

From: [ruralangwin](#)
To: [Morrison, Dana](#)
Subject: Comments on Nov 6 ACLU update
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 5:37:21 PM

[External Email - Use Caution]

Dear Commissioners,

I have the following questions that have yet to be answered on the changes proposed in the Airport Land Use Plan at Parrett Field in Angwin. I believe the Commission will want these questions to be answered and the changes incorporated into the Final Plan.

#1. The long established affordable housing site in Angwin identified as Site B in the 2023 Housing Element, located on Las Posadas Rd., is not correctly referenced in the Plan. The Plan should note the 'shovel ready nature' of the site that requires no use permit and allows "by-right" development of 77 units of housing with a density of 25 units per acre per the 2009 Specified Priority Housing Development Site.

The site is south of the proposed runway extension and is an entitlement that should reasonably be identified and acknowledged. The Plan does note potential development including dormitory and cafeteria construction, which do not have entitlements nor submitted applications. The Angwin Site B Affordable Housing Site has the very real potential for a housing project in the life of the Plan, particularly since a recent omnibus ordinance adopted by the BOS reduced the inclusionary percentages required which is intended to stimulate housing development at the site. Please amend the Final Plan to call out the location, and entitled housing unit number and density of Affordable Housing Site B in Angwin.

#2 The affordable housing site B in Angwin is not accurately identified by Assessor Parcel Number(s) in the 2023 Housing Element or the recent omnibus ordinance. As a result the parcel (s) impacted by the proposed changes in the compatibility plan cannot be identified as to their compatibility with proposed Plan changes. It is unclear due to conflicting parcel number(s) noted in various County Documents exactly WHERE the Angwin Site B is located.

The 5th Cycle Housing Element states Angwin Site B includes all or portions of APN numbers:

024-080-033
024-080-035
024-080-036
024-080-028
024-300-077

Two of these parcels are no longer owned by PUC and have been developed as vineyard.

The 6th Cycle Housing Element on Table 52 Page 289 indicates Site B is located only on 024-080-029. Yet the County On Line GIS System reports there is NO SUCH PARCEL

NUMBER.

Further, the Napa County Municipal Code Section 18.82.020 notes Site B in Angwin is located on APN # 024-080-024. This parcel is not found in the County GIS mapping program.

The following parcels are designated as "2009 Specified Priority Housing Development Sites":

* Angwin Sites A and B (APN 024-410-007, 024-080-024)

Lastly the September 24, 2024 Omnibus Ordinance approved by the BOS (Page 27) refers back to the 2009 Specified Priority Housing Sites which includes the six parcels referenced above. As detailed above, some of these parcel numbers no longer exist (024-080-033), or land is no longer owned by PUC and has been developed as vineyard.

The exact location of Angwin Affordable Housing Site B must be identified in order to fully evaluate proposed airport expansion compatibility with housing. Determining what comparability zone the Angwin Site B is in requires addressing these inconsistencies.

#3 The Plan in the Angwin area includes the statement " Results in a net increase in allowed units".

Where? How? This plan analyses airport compatibility safety zones. The Plan has NO AUTHORITY to increase development potential in the Angwin area. The response to my comment in the Response to Comment Matrix is all the more baffling:

"As indicated in the July 17, 2024, hearing presentation (slide 29), the reference to "will result in a net increase in allowed units" is intended to highlight the difference between the 1999 ALUCP and 2024 Draft ALUCP by indicating that the draft ALUCP would enable county to allow additional housing units subject to local general plans and regulations. As noted on slide 7 (ALUC Limitations) and slide 9 (Relationship to Other Plans), the ALUC may only recommend land use measures for local adoption; the ALUC has no land use authority to allow or approve land use development. The County of Napa has land use authority for the unincorporated lands within the Angwin Airport Influence Area."

An explanation as to how the changes in the Draft Plan will "result in a net increase" in housing units has not been provided. I request that this language be struck from the Plan. It is unacceptable that this Plan purport to result in any increased housing development in Angwin. The response to comment is wholly inadequate.

I request this hearing be continued until these corrections and changes have been incorporated into the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Respectfully,

Kellie Anderson
Save Rural Angwin Steering Committee Member

From: [ruralangwin](#)
To: [Morrison, Dana](#)
Subject: Additional Comment ALUC Plan Nov 6, 2024 Angwin
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 5:43:49 PM

[External Email - Use Caution]

Hello Commissioners,

A few of you might recall the proposed Triad Angwin Eco Village development in Angwin. It was something like 900 houses, a hotel, an underground parking garage, a retail complex and an expanded airport on land owned by Pacific Union College, a Seventh Day Adventist, Liberal Arts institution. The project came at the time when Triad, a developer out of Seattle, that also owned the Aetna Springs Resort was also seeking approval to develop a ginormous resort and golf course around a Pope Valley irrigation reservoir known as Dick Weeks Big Lake!

Fancifully renamed Lake Luciana, the irrigation reservoir and surrounding acreage was imagined as a golf resort, club house, spa and cafe. The plan included 12 Lot Line Adjustments which were granted, resulting in (arguably) 12 waterfront home sites of adequate size to build a home, winery and plant a vineyard!

But Triad had big plans for little Angwin and pushed to increase the airport runway length to lure high rolling jet setters to their proposed developments. Triad envisioned the small Angwin airport as a hub of jet setting golfers, resorts guests and high end wine lifestyle crowds. A terrible idea for a Christian College and a terrible idea for Angwin.

As you know, lawsuits, community opposition, a failed county wide initiative and the down turn of the real estate market ended the Triad plan with a whimper.

During this most terrible time, the residents of Angwin were horribly divided, with employees of the college and hospital, and members of the Church siding with development to 'save' the college, while a huge segment of Angwin (Adventist and non-Adventist) powerfully opposed the Triad Ecovillage. Eco it was indeed not! The battle lasted years and spilled over into Farm Bureau skullduggery and Countywide unhappiness.

Hearings, meetings, protests, harsh words, attorneys, a fractured small community, neighbors against neighbors, hundreds of thousands of dollars spent, a college campus literally closed for an entire day, while students were required to get on buses and attend a public hearing down in Napa (brown box lunches handed out courtesy of Triad to every student). It was a horrific time for Angwin.

In the end the back stabbing deal Triad was working on, to get entitlements for the Eco Village processed while under ownership of PUC, was outed when it became known that Triad was planning to flip the deal for a huge profit to a Chinese developer. So much for the community garden and bicycle paths, purple pipes and electric cars!

In the end the project collapsed, the first woman president of PUC, Dr. Heather Knight was dismissed, another college president was retained and dismissed and now we're on the third president since the whole nightmare. The project destabilized a lovely small community and

it's taken years to heal the wound.

The interim president, Bob Cushman, worked hard to heal the community divide. Dr. Cushman, in a never to be forgotten act, invited all of Save Rural Angwin folk to his home and had his staff including vice presidents serve us a meal. Dr. Cushman spoke to our SRA group and said the following of our years long efforts to preserve our little village " Thank you for saving us from ourselves. We apologize for terrorizing this community".

That's really what happened.

It's been about a decade and the wound is just a tiny scar now. But if the ALUC approves some airport expansion, based upon a non existent master plan and puts more jets on the ground and in the air resulting in increased gentrification of our home place, with no one from PUC bothering to dialog with the community, the band aid is coming off and the wound will once again bleed.

It's understandable, three college presidents out from the Triad terrors, that the current president would not understand SRA and the overall community's unstoppable protection of our precious home.

But now you know.

I respectfully request you do not predicate any airport expansion upon a dead, non existent Triad 'master plan'. Let Angwin residents reach out to the new president, Dr. Ralph Trecartin, and make sure he even has any idea what was in that horrible old Triad Plan and remind him how hurtful these development schemes have been to our little town.

Please do not permit any expansion of the Angwin Airport at this time.

Respectfully,

Kellie Anderson
Founding Member Save Rural Angwin Steering Committee

November 5, 2024

County of Napa
Airport Land Use Commission

RE: Comments for the ALUC Meeting Nov 6, 2024-Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
Update and Negative Declaration Adoption Hearing

After receiving the county mailer that was sent to every household in Angwin, we at Save Rural Angwin began to take a look at what the new ALUCP would mean to the residents living on Howell Mtn. As a life-long professional pilot and current hangar and aircraft operator at Napa County Airport and user of the Angwin airport, my interests peaked when I realized that the Land Use Designation Map used by Mead and Hunt to assist in their development of the updated ALUCP was defunct, changed and is no longer applicable.

Planner Dana Morrison was quick to respond and offered a meeting with her, Patrick Ryan and a representative of Mead and Hunt. During that presentation, it was noted that the the updated plan states that it will “result in a net increase in allowed units.” Even County Counsel Dooly could not give a satisfactory answer as to why or how this occurs as a result of the new plan. **Since it’s been 20 years since the last update, the importance of this statement to the Angwin community cannot be overstated.** The record does not contain any assessment of what caused this change.

We also came to realize that several other troubling gaffs emerged from the draft plan. The Mead and Hunt refers to a non-existent, never adopted , campus master plan that has remained dormant since the 70’s and essentially neutered when the BOS re-designated parcels within Angwin in 2016. A PUC report cites a potential for a runway extension. That is very unlikely, but in any event, extending the runway only decreases the safety issue related to the BOS’s decision to soften the affordable percentages on the AH site just off the runway centerline to the south. This is troubling because Mead and Hunt was presented development plans surrounding the airport that are at the least improbable, likely impossible. But in a unequal application of the law, the affordable housing site (s) were not even mentioned.

Further investigation resulted in discovering that the AH site parcel numbers and locations are inaccurate. I cite, for example, parcel # 024-080-028. Under scrutiny of the County’s GIS system, I easily identified numerous parcel identifications that are flawed. Our County GIS identifies that -028 an AH site, but the reality is that it is not, its vineyard land and located clearly right next to the runway centerline. These inaccuracies related to facts on the ground necessitate that Mead and Hunt do another run through in establishing the geographic areas listed in the Caltrans Aeronautics Handbook. Using the Handbook, I cannot find any references

to Zones D1 and D2. Where did these come from that are used in the Mead and Hunt draft plan?

Equally troubling is that Napa County ALUC seems to be acting not only as the lead agency, but the regulatory agency. At its July 17, 2024 meeting the ALUC advanced the proposed adoption of a Negative Declaration; “The proposed project would not have any potentially significant environmental impacts.” This is blatantly false. Identifying a project for which anEIR is proposed is entirely different than a project on which no mitigations are anticipated. “

Additionally, two regulatory agencies have made comments and proposed mitigation which the County has ignored. Even Mead and Hunt noted that “it’s likely a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be required.” What event has caused the change in assessment? Another CEQA agency who would have jurisdiction over the County would be the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. They state, “the Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of environmental document filing fee is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the environmental document filing fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested and final.” The “no impact” assertion is not supported by fact. CDFW’s recommendations to clarify, evaluate and mitigate were not included.

For the foregoing reasons and concerns, we at Save Rural Angwin respectfully request that the matter be modified to incorporate CDFW’s comments and to qualify the Plan with updated, useful and accurate information related to conditions on the ground surrounding the Angwin Airport.

Respectfully,

Mike Hackett

Spokesman, Save Rural Angwin