; anne.cottrell@lucene.com; Dameron, Megan; Info
Subject: No to "Bishop Site" Comments on 2022 Housing Element Plan
Date: Sunday, July 24, 2022 2:19:47 PM
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Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ...
1. Traffic:
   An unusually large increase to our rural community. Impacting our safety and the quiet atmosphere.
2. Aquifer:
   The impact to our local water supply, wells, creeks etc. would be substantial. Have there been any environmental studies as it relates to the effects of covering the ground with 5 acres of concrete and asphalt? Will my well run dry with the advent of this project?
3. Other sites:
   My wife and I took a drive the other day to visit the Skyland Park area. First we were amazed at all the land that seems to be available on Imola between the state hospital and skyland Park there's hundreds of acres, some of which are hardly used. We were quite disturbed to find that our quiet community is being considered, when you have these other properties.
   We're also very bothered to have been informed so late in the game. I understand that the county needs low income high density housing, but you should have brought this conversation forth to our neighborhood much earlier on. January February at the least.
   Do the right thing... pick one of the other sites.
Thank you
Todd and Janice Ballard
Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" for several reasons. Two major ones are encrease of traffic and watershed reduction. There are many other reasons like non existing infrastructure for low income families, lack of walkability to any services (groceries, medical, etc), extremely high insurance cost in a flood zone, reduction of agricultural land, disturbace to envonment and habitat. The list is very long. However I would like to concentrate on two major problems, which are prohibitive to place a development in the Bishop sites. Traffic will increace dramatically. This will create unsafe environment for entire neighborhood population in day to day life. But in case of emergencies it will be deadly. Flooding will became more severe and will ocure more often. With proposed development there is a possibility that area will be rezone from 100 years flood zone to moderate flood zone. According to recent history area was flooded several times in the past 30 years. Should development will be completed, flooding could become a regular event.
With all this in mind, I do not think that Bishop siyes are good locations to place high density development. There are much better sites without mentioned above problems which will better suit such development.
I also believe that one of the major concerns for the planning department, county and city officials should be safety of residents and their properties. Proposed development will create extremely dangerous traffic and deadly evacuation conditions as well as geopardize existing properties with flooding.
Regards,
Yakov Reznikov

Sent from TypeApp
Trevor,

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ….  

Another major area of concerns (in addition to the many submitted letters addressing multiple issues with the use of this site for high density planning) is the subject of PARKING:

Questions-

1) Will offsite parking be prohibited on both sides of all the neighboring streets, especially Hedgeside Ave itself?
2) In doing so, will the County post “NO PARKING” signage?
3) Will the County enforce all the parking rules and regulations? How will this enforcement be covered?
4) How much acreage on site will be devoted to parking for residents and visitor parking spaces?
5) Does the plan account for all the expected parking that will likely over-spill onto the neighborhood roads, already restricted by narrowed/ obscured walking along the shoulders?
6) How many parking spaces are assigned to each unit, and how is the County planning to accommodate for the expected overage of vehicles on or around the property?

Regarding previously mentioned rainwater diversion and flooding:

Questions-

1) Expecting this project’s diversion of rainwater and floodwater to impact the ephemeral riparian corridor on the eastern border of the Bishop project, who will be responsible for the costs of improving the drainage in the almost already soil-filled culvert under Hedgeside Ave to improve the drainage on my property’s eastern portion, as well as the drainage for my downstream neighbors?

With anticipated rainwater and ensuing floodwater diverted by the Bishop site from paved surfaces (reducing the water necessary for recharging the already-depleted groundwater), WHO will be responsible for any/ all repairs due to the damages caused to both the riparian corridors as well as to my property and that of my downstream neighbors (if mitigation efforts are insufficient)?

I have observed flood waters flowing upon the western portion of the 5 acre site proposed for rezoning.

2) Has the County identified the extent of floodwaters which have impacted and will impact this area? If not, WILL this be identified and how will it be mitigated?  
Without extensive mitigation, flooding is a certainty, not simply a possibility/ probability.
Please address these most critical issues and questions, as this site is perhaps the least suited of all to attempt high density housing in a rural neighborhood that’s already challenged by current and grave traffic concerns (incl. both evacuation safety FROM and emergency service access TO high fire/ flood risk areas). We have already evacuated at least twice in the last three years, and that was after losing extensive family holdings only a few miles up Atlas Peak Road. This is also a watershed that’s already undermined by a depleted aquifer. Water tables have been steadily dropping. Any major development, such as HD housing, in this strained region, is simply outside the realm of safe and/or sustainable smart planning.

Despite an RC zoning, the historic and current use of the Bishop site specifically reflects a pattern of “agricultural” use over recent decades and, as such, the traditional use of such lands renders any re-zoning as clearly illegal without a “site-specific” EIR under current Climate Change state regulations. Please see the letter submitted by ICARE. This project would technically call for a site-specific EIR (as opposed to a Program EIR) or will be in violation of new state climate change restrictions/ regulations, which are based on historic and current land use, whether current zoning is correctly designated or not.

Question:

How does the County plan to meet the new climate legislative requirements prior to consideration of any zoning changes?

Thank you for any/ all thoughtfully considered responses to all of the above questions/ concerns.

Sincerely,

William and Parry Murray
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Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I’m opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because ...

We have lived on McKinley Road for 37 years. We moved here when our children were young, 1, 9 and 11. They grew up in a rural area, which is what we wanted for them. They were able to go to the creek, play in empty fields, and just be kids. Now I want our grandchildren to experience what their parents did.

I’m opposed to high density housing because

The area we live in is on septic tanks and wells. The infrastructure is not here to handle the housing and would cost us, county taxpayers millions of dollars.

Milligan Creek is a flood zone. We moved here in 1985 and the big flood of 1986 flooding Bishop’s field and the surrounding houses. It damaged the bridge and washed out the road. Times have changed, but who’s to say it would not happen again.

We are a small community out here, out of sight, out of mind. My wife and I walk every morning the neighborhood and people drive here to walk the neighborhood. It’s a quiet safe place to walk, with no sidewalks, no street lights to speak of. Since the fires in 2017, traffic has increased as pass through traffic, people fly down Hedgeside, turn right on McKinley, then immediately left on Estee where they continue to fly down the road to Hardman.

Traffic has also increased on Monticello Road as commuters use over the hill to get to Fairfield/Vacaville. I can’t tell you how many times I have been on Monticello Road, waiting to turn left on Hedgeside and cringing, hoping the cars behind me, stop or slow down, or they swerve to the right to drive on the dirt shoulder to go around me, without slowing down.

There is no sewer or water in the area and the property is in a flood zone. If Bishop’s property is rezoned, what’s to stop other property owners in our area wanting to do the same thing, adding more structures to their property, which would impact our wells.

The Committee seems to be only interested in property close to Napa, while the County is a good size and there are other areas that would be a better match. There are no stores close by, the buses do not run here. The only school bus goes to Vichy it does not go to Silverado or Vintage like it did for our children.
Thank you for your time

Jimmy and Julie Gaul
1664 McKinley Road
Napa, CA 94558

Sent from Mail for Windows
Subject: Draft Housing Element Update

To Trevor Hawkes, Project Planner,

My name is Ashley Sherwani and I am a resident of District 4. I live near the Bishop Property and have growing concern for high density housing being built in our rural area.

My husband and I bought our property in 2019 and relocated from San Francisco with the dream of living in a quiet countryside - away from the hustle and bustle of highly populated areas. Napa had been a place we frequently visited and enjoyed, because of its gorgeous greenery and idyllic views, and the home we bought sat at a wonderful cornerstone of Napa county. It was outside of the town center, not in a previous burn zone (although incredibly close, we later found out) and was not super populated. It seems like the county wants to change that by building high density housing in the middle of our countryside neighborhood.

We are highly concerned about a few things in regards to re-zoning and development of high density homes in this area. They are as follows:

1) Fire Safety
2) Fire Insurance Affordability
3) Walking Safety
4) Parking Space
5) Access to Transportation and Grocery Stores
6) Proper Watershed Protection - Milliken Creek

**Fire Safety:** In the event of a fire in this area - which our area has historically been impacted - the chaos of hundreds of people evacuating in our area with limited road outlets is frightening. Hedgeside is a narrow road and currently would not be able to handle mass evacuations of hundreds of cars in the event of an emergency and would cause gridlock. This is a major safety concern for us as our friends - who have shared their experiences of evacuating their neighborhoods from fires - tell us that limited road access can be quite terrifying, and also frustrating as cars pile up to turn off of the road (especially with unprotected left turns). We are extremely concerned that with the addition of hundreds of residents at the Bishop site, evacuations will become life threatening as fires become faster and deadlier each year due to climate change. Two other sites, Big Ranch and Foster Road, were the furthest from any burn zones (2+ miles). What plans and infrastructure does the county plan to implement to ensure that Hedgeside Ave is able to handle the capacity of traffic that will be generated by hundreds of new cars in the event of a fire evacuation?

**Fire Insurance Affordability:** When we built our home in 2019, we were able to get fire insurance for the building of our home; however, that all changed in 2021 when our home was completed. We were denied fire insurance for our completed home due to the 2020 LNU fires (which was not near our property). The fire insurance company refused to cover us because the nearest burn zone to our home was .8 miles away (2017 Atlas Fire) and they also cited
increased fire risk. We eventually found a fire insurance provider after a few months, but that came at the cost of 5 figures every year. Napa is hoping to build hundreds of homes to provide affordable housing - but that is counter productive when these new home owners would not be able to either 1) get coverage or 2) afford the astronomical cost of fire insurance. If Napa wants to create a truly affordable home, they need to also consider the other living costs associated with the area, and that includes fire insurance. Other sites, like Big Ranch and Foster Road, have a much better opportunity for homeowners to get fire insurance (as the fires did not come within 2 miles). How does the county plan to make fire insurance affordable for these residents, in the event that fire insurance is not obtainable?

**Walking Safety**: Hedgeside already poses a safety risk for those who would like to walk outside. The first obvious safety issue is the lack of sidewalks, which results in many people having to walk along the road shoulder - which can be generous at certain areas, and very narrow at some homes. This is already an unsafe situation that many residents already experience, but this will grow considerably more hazardous if hundreds of cars are added to the area by high density housing. More pedestrians, more cars and the dangerous curve along Hedgeside will create an unsafe situation for all - especially when it comes to children. Would the county be adding sidewalk space here to make it more safe for the hundreds of people who would move here? Or what other ways would the county make sure that pedestrian safety is considered here?

**Parking Space**: With the addition of 100+ homes, we can also expect a sharp increase in parking along Hedgeside, which will significantly impact walking space along Hedgeside and make it more dangerous for pedestrians. How will the county plan for the increase in not only traffic, but also the space needed for adequate parking of the high density residents and guests? Parking space is already very limited along Hedgeside - with some homes having no space in front of their property for parking. For those who live across the way from the development and planned space for parking, there is going to be an increase in car parking on those properties, which impacts the parking available for current residents and guests.

**Access to Transportation and Grocery Stores**: With the goal of building more affordable homes, the county also needs to consider general affordability and opportunity for those who live in these affordable homes. Easy access to public transportation and grocery stores does not exist in our area. With no sidewalks or proper bike lanes, getting to the nearest bus stop or grocery store is a 2 mile walk along the speedy, busy, and sidewalk-less Monticello Road. This is dangerous and not an accessible place to live for those who need access to public transportation or food. With the county of Napa spending millions of dollars a year on providing public transportation, it would be considered irresponsible to build high density affordable homes in areas away from access to these services/businesses. Other sites, such as Big Ranch and Skyline Park, provide easy access to public transportation options and grocery stores. Does the county plan to extend public transportation to service this area? And if so, what types of changes can we expect in the hours that this public transportation will be available - for example, will buses be running on this small road at very late hours?
**Watershed Research and Protection - Milliken Creek:** Watershed health is important to the well being of our community. With the development being directly next to Milliken Creek, the county must take the appropriate steps to research and present the potential effects of high density development directly next to a water source that supplies thousands of Napa locals and farms/vineyards. Pollution in our water supplies can be caused in several ways - such as sediment, bacteria (like E. coli) and excess nutrients. The biggest impact we will likely see from a high density project next to Milliken Creek is pollution from excessive cars driving along the road - depositing oil and other waste along the road that eventually seeps into the ground, and makes its way to Milliken Creek. It is imperative that the county do the proper research to protect this water source not only from harmful pollution, but also to protect the habitat of numerous species that rely on Milliken Creek to survive. What current research has been done to see the impacts of high density housing next to Milliken Creek? And if no research has been done, what research must be planned to ensure the health of the watershed?

I hope these concerns are considered and responded to as part of the selection process. My husband and I care about the Napa community, and agree that new homes need to be built to make home buying more affordable; however, building high density housing in the middle of the countryside feels irresponsible and inappropriate considering the lack of infrastructure, public transportation, ease of grocery access, potential watershed pollution, and danger the large population increase would pose to these new community members, and the current residents, in the event of a fire.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Ashley Sherwani
Trevor,

Please include my comments into the record for the 2022 Housing Element update:

I respectfully request that the “Bishop site” be removed from consideration for rezoning to RM from the 2022 housing update for a myriad of reasons including traffic, fire safety, Greenhouse gas emissions, flooding, biological resources, and the other concerns outlined in previous letters.

In addition to my prior concerns, there is the item of the Milliken Reservoir Dam and its potential danger to the proposed new residents on hedgeside avenue.

The Milliken Reservoir Dam was built in 1924 and was designed without a spillway. In 1998 it was brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors by Dean Smith, an engineer at the Division of Dam Safety that severe damage to the upper portion of the structure would cause the Dam to fail in an earthquake, and under normal operation if the dam height was not lowered and capacity reduced.

The 2009 Safety Element of the general plan offers guidance for future projects (and the Bishop site clearly does not meet these requirements).

**Policy SAF-3:**

*The County shall evaluate all potential safety hazards when considering general plan amendments, rezoning, or other project approvals (including but not limited to new residential developments, roads, highways, etc)*

Does the Bishop site meet the requirements of Policy SAF-3? If so, how is this addressed in light of the flooding issue and potential dam breach?

Is the Bishop site in fact within the “inundation area” mapped by the County? Given that the site already floods from current normal rainfall, the inundation area must include this site. How would this project mitigate for this risk? Will there be a warning system? Will there be a dam breach action plan for this development, like a tsunami exit plan? Who will be there to remove disabled residents in the event of a flood or inundation in this low-lying area? Similar to our concerns with evacuation in floods and fires, a Dam breach would have mere minutes for safe evacuations, could this be achieved? If not, isn’t this a clear and present danger for a future large-scale development on this site?

**From the General Plan Safety Element:**

*The County supports and will promote intergovernmental cooperation among local, state and federal public agencies to reduce known hazards and further define uncertain hazards. In particular, the County will work to develop cooperative working relationships with agencies having responsibility for flood and fire protection. Individuals and businesses should have access to up-to-date information and be able to make informed decisions about potential safety hazards and the level of risk they are willing to accept.*

**Action Item SAF-2.1:**
*Participate in local, regional, and state education programs regarding fire, flood, and geologic hazards.
The County shall evaluate potential safety hazards when considering General Plan Amendments, rezonings, or other project approvals (including but not limited to new*
residential developments, roads or highways, and all structures proposed to be open to the public and serving 50 persons or more) in areas characterized by:

1) Slopes over 15 percent,
2) Identified landslides,
3) Floodplains,
4) Medium or high fire hazard severity,
5) Former marshlands, or
6) Fault zones

Encourage intergovernmental and regional cooperation directed toward providing for a continuing high level of public services and coordination of services during a disaster.

The County shall cooperate with other local jurisdictions to develop intra-county evacuation routes to be used in the event of a disaster within Napa County.

Planning and outreach should recognize that Napa County may be cut off from surrounding areas following a natural disaster and may need to be self-sufficient in terms of providing emergency services, information, and support to residents and businesses.

The County supports and encourages the development of individual self-reliance in the wake of a disaster and supports and encourages individual, family, and community disaster plans.

Putting so many new residents in harms way is counter to the Action Item SAF-2.1 and the items in the safety element. How would the DEIR address this? “Self-reliance” is not a tool that is appropriate when considering a site for such high-density housing with limited options for evacuation, especially in the face of all but imminent failure of the Milliken dam over the lifespan of this development. Did we not learn from the Oroville Dam incident and the evacuation of 200,000 people along the feather river? Damage estimates were in the billions for that failure.

**From the Safety Element:**
Promoting a flood safer community, promoting an earthquake safer community, promoting a fire safer community, promoting a technological and biological safer community, Reducing impacts from flooding.
Reducing impacts of earthquakes. Minimizing the task of wildfire at the urban interface.
Improving the County's ability to mitigate technological hazards and agricultural Threats.

**Action Item SAF-38.1:**
Provide staffing and other resources as necessary to regularly update and implement the Napa Operational Area Hazard Mitigation Plan (NOAHMP).
Consider new information regarding climate change and the expected severity and/or frequency of weather events in updates to the NOAHMP.
The County supports the use of communication technologies to get information to other agencies and the public during emergencies, including:
Cellular telephone systems in Napa County should be designed to allow their use in emergency situations.

Does the DEIR address how the Bishop site integrates with the NOAHMP?
When emergencies arise, cell phones typically do not work in our area (fires in 2017, 2020 for example), will buses be standing by for evacuations?
Putting a development in a flood plain, at below an aging and failing dam, does not integrate well with the goals of the safety element to “promote a flood safer community”.


From the Safety Element:
The review of new proposed projects in a floodway as mapped on the County’s Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM3 (Figure SAF-3) shall include an evaluation of the potential flood impacts that may result from the project. This review shall be conducted in accordance with the County’s FEMA approved Flood Plain Management Ordinance, incorporated herein by reference, and at minimum include an evaluation of the project’s potential to affect flood levels on the Napa River; the County shall seek to mitigate any such effects to ensure that freeboard on the Napa River in the area of the Napa River Flood Protection Project is maintained.

How will future residents qualify for flood insurance? does this site conform to the goals of the FEMA flood plain management ordinance, if so, please highlight how this proposed project will mitigate for the flood and inundation risks?

Policy SAF-26:
Development proposals shall be reviewed with reference to the dam failure inundation maps in order to determine evacuation routes.
Where is the evacuation route for Hedgeside Avenue? As others have stated before, exiting west on Monticello Rd is not an option due to repeated flooding of Milliken Creek at 121, as well as the Napa River. Exits from Hedgeside are blocked at Milliken Creek during flooding, Vichy avenue is often closed at Sarco Creek during flooding, rockslides, landslides are all common during flood events on 121 headed towards Berryessa. In the event of dam inundation, residents in Silverado will be trapped as well as new residents along hedgeside avenue. Is this addressed in the DEIR? Putting so many new residents at risk is problematic and in violation of the goals of the general plan and more specifically the items in the safety element.

Policy SAF-27:
Dam and levee maintenance is considered by the County to be the responsibility of the owner/operator of each dam and/or levee. The County will support other agencies in their efforts to ensure that proper maintenance and repairs are accomplished.

What role will the County play in ensuring that proper upgrades to the Milliken Dam are carried out by the City of Napa? Will the City of Napa be liable in the event of a Dam failure? In the event of Injury, death, or property damage, will the County be liable for damages for approving this project in a known hazard area?

This nearly 100 year-old Dam should be seriously considered with regard to the proposed rezoning of this site. The People downstream of this dam chose their homes and workplaces without considering too carefully the consequences of a failure and breach of the Dam. We rarely have the luxury to make decisions with such esoteric priorities. Whether residents realize it or not, they put their trust in engineers, operators, regulators in charge of the dam to keep them safe and sound against disaster. This trust can be broken very easily, as the Oroville dam disaster in 2017 highlights perfectly; anyone who’s work effects public safety has a responsibility to put that safety of residents and future residents above all else.

Please remove the Bishop site from the 2022 Housing element list of sites due to the overwhelming safety concerns.
Thank you for your consideration,

Garrett Buckland
1024 Hedgeside Ave.
Image of the Dam being topped in 2016, despite the “relief holes”. Under a very normal winter, the safeguards put in place did not achieve their goals. As climate change is predicted to increase rainfall amounts in atmospheric rivers, this will continue to occur very frequently, continuing to put the people downstream in jeopardy.
From: Vincent Smith <vsmith@cityofnapa.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:14 AM
To: Morrison, David <David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org>
Subject: Comment Letter - Draft Housing Element

[External Email - Use Caution]

David,

Attached are the City of Napa Comments on the Draft Napa County Housing Element.

Thanks!

**Vin Smith**  
**Community Development Director**  
**Interim Parks & Recreation Director**

Community Development Department, City of Napa  
1600 First Street, Napa, CA 94559  
**Phone** (707) 257-9530  
**Email** vsmith@cityofnapa.org  
**Website** www.cityofnapa.org
July 25, 2022
David Morrison, Director of Napa County PBES

Mr. Morrison,

The City of Napa appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Napa County Housing Element Update. We understand the difficulties placed on the County of Napa with regard to satisfying the Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA); however, we are surprised at your site selections. Some of our concerns include: the location of a future housing site (Site 6) that is outside the City limits but within the City of Napa Sphere of Influence (SOI) and the City of Napa’s 40+ year-old Rural/Urban Limit line (RUL); the reliance on currently unavailable public water and sanitary sewer; and, the reliance on other public services provided by the City of Napa including public safety services provided by Napa Fire and Police Departments. These issues are also described in the comment letter to the County from Napa LAFCO dated July 11, 2022.

Although we would have embraced earlier collaboration, we appreciate the recent contact made by the County in an effort to learn the City’s concerns regarding the inclusion of Housing Site 6. The City explained its lack of support, noting that the site has been within the SOI and RUL for decades and that the County-identified site (Site 6), along with the land to the north, east and south is: a) identified for residential development at densities not normally permitted within the County; b) intended to be annexed to the City of Napa; and, c) included in the City of Napa 6th Cycle Housing Element currently underway. This final point is crucial to RHNA credits for the City of Napa; all sites within the SOI of the City of Napa will need to be included to account for the significantly increased RHNA requirement placed upon the City of Napa, including MTC’s approval on March 17, 2022 of the RHNA transfer of 730 housing units from the County to the City.

Given the expressed desire of the County of Napa to continue a dialogue with the City of Napa about Housing Site 6 to attempt to reach an agreement about if, and if then how, this site is characterized in the Napa County 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City of Napa stands ready to continue the conversations. Again, because of the compressed timeline to provide comments on the current Draft Housing Element given the City of Napa, we provide the following comments for consideration:

Page 222, Constraints of Other Government Agencies

Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 are located outside the City’s Jurisdictional Boundary and outside the SOI; and as such, extension of water service is governed by Government Code Section 56133 (56133). Under 56133, there are two options to extend water service to these sites: 1) seek an amendment from LAFCO to the SOI to include the parcel(s) being served; or, 2) Napa City Council must provoke documentation to LAFCO that the extension of water service is to respond to an existing or impending threat to the health or safety of the public or the residents of the affected territory and request authorization from LAFCO to extend an outside service to the area. City of Napa Charter Section 180 requires a 4/5 vote of City Council to extend water service outside of the City’s Jurisdictional Area. The requirements/constraints of 56133, requirements for a 4/5 vote of City Council related to health and safety findings to extend water service, and the LAFCO process to secure water from the City of Napa are not mentioned in this
section and need to be in order to accurately articulate the process and constraints of approvals from other government agencies.

**Page 233, Infrastructure Availability**

This section explains that evaluation of sites was constrained to those that have access to existing water and wastewater services. The constraint that potential housing sites must be served by existing water services (e.g. municipal supply from City of Napa) appears to stem from LAFCO policies identified on page 222. However, individual groundwater systems are a common water source for residential and commercial development in Napa County and other unincorporated areas. **Site selection should not be constrained by access to City of Napa water or other municipal water providers.** Sites that were rejected due to lack of access to a municipal water system should be re-examined and seriously considered as appropriate for affordable housing development.

**Page 245**

The sentence “These sites are outside the City of Napa’s Rural Urban Limit, and within the City of Napa’s Water Service Area, where City water may be provided upon approval of the City Council.” is incorrect. The sites are not within the City’s water service area, however, City of Napa water infrastructure is nearby. **The sentence should be deleted and replaced with language similar to that used on page 249 for Site 5 as follows:** “The site is outside the City of Napa’s Rural Urban Limit and Sphere of Influence. While water service is located nearby, obtaining water from the City of Napa would require approvals from the City and LAFCO and as such, extension of water services is governed by Government Code 56133.” Please refer to comments made for Page 222.

**Page 249**

Site 5 is located outside the City of Napa’s Sphere of Influence. This fact is missing from this section. **The text in this section needs to be modified to state that the site is outside the City’s Rural Urban Limit and outside the City’s Sphere of Influence and as such, extension of water services is governed by Government Code 56133.**

**Pages 246, 247, 248 and 250**

In each of the Description of Sites and Factors Supporting Development for Sites 2, 3, 4 and 5 there is a presumptive statement that the site will obtain City of Napa water service. **This is not a valid assumption to support development of the site due to the constraints under Government Code 56133, the need for a 4/5 vote by City Council under City Charter Section 180 and the need for LAFCO approval.**

**Page 251**

As noted in the evaluation section of the County report, the County’s General Plan requires parcels within the City’s Rural Urban Limit line to be annexed to the City prior to development. This policy alone should be read, and understood to mean that any development application for land within the SOI would be processed through the City of Napa and would include annexation to the City as a component of the development application. On this point, the City of Napa and Napa County have recently discussed options for treating this site for the benefit of both the County and City’s Draft 6th Cycle Housing Elements. These conversations are ongoing and hopeful that resolution will be achieved prior to certification of the respective Housing Elements.
It should be noted that Site 6 is encumbered by a 20-foot wide water line easement adjacent to Foster Road. The City maintains a 36-inch water transmission main within the easement. The easement and water line will likely impact the developable land available at this site and should be disclosed as part of the evaluation of this site.

City of Napa staff stand ready to continue discussions about the selected sites within the Draft 6th Cycle Housing Element for the County of Napa. We are optimistic that we can reach agreement so that the County can confidently submit a Draft Housing Element to HCD that will be supported and ultimately certified.

If you have any questions regarding the information or comments provided in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Best Regards,

[Signature]

Vincent C. Smith
Community Development Director
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Trevor,
Please include my below comments for the 2022 Housing Element Update.

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because as it is we don’t have enough water for the housing that is here already, that means that new/more water lines would need to be put in, as would sewer lines.
Also, the fire danger in this area is particularly high.
Not to mention the traffic problems this would cause, Hedgside and Montecillo roads were not designed to take the heavy traffic this would cause.
Also if this is to be low income housing we don’t have any public transportation out this way for people to get to work etc…
The ag-preserve was created to preserve open space and this high density housing goes against everything the ag-preserve was created for.
We have a 50ft set back restriction along Milliken creek and it’s tributaries to preserve the health of the creek and water shed. Building this large amount of housing so close to the creek would endanger this water shed and the habitat it provides.
There are other spaces closer to town for this sort of development that won’t have these issues as well as not needing any re-zoning to be done.
Diana Shawley, 22 year resident at:
1681 McKinley Road
Napa, CA 94558p

Thank you for listening and feel free to to contact me at this email or call (707)363-2883.

Sent from my iPad
Trevor (and all),

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

I'm opposed to re-zoning the "Bishop Site" because (#1) It sits in the floodplain for Milliken Creek! These are pictures of Hedgeside at Milliken Creek from the 2005 New Years Eve flood. I have more pictures of more of these so called “100 year floods” we’ve seen since the 1990s. I believe this was from after completion of the flood control project to protect downtown. This flooding of Milliken Creek frequently crosses above the bridge on Hedgeside and has taken out the road at times in two places. Hedgeside was shut down for weeks—maybe a month or so, before repairs were completed from the 2005 flood and the house to the right on these pictures (not shown) was nearly destroyed, with asphalt from the destroyed the road piled up in their yard. This is exactly where the Bishop property is being proposed.
I'm also opposed to the re-zoning of the “Altamura” site as well, but mostly due to traffic/water/sewage concerns and cost to Napa taxpayers.

The Bishop site is just not appropriate for this kind of use. My parents (and now I) have been residents on McKinley Road (which intersects Hedgeside) since 1979. Traffic in this area has increased dramatically, especially in the last 10-15 years. More and more people use a shortcut from Silverado Trail to Hardman, then turning onto Estee and cutting over to Hedgeside to rejoin Monticello. Raising the speed limits recently to 45 MPH made things even more of a nightmare with the blind curve in the road near the Bishop property. We were able to get them to reduce the speed limit to 35 on McKinley (dead end road with a blind hill near the end), but that is still too fast.

This used to all be open fields and people who had horses, cattle, sheep and goats with wide grazing areas. Lately it being built up with many properties having multiple dwellings despite the lack of adequate water or areas for proper septic systems to handle the increasing use (city water and sewer bypass this area).

We moved here for the pastoral feeling, with people walking farm animals and riding or walking horses down McKinley and even Hedgeside. This used to be common. These days it’s mostly people walking/running (often with dogs) and bicyclists that use McKinley—likely due to recommendations from Silverado Resort.

Several of the older residences surrounding our house are in the process of arranging for new wells to be drilled (ours included—probably costing us $35,000-45,000 or more). Our 110’ deep well, installed in the late 1950s, frequently pulls out only mud these days. While the drought has a role, much is due to increased usage and many new wells (3-7 times deeper) being drilled at some of the larger, newer
houses. Many of the new houses in the area are adding swimming pools and vineyards. I doubt we would be in this situation if the county paid more attention to available resources before “approving” this, but it appears like it's more like the wild west out here and probably a lot of money or influence changing hands that has allowed relatively unrestricted growth in this area. Permits for new construction don’t seem to be required out here. All of this has driven out many long time residents as some just wanted to cash out and get away. We had to forego planting our vegetable garden beds this year due to the strain on our current well. Septic systems are also failing all throughout the neighborhood. Some are having them pumped out every 3 months.

Milliken Creek was once teeming with crayfish, frogs, fish and the occasional salmon run (still have pictures of the latter from ~10 years ago). Egrets, herons, kingfishers, pheasant and were abundant, as were jackrabbits. At least we still have some owls, but not nearly in the numbers we once had. Too many fences have been erected to keep out the nature many wanted to move here in the first place. Milliken Creek seems mostly dead these days. All that is proliferating is golf balls washed down from Silverado.

Increasing the population density in this area just seems a bit insane to me, but thank you for hearing me out.

Robert Shawley
1681 McKinley
707-363-2334
rshawley@mac.com