

SONOMA VALLEY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION  
Notice of Meeting and Agenda  
October 28, 2015  
Sonoma Police Department, Community Room  
177 First Street West, Sonoma  
6:30 p.m.

Contact: Pat Gilardi, District Director to Supervisor Gorin at [pat.gilardi@sonoma-county.org](mailto:pat.gilardi@sonoma-county.org)

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Call to Order, Roll Call   |            |
| 2. Approval of Minutes of the meeting of September 23, 2015   | Resolution |
| 3. Public Comment<br>(Limited to items not appearing on the agenda)   | Receive    |
| 4. File Number: UPE15-0046<br>Applicant Name: Westside USA Inc.<br>Owner Name: Same<br>Site Address: 24520 Ramal Road, Sonoma   | Resolution |
| Request for a Use Permit to allow a winery with 20,000 annual production capacity with new buildings, public tasting, retail sales and special events on a 186 acre parcel. | Resolution |
| 5. Hold a special meeting on November 18, 2015  | Resolution |
| 6. Cancel the meetings of November 25, 2015 and December 23, 2015   | Resolution |
| 7. Consideration of items for future agenda   | Receive    |
| 8. Adjourn  | Resolution |

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Board of Supervisors' Office located at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100-AI, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours.

Note: Consideration of proposed development projects will proceed as follows:

1. Presentation by project applicant
2. Questions by Commissioners
3. Questions and comments from the public
4. Response by applicant, if required
5. Comments by Commissioners

Web Links:

County of Sonoma: [www.sonoma-county.org](http://www.sonoma-county.org) select Boards and Commissions  
City of Sonoma: [www.sonomacity.org](http://www.sonomacity.org) select Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission

**SONOMA VALLEY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 23, 2015  
SONOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY ROOM  
175 FIRST STREET WEST, SONOMA  
6:30 p.m.**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Mark Bramfitt, Cynthia Wood, Gini Dunlap, Dick Fogg, Pat Pulvirenti, Ryan Lely, Margaret Spaulding, Tom Martin, Jack Ding, Greg Carr, Gay Johann, Angela White

**EXCUSED:** Ditty Vella

**ABSENT:** Pat Stevens, Sean Bellach, Bruce Green

**1. Call To Order: 6:30 p.m.**

Ms. Dunlap made a correction on the minutes of August 26, 2015. In the Public Comments section, it was Marilyn Goode and not Marilyn Kelly who spoke.

**2. Minutes Approved of August 26, 2015 Meeting**

**3. Public Comment (Limited to items not appearing on the agenda):**

Teri Shore, Hopkins St, provided a brief update on the Greenbelt Alliance presentation. The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors will be voting on a work plan to renew and strengthen Community Separators on 10.13.15 or 10.20.15 and will start the public process to develop a ballot measure to renew the protections by voting on the scope of work. They will consider renewal of the 20 year old policies or update them and consider additional designations. Their decision will be based on the support of constituents in the County. We strongly urge SVCAC to form a subcommittee as discussed on the August 26 meeting to identify additional designations, and to write personal letters as individuals, not as official members of SVCAC to indicate support. A County wide survey was conducted to determine attitudes towards Community Separators and results will be shared with SVCAC.

**4. Applicant Name: Vina Management Service**

**Owner Name: Same**

**Site Address: 2475 Fremont Drive, Sonoma**

**Request for a revision to a previously approved Use Permit for a winery to allow for four (4) tasting rooms, two (2) for wine tasting, one (2) for beer tasting and one (1) for grape vodka tasting.**

Ms. White disclosed that she visited the brewery on 9.21.15 for a tasting and mini-tour to get a better sense of the application.

**Applicant presentation**

Tammy Martin, Steve Martin Associates: We helped put together the proposal for the permit modification and to explain what the existing approved use is and what we're requesting. Original use permit allowed for 1 tasting room in the Phase 2 building and 1 tasting room in the Phase 3 building which hasn't been built yet and located further down – 2 hospitality areas to house 3 tasting rooms. During construction of the 2 winery buildings, approval was given for interim tasting rooms and improvements were made. Our proposal is to have no net increase in hospitality space but to reduce the size of the Phase 3 area and rearrange to retain the 2 tasting rooms and add another for grape vodka tasting. No increase in employees, although there'll be an increase in visitors for grape vodka. Traffic study was performed to indicate no significant increase in traffic impact for the addition.

Chair Ding: Please explain this project because I believe it's a new project. The site used to be an auto body shop so that is a big change from auto to wine industry.

Tammy Martin: Yes, but it's already approved winery and it's currently in operation.

Chair Ding: Please describe the process because it's new for us.

Tammy Martin: The approved use permit is for a 40,000 case production facility with brewery and winery and also the ability to distill grapes for grape vodka. There are already tasting rooms for brewery and winery on site and already under production – this project tonight is for the addition of a grape vodka tasting room but no net increase in hospitality area and no new buildings, just a reconfiguration of the existing space.

**Commissioner questions:**

Ms. Dunlap: I also visited the site. Is Hanson Vodka already processing in the facility - just no tasting at this time?

Answer is inaudible since it was not spoken into the microphone.

Ms. Spaulding: I went with Gini. It's an impressive setup, also no comments or complaints from neighbors.

Ms. White: Now is the time for the Commissioners to ask for clarifying questions. Comments will come after the public comments and questions.

Mr. Martin: Your current use permit is for 40,000 cases and 1100 barrels of beer. What is your actual production at the current time? That was approved in 2010.

Armado Ceja: Currently very small - 75 tons, due to a small crop this year. It will ramp up with better vintages.

Mr. Martin: Have all traffic studies been submitted to PRMD that were requested?

Armando Ceja: Yes, initially for project approval, there was an extensive traffic study and we've done road improvements on Hwy 12/121, slow lane/recovery lane and on Burndale, widening of the road with the encroachment area. With the current project, there's an additional traffic study requested and Tammy commented on that.

Ms. White: What is the alcohol content of grape vodka? The same, 14 ½?

Chair Ding: No, more than 40.

Scott Hanson: Hanson's Distillery is a family business. We take local grapes and distill them into a spirit. With vodka, it doesn't matter what your base product is and the largest and fastest growing spirit in the world is a French based wine vodka. Since no one was doing it here, we got into small batch distilling, handmade, organically certified but same proof as traditional vodkas: wheat, grain, potato or corn based. Being grape based, there are a lot of wine interest people. We're a tenant with the Cejas and to grow our business, we need a tasting room.

Ms. White: How does a vodka tasting work? How many vodkas can you taste?

Scott Hanson: We can't pour more than ¼ ounce 3 times – more of a smelling sniffing tasting approach. We have a variety of flavors with organic and local fruits and vegetables so if you want to try a cucumber or mandarin or one of our flavors, you can try three of those.

Ms. Dunlap: Under the current law, you cannot sell bottles, correct?

Scott Hanson: Since Prohibition, spirits have been handled differently from wine and beer, not just California but the US. In recent years, 42 states have approved the same laws and rights for tasting and selling spirits as wine and beer. Last month, Sacramento has ruled that as of January 1, we can sell limited amounts, up to 3 bottles.

Mr. Lely: I commend on your use of the same space, not more. The conditions of County approval on 10.28.10 specify that groundwater levels are declining and salinity levels are increasing and applicant was to submit water conservation plan. Have you seen a change?

Tammy Martin: The processed wastewater is being recycled, going through treatment plant onsite and used for vineyard/landscape irrigation. No indication of decline in onsite wells and monitored on annual basis. At this point, no depletion of groundwater.

Chair Ding: Your packet states a new tasting room is allowed for vodka tasting and to see attached letter dated 2.5.15. Did you bring this letter?

Tammy Martin (hands over copy of letter): That letter was issued by the Project Planner at PRMD indicating approval under existing use permit for 40,000 cases of wine and to allocate 5,000 for grape vodka production so wine production is reduced to 35,000. Production of grape vodka is approved but not tasting room so modification requested is to allocate 1 tasting room for vodka tasting.

Chair Ding: We keep this letter and include with our permanent files. In future, for your reference, please submit complete documents.

Mr. Carr: As a follow up to Mr. Lely – part of the reason for groundwater monitoring was for saltwater intrusion. Any quality changes? Also, any noise complaints from neighbors during operation?

Tammy Martin: No changes in water quality.

Armando Ceja: During construction phase, some construction noises but no complaints. My sister had a party couple weeks ago and there was one. It was a warm day and the doors were open but we're aware and working to keep the noise down.

Mr. Carr: The complaint came to you, not the County? I didn't see hops growing on property and approval conditions on original beer production, all of the hops but no barley were to be grown onsite.

Armando Ceja: We're in transition – started with sauce hop, an aromatic hop - queen of hops utilized in Belgium and Germany. We got it from Canada which requires cold winter conditions - didn't take well here so we went to another area for other varieties. Hops have a life span and we're in process of replanting. It takes 4 years then hills have to be replanted.

Mr. Carr: Are you planning to plant any barley?

Armando Ceja: There's a winter barley but not economical or feasible and quality not there.

Chair Ding: As to water issue, location was body shop for more than 60 years. What about pollutants/contaminants. The County didn't check the soil in the report. My issue is spills, paints under the ground – there were no wells but now you have wells and the spot for brewing is exactly on top of garage.

Armando Ceja: We do quite a bit of testing on the ground, and the water is monitored on monthly basis. We're on community water system. We developed an additional well with a seal. As for the body shop, we did a thorough cleaning. They were in compliance and had a concrete slab underneath and also a system of recycling, and we found no leakage/contaminants on the ground.

Chair Ding: Monthly testings – how about quarterly reports to PRMD?

Armando Ceja: No, these tests go to the State on a monthly basis.

Ms. White: What other environmental conscious things you have happening – are you considering solar or wind - you have a water reclamation process – does the whole site get same water treatment?

Armando Ceja: Yes, same. Roof is loaded to accept weight of solar panels for the building on the south side.

Ms. White: It's a very large space - what about events? With vodka tasting – buses, vans?

Armando Ceja: We're close to the road, need to capture through traffic to Napa. We're at 16 events per year - not requesting any additional.

Mr. Fogg: 16 events per year? Size limitations?

Armando Ceja: To capacity of each building.

Mr. Fogg: Now approved for 40,000 cases of wine annually and will become 35,000? Vodka produced onsite?

Armando Ceja: We're trading 5,000 for vodka distilled onsite, and utilizing local organic grapes.

Mr. Fogg: What kind of state permits?

Armando Ceja: TTB, ABC.

**Public questions and comments: (Letters of support distributed to Commissioners from Eileen & Rich Pharo, Beth Ohan, and Tom Witzczak & Kristine Nevero)**

Salvador Chavez, Laurel Ave: I'm in favor, they're doing a great job, also creative and different to have tastings for vodka. With distilleries popping up all over the US, a custom distillery here in Sonoma is a good idea.

Kathy Pons, VOM Alliance: Just a commentary on the direction where County is going as far as what you can produce and taste. It's creative to align vodka case production to wine, but am very concerned with traffic since visitors will have more alcohol in them when they leave. This is a discretionary project and not automatic yes. Please express if you have the need.

Rich Pharo, Dale Ave: We know the Cejas, landscaping is immaculate. Due to widening of Burndale – relief pocket, turning is easier and more accessible. As for events, not a problem.

Kristy Baigh, South Central: Cejas have been good neighbors as a business – transparent, charitable, no noise excesses, and a perfect spot to suggest to traffic flow from Napa into Sonoma. No traffic problems.

Jean Gadiot, off Burndale: A lot of us are horse people. It used to be a nightmare coming along 121. The relief lane has made a huge difference. I'm thankful for the changes and their generosity.

Alejandra Cervantes, Sonoma Hwy: I'm in support of small businesses in community and proud that a Latino family is successful and supportive of other events.

John Painter: I'm the husband of Jean Gadiot. We're friends of the Cejas, and have had business relations with them. They have created something very beautiful in a diverse area – there's dairies, a shooting range, vineries with night things going on all night long. They're helping to create jobs and they're great neighbors.

**Commissioner comments and discussion:**

Ms. Spaulding: Do we become a county of fermenters, brewers, and drinkers? That was an excellent question but this is not the project to stop while we contemplate the larger philosophical issue. I support the project.

Ms. Wood: Good job – well done.

Mr. Lely: I applaud your use of space, happy neighbors are rare and I also support this.

Chair Ding: Credit due to neighbor/friends support, harmonious business situation. Sonoma County is becoming beer country. First time for me to know Sonoma is beer country. Maybe in future it becomes vodka country – something to think about but this project is compliant. I fully support.

Mr. Fogg: Mr. Ceja, is this ag zoning?

Armando Ceja: Ag mixed use.

Mr. Fogg: Where are you in finalizing 1010 use permit?

Armando Ceja: Fully vested.

Mr. Fogg: You have 3 tasting rooms on 1 property even if different buildings – how do you separate tasters starting with beer, then moving on to wine and ending up with vodka?

Armando Ceja: Each area is well patrolled. The law states no commingling between beer and wine - portions are very small. There are distinct and separate areas and you can't take 1 product into another.

Mr. Fogg: My point is they go into the wine section and have as much as they can, go walk around their cars, go into the beer section, do the same thing and end up with the vodka. How do you stop that?

Armando Ceja: Don't know if we could stop but being responsible producers, if anyone's intoxicated, they won't get served. Some do beer or wine, seldom both.

Mr. Fogg: Fremont and Hwy 12, that's Death Valley.

Armando Ceja: It's our responsibility – if there's the smallest question that they're under the influence...

Mr. Lely: The zoning is DA F2 flood plain combining SR scenic resources and VOH Valley Oak Habitat.

Ms. White: How do we define ourselves – we moved in that direction a long time ago. We're known for wine, now beer. Vodka's raising flags and seems concerning for people to roll from 1 into another but people can roll into 3-5 wineries in a day. Is this the application that we start to put our foot down? I support the project as proposed.

Chair Ding: Tasting room is extension of wine production. Yours is 40,000 cases. Cline, Jacuzzi have large productions - 300,000, but very small tasting room. If beer, wine becomes popular, you can't support the volume.

Armando Ceja: Our objective or business plan is to acquire beer and wine in restaurants and liquor stores. Tasting rooms are for education and brand support, not full retail.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Fogg raises a sound issue. I'm not with WCTU, but I have concerns about turning in any direction off Hwy 121. Due to several comments, might we have a discussion after the vote on putting an item on the agenda about what is the maximum number of wine tasting rooms allowed or advised by us in Valley area?

**Motion: Ms. Spaulding. Move to approve project. Ms Johann seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.**

Mr. Carr: Mr. Chairman, I think he does have the capacity since he's not required to grow all the grapes. The question of brewers is do they have the agricultural production to support a tasting facility. The one approved in 2010 was based on production cost. Production of hops is minor relative to making beer. A more fundamental question is whether growth in beermaking in ag zones would need more ag production in order for tasting facility to be secondary and incidental. Benziger opened Sonoma Mountain Brewery on Hwy 12 few years ago and the County required that he had to show some ag production and he grew a couple rows of hops along front of his property. He got approval and eventually converted back to winery because he wasn't making any money.

Lorren Lancaster, South Central: I also have a vested interest. I'm head brewer at Carneros Springs, and we grow our own hops. Our organic farm is expanding to 2 acres and we'll be producing our own hops, they take 3 years, and will supply the local industry for beer. I invite you to tour the farm and the brewery.

Mr. Fogg: The County approved a small brewery for 2,000 barrels up in Sebastopol area on small piece of pure ag property but with requirement that they grow their own barley which has been successful for last couple years as home brewers.

## **5. Consideration of items for Future Agenda**

Pat Gilardi: Another winery coming up next month, another one coming up in January.

Ms. White: Can we do more site visits?

Pat Gilardi: That's up to the Chair.

Chair Ding: I was considering this one. I went last Sunday. You can just look at it.

Pat Gilardi: Any of you can visit any property on your agenda without an orchestrated site visit. Once it's orchestrated, there can't be more than a form of you that attends together and a report would be given. Another comment – you mentioned a letter that was missing. If you read through your packet and you find something missing, call me ahead of time and we'll call the Planning Dept. and ask for a copy of that letter.

Ms. Pulvirenti: I appreciate Ditty through Pat, sharing the Napa County Agricultural Committee minutes and Kathy here is looking at Sonoma, correct? Could we get on distribution for those minutes?

Kathy Pons: PRMD has posted on their website the winery working group with all handouts and interactive maps. One more meeting in October, and we'll be talking about areas of over concentration and how to deal with that.

Mr. Martin: SDC larger and major issue in Valley – can we initiate a hearing for us to take position and give advice?

Ms. Johann: I don't believe it's for us to take up. It's too late, also being handled by higher levels of government.

Pat Gilardi: SDC is owned by State of California. We're trying as a County to participate and we had to send our comments and suggestions to the closure plan before 6:30 tonight, but it's up to the State. We do have a great working relationship with Senator McGuire and Assemblymember Dodd. They've been great partners and they're carrying the torch at the State level.

Mr. Martin: I was thinking of having as many Sonoma organizations on the record as possible as to our position.

Pat Gilardi: You can take up whatever you want on the agenda. You can write a letter as individuals and include that you serve on a local Committee to give it more weight. It's a long and complicated issue.

Mr. Carr: The bulk of their meeting discussions is medical. The closure plan punts on future use of the property once part or all of the facility is closed. That will have an impact on the Valley and its citizens.

Ms. Spaulding: We could have an informative presentation on potential future uses from John McCall with Sonoma Land Trust. He would present us with some interesting options

Mr. Fogg: We've been very well served by our Supervisor who's been at the forefront of this.

Chair Ding: We were considering separate committee on Community Separators. I got feedback from many people – some were opposed, Mr. Davis raised the issues with affordable housing. My concern is if we set up this committee, we will lose our neutral image. Is it necessary or not – still open.

Ms. Spaulding: Depends on what Committee was charged to do, if just to gain information....no, not on agenda.

Ms. Johann: If you're having a discussion on this, needs to be on next agenda.

Ms. White: I don't think there needs to be discussion about this – it makes us look biased. Our #1 priority is to represent the community.

Ms. Spaulding: Just an observation that there could be a subset committee of the Commission that could look into Community Separators, for more information, pros and cons - not taking position but greater clarification. Land use is a huge issue and we could bring together people from both sides. That's what the committee could do.

Chair Ding: We have no action on these kinds of comments. This kind of format is not very formal but we can share more information, even after project is approved, like Mr. Carr.

Ms. White: Or we can make suggestions to the Chair, who can find representatives to provide more learning for the Commission.

Mr. Bramfitt: You don't need a subcommittee. You might assign 1 person on the Commission to follow the issue who can report back to the Commission on a general basis and suggest a time when to have a hearing to weigh in on Commission basis. As the Chair, you can assign a Commissioner to follow issue and report back so that we can talk about it as a Commission.

Mr. Martin: Ms. Shore said the Board of Supervisors will develop a work plan on this subject. I don't think we can move ahead without understanding what the Board of Supervisors' work plan is going to be but once adopted, we can maybe at that time make a decision.

**6. Adjourn 7:55 pm**



# COUNTY OF SONOMA

## PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

To: Interested Agencies

July 21, 2015

The following application has been filed with the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department.

**File Number:** UPE15-0046  
**Applicant Name:** Windside USA Inc.  
**Owner Name:** Same  
**Site Address:** 24520 Ramal Road, Sonoma  
**APN:** 135-081, -015, -017, and -020

**Project Description:** Request for a Use Permit to allow a winery with 20,000 annual production capacity with new buildings, public tasting, retail sales and special events on a 186 acre parcel.

We are submitting the above application for your review and recommendation. Additional information is on file in this office.

Responses to referrals should include: (1) statement of any environmental concerns or uncertainties your agency may have with the project; (2) any comments you wish to make regarding the merits of the project; and (3) your proposed conditions and mitigations for this project. Responsible agencies under CEQA are requested to indicate whether permits will be required for this project.

Your comments will be appreciated by August 11, 2015 and should be sent to the attention of:

**UPE15-0046, Blake Hillegas (Blake.Hillegas@sonoma-county.org).** The Project Planner can also be reached at 707-565-1392. Native American tribes receiving this Referral have 30 days to request a tribal consultation under the guidelines governing AB 52.

Please send a copy of your comments to the applicant(s) or their representatives as indicated on the attached Planning Application.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> PRMD County Surveyor                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BOS Dist 1 Director and Commissioners           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Specialist                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SVCAC   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sanitation  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Valley of the Moon Alliance and Kenwood Press   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading and Storm Water                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NW Information Center, S.S.U.                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SUSMP   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Milo Baker Chapter Conservation Committee       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building Inspection                               | <input type="checkbox"/> PG&E   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Code Enforcement                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> North Bay Corporation (Disposal)                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Naming                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> So. Co. Environmental Health                      | <input type="checkbox"/> State Coastal Commission - Appealable Yes / No             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DTPW, Land Development                 | <input type="checkbox"/> State Dept of Transportation (Caltrans)                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DTPW, Drainage                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Dept of Fish and Wildlife                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ag Commissioner                        | <input type="checkbox"/> State Dept of Forestry                                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Parks Dept                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Dept of Water Resources Control Board     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire and Emergency Services            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Parks and Recreation-Duncans Mills Office |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Fire District – Schell Vista FPD | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water QCB: SF Bay                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Treasurer/Special Assessment                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control: No. So. County / Bay Area AQM       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assessor  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Sonoma, Planning Dept                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development Board             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonoma MOAG                                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transit/BPAC                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Apple Roots Group                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCTA/RCPA                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Consultation                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communications                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Sonoma Water Dept                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Landmarks Commission                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonoma Mountain Preservation                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sheriff Community Service Officer                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonoma Valley Chamber of Commerce               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LAFCO   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ALUC/CLUP   |   |

# Planning Application

PJR-001

File#: UPE15-0046

### Type of Application:

- |   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Admin Cert. Compliance       | <input type="checkbox"/> Design Review Comm./Ind.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Subdivision            | <input type="checkbox"/> Variance          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ag./Timber Preserve/Contract | <input type="checkbox"/> Design Review Residential | <input type="checkbox"/> Mobile Home Zoning Permit    | <input type="checkbox"/> Zone Change       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cert. of Compliance          | <input type="checkbox"/> Design Review Signs       | <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance Interpretation     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cert. of Modification        | <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment    | <input type="checkbox"/> Second Unit Permit           | <i>Voluntary Merges</i>                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit               | <input type="checkbox"/> Lot Line Adjustment       | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific/Area Plan Amendment | <i>Revision to File</i>                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Design Review Admin.         | <input type="checkbox"/> Major Subdivision         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use Permit        |  |

### Applicant (Contact Person):

### Owner, if other than Applicant:

Name Anne Moller-Racke  
 Mailing Address 24520 Ramal Road  
 City/Town Sonoma State CA Zip 95476  
 Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_  
 email amoller-racke@thedonutstate.com  
 Signature *Anne Moller-Racke* Date 06/01/15

Name ANNE MOLLER-RACKE  
 Mailing Address 24520 RAMAL RD  
 City/Town SONOMA State CA Zip 95476  
 Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_  
 email AMOLLER-RACKE@THEDONUTSTATE.COM  
 Signature *Anne Moller-Racke* Date 6/1/15

### Other Persons to be Notified: (Specify: Other Owner(s), Agent, Lender, Architect, Engineer, Surveyor)

Name Matt Hollis Mt Architects  
 Mailing Address 2325 3rd St, Studio 224  
 City/Town San Francisco, CA State CA Zip 94107  
 Title Project Architect  
 Phone (415) 977-0194/977-0196  
 email matte@mathollis.com

Name Jeffrey Redding  
 Mailing Address 2423 Rentrow St.  
 City/Town Napa, Ca. State CA Zip 94558  
 Title Planning Consultant  
 Phone (707) 255-7375/255-7275  
 email jreddingarc@comcast.net

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 City/Town \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_  
 email \_\_\_\_\_

### Project Information:

Address(es) 24520 Ramal Road City/Town Sonoma CA  
 Assessor's Parcel Number(s) 135-051-014, -015; -017, -020 Acreage 1867/- acres  
*merger includes*

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Site Served by Public Water?  Yes  No Site Served by Public Sewer?  Yes  No  
 Number of new lots proposed RC (50/50)

----- **DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE - To Be Completed by PRMD Staff** -----  
 Planning Area: 9 Supervisorial District: 1 Current Zoning: LEA B6-60cc, Z, SR, VO, LG/MTN General Plan Land Use: LEA 60  
 Specific Plan: \_\_\_\_\_ S.P. Land Use: \_\_\_\_\_ Needs CEQA Review?  yes  no

Commercial/Industrial Uses: (Enter numbers where applicable)  
 Bldg. sq. ft. Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ Proposed: \_\_\_\_\_ Existing Employees: \_\_\_\_\_ New Employees: \_\_\_\_\_  
 New Manufactured Homes: \_\_\_\_\_ New Units For Sale: \_\_\_\_\_ New Units For Rent: \_\_\_\_\_ Density Bonus Units: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Violation?  yes  no; Application resolve planning violation?  yes  no; Penalty applicable?  yes  no; Civil Penalty Factor \_\_\_\_\_  
 Previous Files: UPE11-0047  
 Application accepted by SCOTT HUNSPERGER Date 6/24/15

**Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**  
 2550 Ventura Avenue \* Santa Rosa, CA \* 95403-2829 \* (707) 565-1900 \* Fax (707) 565-1103

# Supplemental Application Information

Existing use of property: Vineyards, agricultural offices  
misc. ag buildings Acreage: 186<sup>+</sup> ac.

Existing structures on property: Please see a Hatched site plan prepared by  
MHA

Proximity to creeks, waterways and impoundment areas: N/A

Vegetation on site: Vineyards

General topography: Rolling hills,

Surrounding uses to (Note: An adjoining road is not a use.)  
North: Vineyard South: State lands  
East: Vineyard West: Agriculture

New structures proposed (size, height, type): Agricultural processing building, hospitality/administrative  
building. Please see plans prepared by MHA  
Architects for details

Number of employees: Full time: 9 Part time: \_\_\_\_\_ Seasonal: \_\_\_\_\_

Operating days: M-S Hours of operation: 9-5pm

Number of vehicles per day: Passenger: 20 +/- Trucks: 2

Water source: On-site well Sewage disposal: On-site disposal

Provider, if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_ Provider, if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

New noise sources (compressors, power tools, music, etc.): Typical winery production equipment  
during harvest; cooling units

Grading proposed: Amount of cut (cu. yds.): \_\_\_\_\_ Amount of fill (cu. yds.): \_\_\_\_\_ Will more than one acre be disturbed by construction of access roads, site preparation and clearing, fill or excavation, building removal, building construction, equipment staging and maintenance, or other activities? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If Yes, indicate area of disturbance(acres): \_\_\_\_\_

Identify method of site drainage (sheet flow, storm drain, outflow to creek or ditch, detention area, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_

Vegetation to be removed: Ornamental of non-irrigation grasses

Will proposal require annexation to a district in order to obtain public services: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

Are there currently any hazardous materials (chemicals, oils, gasoline, etc.) stored, used or processed on this site? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

Will the use, storage, or processing of hazardous materials occur on this site in the future if this project is authorized? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

Fire safety information (existing/proposed water tanks, hydrants, emergency access and turnaround, building materials, etc): Please see plans prepared by MHA Architects &  
Attorney Engineering

## Proposal Statement The Donum Estate Winery

Donum Estate currently produces awarding winning wines from its on-site vineyards and other fruit sources primarily from the Russian River appellation. Its wines are currently produced at an off-site facility. As its reputation for producing superior ultra premium wine continues to grow, the owners are desirous of constructing a small production facility to oversee wine production from vine to bottle.

### **Existing Conditions**

Donum Estate currently owns four assessors parcels totaling approximately 186.35 acres. The property was previously used as a dairy. Barns, sheds and other agriculturally related buildings are reminders of this prior agricultural use. The property remains in agricultural use today with approximately 45 acres planted to vineyard. The existing vineyards are irrigated by recycled wastewater provided by Sonoma County. An additional 50 acres of the property is available for planting.

Vineyards to the north and east surround the property. To the south and southwest are State owned wildlife lands with vineyards and dairy lands to the west. The nearest off-site residence is located more than 1500 feet from the subject property.

### **Revision to File**

The owners are seeking a revision to file to modify the previously approved 100,000 case agricultural processing facility on the adjacent 40-acre parcel (APN 135-081-014 & -015) owned by the Donum Estate. This permit (#UPE011-0047) is still active and would expire in August 2015 unless an extension is sought. A request for a one-year extension of this permit is being submitted with this application.

Rather than the approved 100,000 case facility, the owners are seeking approval of a 20,000 case facility designed to process grapes grown on the property and in the local area. The proposed project would be located on the adjacent 146-acre property (APN 135-081-017 & -020) also owned by Donum Estate. A request for voluntary merger to consolidate the four assessor's parcels into a single legal parcel is being submitted with this application.

The site of the approved 100,000 case facility is more visible to the traveling public than is the proposed project and is located on viable agricultural land. The 10,000 case facility has several advantages over the approved 100,000 case project:

1. The proposed project is more in scale with the existing structures, improvements and site topography

2. The new buildings and roads will involve less earthmoving, and be located on less visible and prominent portions of the property
3. The proposed project is considerably smaller than the approved facility ((83,400 square feet vs. 14,000 square feet) and is designed to process grapes primarily grown on the property as well as fruit from other vineyards in the local area
4. The new buildings would be constructed on previously disturbed portions of the site, rather than on undisturbed land that can be planted to vineyard.

### **Project Description and Location**

The subject property is located on the east side of Ramal Road at 24520 Ramal Road south of its intersection with the State Highway 121. Topographically, the property consists of gentle to rolling terrain with slopes less than 15%. The location of the new buildings is within a compound of existing agricultural buildings, residences and vineyards. The new buildings are designed to reinforce the current agricultural setting of the property.

The current proposal would consist of two separate buildings as shown on architectural plans prepared by MH Architects. The proposed improvements will be constructed on portions of the site that were disturbed previously by prior agricultural activities or existing buildings. Rather than attaching the buildings in a large complex, the project architect has dispersed them in a development pattern comparable to the pattern of the previous dairy use. This dispersal on portions of the property allow for separation of production use from hospitality use and keeps the new buildings in scale with the existing buildings. Architectural plans prepared by MH Architects provide additional project details including floor plans, site plans and building elevations. A preliminary landscape plan and visual analysis is also included with the application.

The agricultural processing building would measure approximately 10,404 s.f. with the combined administration/hospitality building measuring approximately 3,410 s.f. A 144 s.f. outdoor pavilion that will be used for tastings is also part of the project. The two principal buildings are designed to conform to existing topographic conditions. The processing building would be a partial two-story structure on south facing elevation and one story on the north. It would measure approximately 34 feet average height. The combined administration/hospitality building would be one story oriented to take advantage of the bay lands and vineyard views. It is 24 feet in height. The buildings are designed to be compatible with the color and materials found on the buildings that will remain on site following project completion.

Several existing improvements will be demolished to facilitate the construction of the new project. These are shown on sheet A0.07 of the architectural plans prepared by MH Architects. Retail sales of wine to the public and on-site wine tasting are proposed as incidental and accessory to the production

facility. A maximum of 10 special events are proposed annual with a maximum of 100 persons attending and an average of 50 persons attending each event.

While market and economic conditions will influence construction time lines, the project is to be built in two phases. Phase 1 would consist of the administration building with the production building constructed in Phase 2.

The project architect has developed a visual analysis for the project. It depicts the view of the new buildings from several vantage points along Ramal Road. These depictions confirm that the new buildings will be having no impact on the Ramal Road view corridor.

A preliminary landscape plan, tree removal and preservation plan is included with this submittal.

The project includes a number of water and energy conserving features that together with the siting of the buildings on previously disturbed portions of the site will serve to reduce its impact on the environment. The processing building will be equipped with roof top solar panels. Electrical vehicle (EV) charging stations and bicycle parking is provided for guests within the parking area. Each building is fitted with a 'cool' roof and skylights to provide natural lights and reduce the need for artificial lighting. It is the intention of the owner to provide LED and task-appropriate lighting to further reduce electrical demands. Process wastewater will be available for re use on the existing vineyards.

Access to the proposed winery is via a driveway from Ramal Road. The driveway then splits into two separate driveways, one that provides access to the production building with the second driveway providing access to the new hospitality building. Parking is provided adjacent to each new building. Seven (7) spaces including a handicapped space are provided for the hospitality building. Four (4) parking spaces including a second handicapped space are provided adjacent to the production building.

While the precise employee levels are still being determined it is expected that ten (10 FTE) full time equivalent persons will be employed by the winery.

Sanitary waste will be treated and disposed of on-site. Process wastewater will be treated either through the use of aerated lagoons or a package treatment plant with vessel storage. The treatment method shall be determined at a later date. Process waste water, after treatment, will be drip irrigated in vineyard under an approved Water Quality Control Board waste discharge permit. Preliminary site grading and drainage plans have also been prepared. Please see plans prepared by Atterbury & Associates, Inc.

Water will be provided by an on-site well and pressurized system with on-site storage. The line sizes, flow rates, and amount of storage will be consistent with County fire department requirements.

# Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Questionnaire

NPD-004

**PURPOSE:** Storm water is the largest source of pollution in creeks and rivers. Projects are required to prevent storm water pollution and clean storm water before it leave a project site. This form is used to determine if a project is subject to special regulation on storm water.

Applicant:  Owner  Engineer  Architect  
 Landscape Architect  Contractor  Developer

Atterbury and Associates

Name

16109 Healdsburg Ave

Mailing Address

Healdsburg

CA 95448

City/Town

State/Zip

(707) 433-0134

(707) 433-1035

Phone

Fax

Project Site Information:

24500 Ramal Road

Street Address

Sonoma

City/Town

135-081-017

Assessor's Parcel Number

Permit Number(s)

## QUESTIONNAIRE:

To determine if a project is subject to the requirements of SUSMP, please answer the following questions. If you are unable to answer any questions or if you checked unknown, you may consult a PRMD National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) staff member, or your design professional.

Yes  No  Unknown

1. Is the project within either of the two NPDES boundaries? Check the box below for either the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board or the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. See attached map.

North Coast  San Francisco Bay

Yes  No  Unknown

2. Does the project create one (1) acre (43,560 square feet) or more of new impervious surface or is it directly adjacent to a waterway or does it require a new storm drain outfall?

Yes  No  Unknown

3. Does the project require a discretionary permit or any ministerial permit(s) related to a discretionary permit (e.g. a grading or building permit for a project subject to a use permit or other discretionary land use approval)?

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

I, as the applicant, understand that a Yes answer to all of the above questions means the project is a SUSMP applicable project subject to the requirements of SUSMP guidelines. Any unknown responses must be resolved to determine if the project is subject to SUSMP requirements. The applicant must complete the Preliminary Storm Water Mitigation Plan Worksheet (NPD-005) for all applicable SUSMP projects.

  
Signature

6/23/15  
Date

**Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**

2550 Ventura Avenue ❖ Santa Rosa, CA ❖ 95403-2829 ❖ (707) 565-1900 ❖ Fax (707) 565-1103

# Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Questionnaire

NPD-004

**PURPOSE:** Storm water is the largest source of pollution in creeks and rivers. Projects are required to prevent storm water pollution and clean storm water before it leave a project site. This form is used to determine if a project is subject to special regulation on storm water.

Applicant:  Owner  Engineer  Architect  
 Landscape Architect  Contractor  Developer

Atterbury and Associates

Name

16109 Healdsburg Ave

Mailing Address

Healdsburg

CA 95448

City/Town

State/Zip

(707) 433-0134

(707) 433-1035

Phone

Fax

Project Site Information:

24500 Ramal Road

Street Address

Sonoma

City/Town

135-081-017

Assessor's Parcel Number

Permit Number(s)

## QUESTIONNAIRE:

To determine if a project is subject to the requirements of SUSMP, please answer the following questions. If you are unable to answer any questions or if you checked unknown, you may consult a PRMD National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) staff member, or your design professional.

Yes  No  Unknown

1. Is the project within either of the two NPDES boundaries? Check the box below for either the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board or the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. See attached map.

North Coast  San Francisco Bay

Yes  No  Unknown

2. Does the project create one (1) acre (43,560 square feet) or more of new impervious surface or is it directly adjacent to a waterway or does it require a new storm drain outfall?

Yes  No  Unknown

3. Does the project require a discretionary permit or any ministerial permit(s) related to a discretionary permit (e.g. a grading or building permit for a project subject to a use permit or other discretionary land use approval)?

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

I, as the applicant, understand that a Yes answer to all of the above questions means the project is a SUSMP applicable project subject to the requirements of SUSMP guidelines. Any unknown responses must be resolved to determine if the project is subject to SUSMP requirements. The applicant must complete the Preliminary Storm Water Mitigation Plan Worksheet (NPD-005) for all applicable SUSMP projects.

Signature

Date

**Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**

2550 Ventura Avenue ❖ Santa Rosa, CA ❖ 95403-2829 ❖ (707) 565-1900 ❖ Fax (707) 565-1103

# Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Questionnaire

NPD-004

**PURPOSE:** Storm water is the largest source of pollution in creeks and rivers. Projects are required to prevent storm water pollution and clean storm water before it leave a project site. This form is used to determine if a project is subject to special regulation on storm water.

Applicant:  Owner  Engineer  Architect  
 Landscape Architect  Contractor  Developer

Atterbury and Associates

Name

16109 Healdsburg Ave

Mailing Address

Healdsburg

CA 95448

City/Town

State/Zip

(707) 433-0134

(707) 433-1035

Phone

Fax

Project Site Information:

24500 Ramal Road

Street Address

Sonoma

City/Town

135-081-017

Assessor's Parcel Number

Permit Number(s)

## QUESTIONNAIRE:

To determine if a project is subject to the requirements of SUSMP, please answer the following questions. If you are unable to answer any questions or if you checked unknown, you may consult a PRMD National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) staff member, or your design professional.

Yes  No  Unknown

1. Is the project within either of the two NPDES boundaries? Check the box below for either the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board or the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. See attached map.

North Coast  San Francisco Bay

Yes  No  Unknown

2. Does the project create one (1) acre (43,560 square feet) or more of new impervious surface or is it directly adjacent to a waterway or does it require a new storm drain outfall?

Yes  No  Unknown

3. Does the project require a discretionary permit or any ministerial permit(s) related to a discretionary permit (e.g. a grading or building permit for a project subject to a use permit or other discretionary land use approval)?

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

I, as the applicant, understand that a Yes answer to all of the above questions means the project is a SUSMP applicable project subject to the requirements of SUSMP guidelines. Any unknown responses must be resolved to determine if the project is subject to SUSMP requirements. The applicant must complete the Preliminary Storm Water Mitigation Plan Worksheet (NPD-005) for all applicable SUSMP projects.

Signature

Date

**Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**

2550 Ventura Avenue ❖ Santa Rosa, CA ❖ 95403-2829 ❖ (707) 565-1900 ❖ Fax (707) 565-1103

135-08

COUNTY ASSESSOR'S PARCEL MAP

TAX RATE AREA/  
158-091  
158-078

