

MIKE THOMPSON

4TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAX POLICY

RANKING MEMBER

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH



CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

ATTACHMENT 10

DISTRICT OFFICES:
100 VALLEY CORPORATE DRIVE
NAPA, CA 94558
(707) 226-9898

2300 COUNTY CENTER DRIVE, SUITE A100
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403
(707) 542-7182

622 MAIN STREET
SUITE 106
WOOLAND, CA 95695
(530) 753-5301

CAPITOL OFFICE:
268 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3311

WEB: <http://mikethompson.house.gov>

September 12th, 2024

Mr. Stanley Masuda

[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558

VIA EMAIL [REDACTED]

RE: Big Ranch Road Annexation by the Planning Commission of the City of Napa

Dear Mr. Masuda:

I am writing in response to your email inviting me to the Big Ranch Road Annexation hearing before the Napa Planning Commission. I have a long-standing policy against taking positions on local land use issues as a Member of Congress.

Local land use issues are not under the jurisdiction of the Federal government, but as you know, in this case, the City of Napa. Therefore, I am forwarding your email to the Honorable Mayor of Napa, Scott Sedgley for he and his colleagues to review.

Thank you for your email and invitation. If I may ever assist you with a federal government issue, please contact me at my Napa district office at (707) 226-9898.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Mike Thompson".

MIKE THOMPSON
Member of Congress

CC:bo

Mayor Scott Sedgley

**Big Ranch Road Annexation by the Planning Commission of the City of Napa, Th, Sep 19,2024 @ 530p,
Council Chambers, City Hall, 955 School St, Napa**

Mr. Stanley Masuda

Sep 09, 2024, 6:08 PM

[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Thompson,

Recently, a Legal Notice appeared on Sep 7th, 2024 in the Napa Valley Register from the Community Development Department - Planning Commission regarding an application to change the pre-zoning of 66-acres from single-family residential to a Master Plan District. The City Council meeting would CHANGE current planning of single-family homes to MEDIUM DENSITY (8 to 18-units per acre) resulting in 350+ units.

After noting published notice, (NOTE: this is the second notice in the NV Register, first being on Aug 24th, 2024), residents bordering and in the Annexation APNs are very upset and concerned with said proposal. In addition, a majority of residents will be in attendance at this meeting to voice their concerns and disapproval.

Furthermore, residents NEVER received any notice in the mail for the following:

1. Notice of Public Hearing, City of Napa, Big Ranch Rd Annexation on Sep 3, 2024 at 330p, City Hall, 955 School St, Napa
2. Notice of Meeting Cancellation for above said meeting. Personally, I had to go on the Napa County Website to retrieve Notice and rescheduled for Tue, Oct 1st, 2024 at 330p.
3. Notice published for the above meeting on Th, Sep 19th, 2024 @ 530p

Collectively, we wanted you to be aware of this upcoming meeting and would appreciate your presence.

If you need copies of above notices, please advise where I can forward them.

Thank you.

Jeri and Stan Masuda



MEMO

TO: CHAIR SHOTWELL, MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: MICHAEL ALLEN, SENIOR PLANNER
DATE: SEPTEMBER 17, 2024
SUBJECT: BIG RANCH ROAD ANNEXATION (Project No. PL23-0143)

Following the publication of the September 19, 2024, Planning Commission agenda, additional correspondence was received for consideration for the Big Ranch Road Annexation project (PL23-0143) identified as Public Hearing Item 7. A.

The correspondence includes letters and correspondence from the following attached to this memorandum.

- Emily and Patrick Stanton (09-13-2024)
- Deborah Staats (09-16-2024)
- Bruce Silcox (09-17-2024)

Mayra Espinoza

From: Emily S [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 4:13 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Cc: Patrick Stanton; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: September 19 City Hall Consent Hearing

Categories: Unverified Contact

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

To: City of Napa Planning Commission

Regarding the Commission's consent hearing to determine item "B. Big Ranch Road Annexation" we challenge the survey CEQA "per their guidelines" claim of "adequately analyzed" (Sept. 20, 2022) information as incorrect regarding "no significant environmental impact". There is most assuredly, VERY significant environmental impact to the residents south of the area being considered.

We, the current residents of Rosewood Lane, wish to request the cessation of any development until further action has been taken to correct the water drainage problem from the fields between Trower and Big Ranch Rd. before the project be allowed to go forward.

Since the five homes were built here on Rosewood Lane, in approximately 1965, at the end of the road, there has been the development of Vintage high school as well as the homes to the north of Trower, east of Jefferson, toward El Centro.

I'm a resident of Rosewood Lane for over 50 plus years and have experienced many years of trauma due to the drainage from the fields to the North of our property and have sincere concerns that the environmental analysis doesn't have this drainage issue sufficiently addressed. We've had to fill countless sandbags to protect our property when the rains have been extreme as we know once the ground is saturated, and creeks are full- the water from the North has our property in its path.

This area is not considered a flood zone and yet we have maintained flood insurance for many years as we have seen surface water at our door and beyond.

The current existing pipe is open to the field north of Rosewood and goes underground there and through our property and on many occasions over the years we've stayed awake through countless nights to watch the water from the north coming across the surface because the pipe couldn't hold it all.

We've experienced debris from the field coming through and getting caught where the pipe turns, (the pipe turns from north to south towards the east and Pheasant Lane) causing the water to shoot up like a geyser into our yard.

We propose the developers be required to correct the drainage issue and relocate the pipe away from Rosewood Lane entirely.

We also request to have the current insufficient pipe be abandoned and removed as part of the annexation of these properties. Additionally, as curb and gutters are installed, we request speed bumps as the current gravel road has delivery vehicles multiple times per day at dangerous speeds, in spite of multiple signs to slow down.

Respectfully,

Patrick and Emily Stanton
[REDACTED] Rosewood Lane
Napa, CA 94558

To The Planning Commission and The City Council of the City of Napa,

I live off Big Ranch Road and Garfield. I would like to be heard regarding the Annexation and change of zoning from single-family residential to Master Plan District and the annexing 53.5 acres of said 66 acres into the cities boundaries. I am against this change for several reasons. Annexing 53.5 acres of said 66 acres into the city boundaries violates the previous restrictions for use of county lands for single family and agricultural. If the city can keep annexing piece by piece county lands then the agriculture that supports this valley will be severely compromised. That was the original reasons for those restrictions and no exceptions should be made because each annexation makes it easier to continue to keep annexing. This change absolutely violates the spirit of what was intended. This change seems contrary to what the city council and planning commission should doing, which is preserving our wine culture and agriculture. Without the viability of the wine culture and agriculture Napa won't be attractive to visitors or business.

I am also against this change because the infrastructure does not support the traffic that already exists without adding medium density housing into the equation. Big Ranch Road starting at Trancas is a two lane road. It has needed repaving for the last few years from Trancas to the first bridge at Catania due to potholes, and really should also be repaved up to just past Garfield. Central Ave. is an even narrower two lane road. The traffic from Vintage High School across Central to Big Ranch down to Trancas can be backed up all the way to Garfield several times a day. Backups occur during the morning and evening commute times plus start and end of the school day. Adding medium density housing using these roads instead of the single family homes now there will be a detriment to all the students, teachers, wineries, and residents in that entire area. There will be more traffic, road deterioration, frustration and maybe accidents.

In addition more traffic comes from the use of Garfield Little League Park down Garfield onto Big Ranch before and after both games and practice. Hundreds of cars through another two lane residential street feeding onto Big Ranch several times a day, two to three times a week, for the 4 months of the Little League season. There is inadequate parking for the park so the few streets of residents surrounding the Park are inundated with cars lining the residential streets down both sides of the streets making it difficult to get to our own homes and interfering with our own parking needs, even blocking driveways. We have spoken to the Little League regarding these issues many times. This is more traffic, road deterioration, frustration and maybe accidents which would be greatly increased with this change to medium density.

These issues could not have been adequately analyzed with no further environmental review required. No City Council, Planning Commission or staff member should recommend initiating any petition, or proceedings authorizing annexation of the property, or adopting any ordinance until they have driven down these two lane roads themselves during backup hours and Little League season. It is actually inconceivable to me that staff are making this recommendation.

I am completely against this entire Annexation and Zoning change. I have discussed this with many neighbors, and the consensus is unanimous that this Annexation and Zoning change be rejected. I will be attending any hearings regarding this issue, as will many of my neighbors.

Thank you, Deborah Staats, [REDACTED] Napa, 94558, [REDACTED]

Mayra Espinoza

From: Bruce Silcox <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 8:43 AM
To: PlanningCommission
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Considerations for 9/19/24 hearing

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[EXTERNAL]

To: City of Napa Planning Commission
From: Bruce Silcox [REDACTED] Napa

Regarding hearing on proposed annexation of Big Ranch Road properties

My property lies south of proposed annexation. We have resided at this address for 22 years. My concerns that I wish to convey are as follows

The commissioned environmental impact report did not take into consideration storm waters and the impact it is having on the residents lying south of proposed annexation. With the current infrastructure ending at Trower and the Salvador Channel not sufficiently capable of routing storm water, adding any structures over soil, aggravates the existing problem. Currently storm waters flow over into the adjacent empty land at the end of Trower. When ground is at saturation, the waters path is the corner of my property. The current plan or lack there of by the City of Napa is discharging storm waters onto private property. This is an annual occurrence and has several times over the years resulted in property damage. Building and or additional infrastructure will result in less soil absorption.

Additionally, Big Ranch Road was never intended, nor designed for high density traffic. Yet, due to constant traffic backups on Hwy 29 and the Silverado Trail, Big Ranch Road is now being used as a commuter path into town. The "new Soscol" has made Big Ranch a 2nd Highway through town. The backup is 1/2 mile long between 3pm and 5:30pm approaching Trancas.

Without addressing the current problems that the city has a responsibility to consider, adding additional housing would create serious congestion.

Thank you,
Bruce Silcox



M E M O

TO: CHAIR SHOTWELL, MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: MICHAEL ALLEN, SENIOR PLANNER
DATE: SEPTEMBER 18, 2024
SUBJECT: BIG RANCH ROAD ANNEXATION (Project No. PL23-0143)

Following the publication of the September 19, 2024, Planning Commission agenda, additional correspondence was received for consideration for the Big Ranch Road Annexation project (PL23-0143) identified as Public Hearing Item 7. A.

The correspondence includes letters and correspondence from the following attached to this memorandum.

- Simon Holden (09-18-2024)

Mayra Espinoza

From: Simon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 2:47 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: Comments on the Big Ranch Road Annexation - 2275, 2285, 2305, 2331 etc

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Planning Commission,
as a Napa resident who lives on Big Ranch Road, I want to write to voice my opposition to this development. Big Ranch Road has become increasingly dangerous with higher speed traffic, and now significant delays from congestion at the Trancas traffic lights. Adding this development is not to the benefit of the city or the residents of Big Ranch Road, removes yet more valuable farm land, and will significantly increase road dangers and congestion.

Sincerely,
Simon Holden.

[REDACTED]



MEMO

TO: CHAIR SHOTWELL, MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: MICHAEL ALLEN, SENIOR PLANNER
DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2024
SUBJECT: BIG RANCH ROAD ANNEXATION (Project No. PL23-0143)

Following the publication of the September 19, 2024, Planning Commission agenda, additional correspondence was received for consideration for the Big Ranch Road Annexation project (PL23-0143) identified as Public Hearing Item 7. A.

The correspondence includes letters and correspondence from the following attached to this memorandum.

- Michael Stone (09-18-2024)
- Kerry Lyall (09-18-2024)
- Lori and Ardy Van Winden (09-18-2024)
- Ben Hardisty (09-18-2024)
- Jaqueline A. Hawker-Wessel (09-19-2024)
- Jana Cohen (09-19-2024)
- Ralph Melligio (09-19-2024)
- Doris and Tom Smeltzer (09-19-2024)
- Susan and Ninad Dabadghav (09-19-2024)
- Jim and Connie Caven (09-19-2024)

MICHAEL AND ANN STONE



September 18, 2024

Planning Division, City of Napa

1600 First Street

Napa, CA 94559

(Sent via email: planningcommission@cityofnapa.org)

Proposed Big Ranch Road Annexation

Hearing Date: September 19, 2024

Planning Commission Members:

As adjacent property owners, we wish to record our vociferous objection to the annexation plan as currently proposed. Specifically, we object to the adoption of ordinance pre-zoning the designated parcels to a Master Plan District, to the adoption of a zoning designation that was not properly noticed or covered as part of the EIR undertaken in connection with the 2024 Master Plan, and seeking a determination that the actions authorized by the resolution and ordinance were adequately analyzed by previous CEQA action.

The proposal attempts to bootstrap its approval by virtue of the EIR done in 2022 in support of the General Plan which covered the entirety of Napa and, although the EIR addressed the Big Ranch area in passing, it was not highlighted as a major change in residential density. Rather, the General Plan presented "Focus Areas," none of which included the Big Ranch Road area. By failing to provide any but the barest of reference to the Big Ranch area in the General Plan, the city essentially assured that those with the most interest in the drastic change in zoning would not be alerted nor would we likely to object. We suspect this was intentional.

Make no mistake, the proposed zoning changes will potentially make a dramatic change in the character of the northern portion of the city and will have substantial impact on the environment in that area. The 2022 EIR fails to address many of these site-specific issues in a significant and scientific manner. As noted, the parcels in question have been within the city's "sphere of influence" for more than 30 years. During that time they have been zoned with varied minimum lot sizes that reflect the general density of the northern edge of Napa. Indeed, the map included in the Draft Land Use Plan for with the EIR reflects that, with the exception of the Valley Club and Willowbrook condominiums, **ALL** of the surrounding area is zoned and was built as **Low Density Residential**. The so-called Medium Density category that the city and the applicants seek to stealthily push through is in fact a 200 to 400 percent increase in housing density. That type of density is inconsistent with the existing and historical

character of the neighborhood and would have significant environmental impacts that were inadequately addressed by the overall EIR.

The 2022 EIR that purports to support this density notes the parcels include Prime Agricultural and Farmland of State Significance, and further concludes that the proposed project would have a significant environmental impact. It dismisses this impact as "unavoidable." We believe this analysis and conclusion to be wholly inadequate, particularly in the context of this property.

Similarly, the EIR fails to adequately analyze the impact of real world vehicular traffic that regularly uses Big Ranch Road. As others have noted, traffic is often backed up from Trancas to Rosewood Lane and beyond (a distance of almost a mile) during afternoon rush hour. The density proposed, in addition to traffic on an extended Trower Ave. would be impossible. Simple trip calculations do not account for real world facts.

The EIR speaks to the impact on wildlife and (of course) concludes that there would be very little. It completely fails, however, to address the aviary element of the wildlife in the area. The parcels in question are the home for a large cohort of varied birds, including geese, ducks, hawks, owls, pheasants, quail and a vast array of smaller species that would be completely displaced by housing of the density suggested.

Additionally, although addressing the concerning issue of wildfires, the EIR fails to address or analyze the fire danger to the surrounding neighborhoods that would be presented by housing of the density allowed by this change in zoning. Although often overlooked, recent fires here in Northern California and several in Southern California implicate housing density as a significant element in the rapid spread of fires brought to the perimeter of housing development, particularly in high wind events.

We strongly urge the Planning Commission to reject this proposal as presented.

Handwritten signatures of Michael and Ann Stone. The signature on the left is 'Michael Stone' and the signature on the right is 'Ann P. Stone'.

MICHAEL AND ANN STONE

Mayra Espinoza

From: Kerry Lyall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 7:13 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: Big Ranch Annexation

Categories: Unverified Contact

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[EXTERNAL]

Napa needs more housing.
I support this project as long as the houses are NOT 5-6 brs 3-4 bath mansions.
We need 2-3 br 1-2 bath 1200 sq ft houses and 1-2 br 1 bath apts.
No more monster mansions!
We need affordable housing!

September 18, 2024

Planning Commission of City of Napa
Re: Big Ranch Road Annexation Proposal

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments for the hearing scheduled for September 19 to discuss the proposed annexation of six parcels near the RUL along and near Big Ranch Road. We are one of the six parcels rejecting inclusion into the city.

We purchased our parcel in 1974 when it was a prune orchard, cleaned it up and began farming cattle feed within two years. A decade later we built our home here and then planted a cabernet vineyard in 2002, which yields a significant portion of our income. We are the longest property owners in the proposed area and are a second-generation farming family in this county.

We are opposed to annexing our property for a number of reasons.

Our farming practices involve nighttime noise from tractors, sprayers, and other equipment use as well as wind machines for frost protection. In addition, it is important we maintain our private lane access to Big Ranch for the many vehicles, laborers, and the large trucks hauling equipment in and out. We paid to develop this private lane for access to our property at the time of purchase.

We host 4H animals on the property and plan to continue doing so.

Another general concern is how this area will accommodate an influx of medium to high-density units and the traffic impact on Big Ranch Road.

We hope you understand how important it is for us to remain in the county.

Thank you,
Ardy and Lori Van Winden

Ben Hardisty
Rachel Stark
[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558

City of Napa
Planning Commission

I am writing to voice my opposition to the Big Ranch Road annexation.

As noted in the staff report dated 9/19/2024, for more than 30 years the subject parcels have been pre-zoned with Single-Family Residential zoning designation with varied minimum lot sizes from 5,000 square feet to 20,000 square feet. This was the pretext under which we purchased our property, understanding that while development in the future may be possible, it would align with normal and traditional urban development patterns, moving outward where typical densities diminish. The subsequently adopted general plan runs contrary to these development principles.

Given the adoption of the 2040 general plan, it clearly aims to achieve a walkable, connected neighborhood, with easy access to Vintage High School, "stores", and amenities on Trancas street. However, in the general plan development summary, zero retail, office, or industrial development is projected. I find the LUCD-24 Goal to be disingenuous and impractical.

In addition, city planning has shown limited competence in providing adequate infrastructure development on Big Ranch Road from Trancas street to the proposed annexation area. There exists a series of developments that are neither connected, nor have provided consistent shoulders to alleviate traffic, for the use of emergency vehicle traffic, pedestrian use, or bicycles. It is concerning that the city is eager to approve this annexation for the purposes of development without addressing the existing and potentially amplifying impacts to traffic and safety.

Additional review should be done to assess whether the specific area policies within the general plan are in fact in line with the best long-term interest of the residences in the area and the city of Napa, and not solely a means to comply with the State's Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Respectfully,

Ben Hardisty & Rachel Stark

Jacqueline A. Hawker-Wessel

[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558
[REDACTED]

September 19, 2024

City of Napa
Planning Commission

Delivery via email to planningcommission@cityofnapa.org
and in Person at the 09/19/24 City of Napa Public Hearing

Re: Big Ranch Road Annexation & Rezoning

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am opposed to the proposed conversion of the referenced prime farmlands off of Big Ranch Road in our primarily Agricultural community by Annexation into the City of Napa and more specifically of the proposed rezoning from Low Density to Medium Density which would potentially allow 8-18 dwelling units per acre into this agricultural area and low density residential area.

Rezoning: This does create a significant and **avoidable** impact (as opposed to the CEQA comment that it is an unavoidable impact). **Rezoning seems like a dangerous precedence** that could adversely affect our community in the future. It **does not** follow normal urban development plans which **lower density** as you move to rural areas not increase density. Makes no sense in North Napa right at the edge of the County and agriculture.

Environmental Impact Report: The EIR currently conducted for the General Plan is done with very broad strokes and is **not site specific**. A **new site specific EIR** should be conducted **before** allowing the Annexation and/or the change in zoning.

Salvador Creek is a Blue Line Creek and there is an off shoot of it that runs along the Eastern border of Vintage High School and some of the Old Vine Way homes and the Mueller/Skold properties. There is an abundance of life in this creek including frogs, salamander, turtles. As well as fantastic owls that live in the trees that we hear at night and I have seen land on my roof. **Juvenile salmon and adult Chinook salmon have been documented spawning in Salvador Creek and have been observed upstream of Big Ranch Road.**

More EIR studies need to be done to see the impact of development in this area on these natural habitats before CEQA approves any Annexation or Rezoning.

Has a detailed EIR been done of the storm run offs into Salvador Creek and how any development would affect this creek?

Property Value Impact: And yes medium density development in this area would affect our **Scenic Vistas** which are significant East, West and North and are part of the value of our properties and living in the Napa Valley especially on the edge of the City.

Road Access: It would also significantly impact the surrounding agricultural areas and the access in and out - Big Ranch Road is already feeling the impact of commuter traffic avoiding main highways and there is daily a back up from South of Garfield Road to Trancas at commute hours. Imagine if there are hundreds and hundreds of additional housing in the area trying to move in and out. And how do you move all of these people out if there is an **evacuation due to fire, earthquake etc. onto a rural road?** Napa Pipe is the ideal location for such a development which is why the City approved it. There are main highways and access in and out of the City of Napa all around it.

When the previous General Plan was created they envisioned a continuation of single family low density neighborhoods that would seamlessly grow with the existing properties around and not have an adverse affect on our surrounding areas. And create harmonious neighborhoods surrounded by agriculture. This proposed re-zoning is unconscionable and the **current City Planners have a responsibility to protect** the uniqueness of our agricultural community for us and future generations so that we do not become a Walnut Creek, San Jose, etc.

We are the Napa Valley and people move here to get away from big City politics and development. You all have an obligation to protect us from that. You are stewards of our City with powers that will affect all of us - you, me, all the people in our city and our children and grandchildren moving forward. Be thoughtful in making your choices moving forward.



Jacqueline A. Hawker-Wessel

Mayra Espinoza

From: Jana Cohen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 10:05 AM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: Big Ranch Road Annexation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

September 19, 2024

Jana Cohen
[REDACTED]

To our Napa Planning Commissioners:

I received the notice that there is an application to change the existing pre-zoning of approximately 66 acres to the northeast corner of the City of Napa and within the Rural Urban Limit from single-family residential to a Master Plan District and to authorize staff to submit a petition to the Napa County Loal Agency Formation Commission to annex approximately 53.5 acres into the City’s boundaries.

I am opposed to the annexation for the following reasons:

1. Safety – with the potential of over 1000 homes (medium-density housing), I have concerns about safety given that Vintage High School is adjacent to the area, and with so many cars resulting from the homes, student safety will be at risk.
2. Access for emergency vehicles – access may be impeded for emergency vehicles in such a huge, densely populated area, with only Big Ranch Road and El Centro.
3. Fire hazard – with the potential of over 1000 homes, and with fire a high risk in Napa, there could be entire neighborhoods destroyed by a fire, as happened in Silverado, as well as in Santa Rosa and Sonoma.
4. Traffic on Big Ranch Road – traffic is already an issue on Big Ranch Road, especially in the afternoons after school is dismissed and workers driving south on Big Ranch Road. The increased amount of traffic from these up to 1000 homes would be a disaster. When the Napa 20240 plan was developed, was there any recommendation to address the impact to improve Big Ranch Road?
5. Noise and density– noise would be a big factor with the density potential for over 1000 homes. Given the fact that there are currently only 12 farming/agricultural properties in this quiet neighborhood, in the proposed Master Plan, this would significantly change with over 1000 new homes.
6. Market-based housing – given the current status, with medium-density housing, is consideration given for market-based housing?

If a master plan is developed, has consideration been given to the following:

- setbacks
- roads
- preliminary plans

- infrastructure plans
- plot plans

I would like to request for a continuance for the decision on annexation given the issues raised by me and many others.

Thank you.

Ralph Melligio
[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558

19 September 2024

City of Napa
Planning Commission

I am opposed to the Big Ranch Road annexation.

My family has lived at [REDACTED] since Dec 1969. This has been my home of record throughout my military and subsequent civilian careers. I have occupied this home full-time since October 2005.

For more than 30 years the subject parcels have been pre-zoned with Single-Family Residential zoning designation with varied minimum lot sizes from 5,000 square feet to 20,000 square feet. That type of development would be a better fit than the proposed medium density zoning.

The 2040 general plan clearly aims to achieve a walkable, connected neighborhood, with easy access to Vintage High School, "stores", and amenities on Trancas street. However, in the general plan development summary, zero retail, office, or industrial development is projected. I find the LUCD-24 Goal to be impractical and unrealistic.

I also believe that a site-specific EIR for the proposed annexation be done to address any and all items not adequately addressed under the blanket of the 2040 General Plan (which, by definition, is general), meaning the 2040 General Plan is just a guide – NOT a god, Specifics must be addressed in order to provide thoughtful and sustainable growth in keeping with the overall health of the city and the welfare of its citizens.

In my opinion, city planning has shown limited competence in providing adequate infrastructure development on Big Ranch Road from Trancas street to the proposed annexation area. There exists a series of developments that are neither connected, nor have provided consistent shoulders to alleviate traffic, for the use of emergency vehicle traffic, pedestrian use, or bicycles. It is concerning that the city is eager to approve this annexation for the purposes of development without addressing the existing and potentially amplifying impacts to traffic and safety.

In conclusion, a review should be done to assess whether the specific area policies within the general plan are in fact in line with the best long-term interest of the residences in the area and the city of Napa, and not solely a means to comply with the State's Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Respectfully

Ralph Melligio HP [REDACTED] MP [REDACTED]

██████████
Napa, CA 94558

September 18, 2024

City of Napa Planning Commission
City Hall / Council Chambers
955 School Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: BIG RANCH ROAD ANNEXATION

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Our Napa home for 36 years has been the last house on the left at the end of Rosewood Lane. It is our understanding that six of twelve property owners are requesting annexation, whereas six other property owners, including us, are against annexation and medium density zoning. Given our proximity to the above-named annexation, we are concerned that:

--We were not provided Public Notice as specified on pg. 6. Section IX of the Staff Report. If not for our kind neighbor, Rachel Stark, we might still be unaware.

--Attachment 2 speaks to walkable, connected neighborhoods with easy access to stores and amenities on Trancas Street. How is it walkable when Trancas is more than a mile away from this neighborhood? Can you envision a resident pushing a Nob Hill shopping cart up Big Ranch Rd to this development? Currently, southbound peak afternoon traffic on Big Ranch is often backed up from Trancas as far as Garfield Ln.

--Properties being annexed and re-zoned are subject to the Medium Density Residential Designation for densities between 8-18 units per acre. Such density loads will add an immense traffic increase on Big Ranch Rd beyond what now occurs, more so once the extension of Trower Ave to Big Ranch Rd is added.

The most disturbing part of reading through the 53-page CA Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Attachment 3 is the repeated use of "double speak" when enumerating the environmental checklist from "Aesthetics" through "Wildfire."

Each section begins with some form of explanation/example of how situations or items can be detrimental and/or cause less than desirable outcomes, but these are ALWAYS followed by a listing of mitigations that make the impact "less than significant" or conclude that the project "will not have a substantial adverse effect" or "would not result in any new significant impacts" or "increase the severity of a significant impact, etc." For example: (from pg. 46 Attachment 3):

[Emphasis added]

The General Plan Update EIR determined that implementation of the General Plan would increase land uses in the Planning Area, which **would** require additional emergency access to respond to emergencies. However, these new roadways and intersections **would** be designed to City design standards that account for emergency access and, therefore, **should not** result in inadequate emergency access. Construction of these new roadways and intersection would have the potential to result in impacts related to emergency service; nevertheless, these projects would be required to comply with CEQA and avoid or minimize such impacts as needed. Additionally, the General Plan includes Goal TE-9 to ensure that there are safe evacuation routes in case of emergencies and natural disasters. Therefore, the General Plan Update EIR concluded that the impacts would be less than significant.

Stunning to read a document that presents a solution to *every* potential problem—it makes us curious and honestly ... suspicious, especially of the EIR!

Respectfully,



Tom Smeltzer



Doris Smeltzer

Mayra Espinoza

From: Suzanne Dabadghav <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 1:23 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Cc: Ninad Dabadghav Dabadghav
Subject: Conversion of 66 acres to town homes

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

To Whom it May Concern,

My husband and I live on Pheasant Court in Napa and there is a planning commission meeting tonight that we are not able to attend, but we wanted to at least let you know of our huge resistance to this build.

Big Ranch Road is already way too congested on a daily basis, and the idea of having 8 to 18 units per acre is ludicrous in this space. We already time our departures to and from our home daily to avoid the Big Ranch Road traffic. **We are strongly opposed to this build** and of any other builds near Big Ranch Road. This community is already too fragile and cannot handle any more traffic.

Please do not move forward with the building proposition in this area.

Thank you,

Suzanne & Ninad Dabadghav
[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558

--

[Suzanne Dabadghav](#)
[REDACTED]

Jim & Connie Caven

[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558

Dear Napa Planning Commission :

We are opposed to the Annexation Plan for Big Ranch Road for the following reasons:

- The commissioned environmental impact report did not consider storm waters and their impact on the residents lying south of the proposed annexation. With the current infrastructure ending at Trower and the Salvador Channel not sufficiently capable of routing stormwater, adding any structures over the soil aggravates the existing problem. Currently, storm waters flow over into the adjacent empty land at the end of Trower. When the ground is at saturation, the water path is the corner of several properties. The current plan, or lack thereof, by the City of Napa, is to discharge the overflow of the storm waters onto private property at the east end of Trower. This is an annual occurrence and has resulted in property damage several times over the years. The current Salvador Creek/channel plan is unreliable for handling all the street drain water. Until the city knows how to handle this issue, it should not proceed with this annexation.
- Additionally, Big Ranch Road was never intended nor designed for high-density traffic. Yet, due to constant traffic backups on Highway 29 and the Silverado Trail, Big Ranch Road is now being used as a commuter path into town. The “new Soscol” has made Big Ranch a 2nd Highway through town. The backup is 1/2 mile long between 3 pm and 5:30 pm, approaching the Trancas stoplights. The failure of the city and county to plan and forecast the increase in traffic from the Napa Valley workforce commuting up and down the valley, causing long backups on Highway 29 and at the traffic lights of Salvador, Wine Country Lane, and Trower, as well as the Silverado Trail and Trancas intersection. These traffic log jams have resulted in the commute traffic moving onto surface streets, i.e., Big Ranch Road, resulting in already congested traffic; thus, this project should not move forward until this is resolved.
- Disaster Safety is also a concern. Big Ranch Road is the primary and sole exit thoroughfare out of several neighborhoods. Now, you propose to add many more houses to exit the “Country Road” design of Big Ranch. The average age of residents is probably over sixty when you count Valley Club, Willowbrook, Old Vine Way, Rosewood, and the long-term residents of Big Ranch Road itself. This will create an additional crisis.
- Wildlife disturbance. The frogs who inhabit the gardens, the Salvador Creek, the geese are already having problems, coyotes, occasional deer,



MEMO

TO: CHAIR SHOTWELL, MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: MICHAEL ALLEN, SENIOR PLANNER
DATE: SEPTEMBER 20, 2024
SUBJECT: BIG RANCH ROAD ANNEXATION (Project No. PL23-0143)

Following the deadline for late correspondence for the September 19, 2024, Planning Commission meeting, additional correspondence was received for consideration regarding the Big Ranch Road Annexation project (PL23-0143), identified as Public Hearing Item 7. B

The correspondence includes letters and correspondence from the following attached to this memorandum.

- Jeri and Stan Masuda (09-19-2024)
- John and Peggy Wilkinson (09-19-2024)
- Susan Rushing-Hart (09-19-2024)
- Peter Bartlett (09-19-2024)

September 19, 2024

City of Napa Planning Commission

RE: Big Ranch Road Annexation

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

Currently, we have been residents on Big Ranch Road since 2005, but have lived in Napa since 1989. The proposed Annexation has created disturbing issues and concerns. They are as follows:

1. Lack of communication is inexcusable. Interviewing our neighbors we discovered at least half never received any notification in the mail. We downloaded the copy of the mailing the City of Napa has on file and our name is on it. Fortunately, our fellow neighbors have kept us informed.
2. Recently, the Planning Commission has decided to go from low-density housing to medium-density housing which includes 350+ units without a new Environmental Impact Report specific to the Annexation Proposal.
3. Currently, Monday to Friday from 3pm, southbound traffic starts to back up from Trancas St past Rosewood Lane which creates issues leaving our home. If there was a medical emergency, First Responders access would have difficulty accessing a resident when seconds count. Cars on Big Ranch Road are unable to pull to the shoulder because there is none. Furthermore, our biggest fear is if there were another wildfire like 2017 where the Napa Valley was surrounded by fire (west, north, east) but in this case the fire rages through the valley floor. How are we going to get out?...WE WON'T!!
4. Finally, we have read all the LATE COMMUNICATIONS (1 to 14) submitted by our fellow neighbors. Thus, we are proud to be associated with people who are passionate about where they live, have integrity and common sense.

We urge the Planning Commission to reject the Big Ranch Annexation.


Jeri Masuda


Stan Masuda

Mayra Espinoza

From: Peggy Burgess Wilkinson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 4:30 PM
To: PlanningCommission
Subject: Opposition to Big Ranch Road annexation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

To whom it may concern,

We are property owners, living in the County of Napa and our property borders the RUL. Our address is [REDACTED]

We vehemently oppose the annexation of 2275, 2285,2305,2331 Big Ranch Road and various additional parcels on Rosewood Lane and Tower.

We have lived at our address for over 30 years and participated in the original discussions regarding the Van Winden Growing Grounds property on Big Ranch Road.

The City of Napa has long since supported the concept of residential feathering of density toward the RUL. When this discussion was entertained last regarding this property (to our knowledge 30 years ago) the density proposed for the Van Winden Growing Grounds property was **one house per acre with higher density toward to back of the property closer to Vintage High School.**

We strongly oppose any density along the RUL that would allow for the building of homes exceeding one home per acre. We have never been given the opportunity to review density changes and we strongly oppose re-zoning the areas in question.

Additionally, the Van Winden Growing grounds is home to many types of wildlife including frogs, owls, many types of birds and hawks and countless other species that would be eradicated should housing fill the area.

There hasn't been adequate study of the area for environmental and wildlife impacts.

Big Ranch Road is a rural road which is already over burdened by traffic and accidents.

Any re-zoning of the Van Winden Growing ground property would adversely impact the safety and enjoyment of our property and that of our neighbors.

There is no way that the property should be developed into anything other than low density housing at some point when Napa needs additional housing.

WE OPPOSE ANY ANNEXATION UNTIL THE DENSITY ISSUES ARE DISCUSSED AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ARE APPROPRIATELY STUDIED.

We will be at the meeting this evening in opposition to the proposed annexation.

John and Peggy Wilkinson



Napa CA. 94558

Mayra Espinoza

From: Planning Department
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 4:55 PM
To: Mayra Espinoza
Subject: FW: Big Ranch Road Annexation

Hello Mayra,

Please see the attached public comment from a neighbor near Big Ranch Road.

Best,

Angela Alvarez-Cendejas

Assistant Planner

Planning Division

Community Development Department, City of Napa

1600 First Street, Napa, CA 94559

Direct: 707-257-9639 | **Main:** 707-257-9530

E: acendejas@cityofnapa.org



From: Susan R-H [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 4:22 PM
To: Planning Department <planningdepartment@cityofnapa.org>
Subject: Big Ranch Road Annexation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[EXTERNAL]

Napa Planning Commission members

First of all I am very concerned with the loss of ag land. To change the RUL, shouldn't the people of our City, or County vote on whether we want this change?

In the late 90's, a Big Ranch Road Specific Plan was created. It included an EIR.

Within this plan was the housing density.

ATTACHMENT 10

With the studies, it was determined that there should be higher density near Jefferson St and less density or a "feathering" of housing along Big Ranch Road.

Now, doesn't it appear that the city (land investors or developers) want to increase the density some 10X over along Big Ranch Rd and some distance west?

What studies have shown this to be environmentally sound?

When the 2020 General Plan was implemented, a new EIR was not completed.

I was told the BRRd Specific Plan's EIR would cover the extended area both north and west within the city.

How can the city determine that there are no endangered species north or west without completing a new study?

To the west were wetlands.

An area, along Linda Vista Avr (at the Dry Creek Rd end), is known to flood with heavy rains.

At the east end of Trower, there was a seasonal brook that was a part of a small waterway that passed from the El Centro area by Willow school (formerly known as ElCentro school). It was very recently destroyed.

Soon after the Silverado Creek subdivision was completed, the City, through RCD, held meetings concerning Salvador Creek.

It was determined that the Creek could hold no more water during storm events, and yet the city has continued to approve diversions of storm water to the creek.

Why hasn't the city completed a study from Alston Park to Big Ranch Rd (as well as to the Napa River at Trancas Crossing Park) to mitigate the destruction of seasonal waterways, wetlands, and the loss of open or undeveloped properties that water can infiltrate?

Have there been any environmental studies covering this area of Napa over the past 25 years?

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Susan Rushing-Hart

[REDACTED]

Napa, Ca 94558

[REDACTED]
Napa, CA 94558

September 19, 2024

Members of the Planning Commission
City of Napa
955 School Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Proposed Annexation of Parcels along Big Ranch Road

Commissioners:

I'm writing to you as a concerned neighbor of the parcels proposed for annexation into the City of Napa along Big Ranch Road.

What concerns me is not the annexation per se, but rather the upzoning of these parcels that was included in the Napa 2040 General Plan. As I understand it, if the annexation takes place, the zoning designation for these annexed parcels will be medium density residential, allowing for between 8 and 18 units per acre – a total of between 528 and 1,188 new units of housing.

The City's position is that the proposed annexation doesn't require any environmental review because it falls within the scope of the Napa 2040 General Plan FEIR.

I, and many of my neighbors, believe that at a future date when the City seeks to adapt a Master Plan for the property, additional environmental review will be warranted and mitigation measures will be necessary for:

1. **Traffic/Transportation.** As traffic congestion heading out of the valley at the end of the work day has worsened, many commuters leave Highway 29 for Big Ranch Road, leading to long delays at the intersection of Trancas and Big Ranch, frequently backing up as far as Garfield Lane.
2. **Walkability.** For development at this density, walkability is important, and proximity to services is far from ideal.
3. **Environmental.** The development of these parcels will result in loss of open space and habitat, increased need for stormwater management, adverse impact to riparian corridors, and increased noise and pollution.
4. **Neighborhood character.** The density contemplated by the Napa General Plan 2040 for this site is substantial. The amount of units, and the density and massing, could significantly adversely impact the character of the area.

If the annexation goes forward, we will be sure to weigh in on any proposed master plan and any entitlements sought by a future developer.

Sincerely,



Peter Bartlett