



Letter & Comment: RE: PROJECT DESCRIPTION: REVISED request for an Amended Use Permit (UP-19;12-1) for La Mesa Vineyards.

1 message

William Easton <terouge@volcano.net>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Sat, Feb 5, 2022 at 10:13 PM

Bill Easton
Winemaker & Winegrower
DOMAINE DE LA TERRE ROUGE, Ltd.
TERRE ROUGE and EASTON Wines
P.O. Box 41
Fiddletown, California 95629-0041
Voice: (209) 245-3117
Cell/VM: (209) 304-0642
Fax: (209) 245-5415
terouge@volcano.net
twitter: @rhonist
<http://www.terrerougewines.com>
"The Wine Enthusiast" - Two 100-point wines grown and made in the Sierra Foothills - First Ever!
"Wine & Spirits Magazine" - Top 100 Winery in 2016, 2019 & 2020
Slow Wine 2021

 **La Mesa_Amended Use Permit.pdf**
435K

Domaine de la Terre Rouge

TERRE ROUGE® AND EASTON WINES

February 5, 2022

Amador County Planning Commission
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
810 COURT STREET
JACKSON, CA 95642-2132
planning@amadorgov.org

RE: PROJECT DESCRIPTION: REVISED request for an Amended Use Permit (UP-19;12-1) for La Mesa Vineyards.

1 - All of the requested expanded uses at La Mesa Vineyards should be declined. Their tasting room was allowed to be built too close to a neighboring property on a too small R-1A parcel. There have been other instances of R-1A winery use permits that should **NEVER** have been allowed. The County of Amador should address and investigate a lack of managerial understanding or will to enforce County codes and government alcohol beverage law at **ALL** levels by appointed officials, elected officials, and County employees.

2 - “**The Wrecking of the Shenandoah Valley - An Agricultural Preserve**”: not everyone who lives in the Shenandoah Valley is in the wine business. Some people grow grapes; some people make wine. Some folks just have ranches and family history here.

4.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Agriculture is important to Amador County because it contributes to the local economy, helps define the County's character, and provides access to a local food source. Amador County identifies eight major agricultural areas: Willow Springs, Ione Valley, Jackson Valley, Shenandoah Valley, the Fiddletown area, the Ridge Road area, Clinton Road/Tabeau area, and the Shake Ridge Road area. Other agricultural and timber areas of the County are generally characterized as the Rangeland and Timberland areas. Each of these areas has unique features that support a variety of agricultural land uses. (Amador County 2006)

Land for farming and ranching must be preserved in parcels sizes that are economically viable. According to the USDA, a farm is any place from which \$1,000 or more of agricultural products were sold, or normally would have been sold, during the census year. In general, there has been a trend involving an increase in the number of farms and a decrease in farm size in Amador County. Between 2002 and 2007, the number of farms increased from 451 to 478, or 6%. The overall acreage of farmland decreased during the same timeframe from 194,144 acres to 163,482 acres, or 16%. (USDA 2007)

Important Farmland Category	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
Unique Farmland	3,054	3,491	3,755	3,596	3,678	3,335
Farmland of Local Importance	2,789	1,575	1,255	1,272	1,485	1,864
Grazing	190,791	191,110	188,218	188,569	188,115	188,433
Agricultural land total	202,356	202,113	198,908	198,764	198,392	198,264

Source: DOC 2010

Domaine de la Terre Rouge

TERRE ROUGE® AND EASTON WINES

“Decreasing more rapidly now.” This chart is from 2010.

Concentrations of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance and some small areas designated as Unique Farmland are located in the Shenandoah Valley portions of the County and areas south and west of Ione. Between 1996 and 2002, conversions of marginal lands to agricultural lands resulted in overall increases in Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland. Most of these conversions were localized to the Shenandoah Valley area where grazing land was planted with new vineyards (DOC 2000, 2002). Decreases of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland resulted from boundary adjustments; irrigated farmland left idle for three or more update cycles; and development of new homes, businesses, and recreational facilities in and adjacent to Camanche, the Shenandoah Valley, and the cities of Ione, Jackson, and Sutter Creek (DOC 2004, 2006).

Farmland of Local Importance is land of importance to the local economy, as defined by each county's local advisory committee and adopted by its Board of Supervisors. The FMMP identifies Farmland of Local Importance in Amador County as land that is currently in agricultural production and that is providing an economic return equal to that from the prime soil types (DOC 2012). Farmland of Local Importance is scattered throughout the County, with a majority of land located east of SR 49. Changes in the acreage of Farmland of Local Importance are primarily caused by boundary adjustments, the redistribution of categories in 2002, and irrigated farmland left idle for three or more update cycles.

*Grazing land is concentrated primarily in the western and central portions of the County. Increases in Grazing land between 2000 and 2002 resulted from boundary adjustments, redistribution of categories in 2002, and irrigated farmland left idle for three or more update cycles (DOC 2000, 2002). Later decreases in Grazing land resulted from planting of new vineyards and development of new homes, businesses, and recreational facilities in and adjacent to Camanche, the Shenandoah Valley, and the cities of Ione, Jackson, and Sutter Creek (DOC 2004b, 2006b). - **Amador County General Plan FEIR County of Amador***

3 - The County of Amador defines a winery as:

19.08.687 Winery.

"Winery" means an agricultural facility used for the processing (fermentation when combined with any two of the following: crushing, pressing, aging, blending or bottling) of juices into wine or the re-fermenting of still wine into sparkling wine and which is currently bonded as such by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau and has a current California Alcohol Beverage Control winegrower's 02 master license. (Ord. 1708 §2, 2011; Ord. 1320 §2, 1993).

4 - Having a tasting room is a privilege of having a California wine grower's license:

Domaine de la Terre Rouge

TERRE ROUGE® AND EASTON WINES

(c) A winegrower shall actually produce on his or her licensed premises by conversion of grapes, berries, or other fruit, into wine, not less than 50 percent of all wines sold to consumers on his or her licensed premise or premises and any licensed branch premise or premises. - State of California BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE Section 23358 (attached)

5 - A winery is an agricultural processing facility that has the ability to taste its production of wines made predominately on the State and Federally licensed winery premise **ON THAT SITE. (not trucked in from elsewhere in BULK or made and bottled in another County or at a non-associated winery facility)** A **WINERY** is a **NOT** predominately an amusement park, side-show attraction, **food service facility**, wedding facility, movie theatre, dance venue, bar, music and entertainment venue, retail gift store, hotel, convention center, golf course, par-course, fruit & vegetable stand, etc. As ignored uses leak into this other areas without concern to the history of agriculture in Amador County we diminish our valuable agriculture land and our human communities and relationships. Most winery events should end at sunset. Winery lighting and noise should be extinguished at dusk as well. If you can't just sell predominately wine at your tasting room, based on the wine quality, you should find another line of work. All of the other uses mentioned above belong in C-1 zoning areas.

6 - County code enforcement had been non-existent and seems to lack an understanding of County Code, State Code, Alcoholic Beverage Law (Local, State, and Federal). There are wineries with tasting rooms in Amador County in **BOTH** R-1A zoning and A-1 zoning that are violating these laws.

7 - If the County refuses to enforce local codes and state codes it may become necessary to request that the California State Attorney General's Office investigate the reason for the lack of enforcement of these regulations.

8- The County should look at **ALL** wineries in Amador County (including mine) to see if they are operating within the regulations of the State of California as noted in this letter.

Let's keep and preserve the historic and agricultural character and functionality of Amador County and **NOT** turn it into another subdivision of Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. Let's make Amador known better internationally for the high-quality of its wines. After all this is why many of us like living here, in harmony with our neighbors, and the surrounding landscape.

Let us **NOT** soil the nest that we all live in!

Sincerely,

Bill Easton
Owner, Founder, Wine Grower, Winemaker

☞ BOX 41, FIDDLETOWN, AMADOR COUNTY, CALIFORNIA USA 95629-0041 ☞
TELEPHONE 209-245-3117 FAX 209-245-5415 E-MAIL: TEROUGE AT VOLCANO.NET
WWW.TERREROUGEWINES.COM BW CA 5789

Domaine de la Terre Rouge

TERRE ROUGE® AND EASTON WINES

State of California

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE

Section 23358

23358. (a) Licensed winegrowers, notwithstanding any other provisions of this division, may also exercise the following privileges:

(1) Sell wine and brandy to any person holding a license authorizing the sale of wine or brandy.

(2) Sell wine and brandy to consumers for consumption off the premises where sold.

(3) Sell wine to consumers for consumption on the premises.

(4) Sell all beers, wines, and brandies, regardless of source, to consumers for consumption on the premises in a bona fide eating place as defined in Section 23038 of this code, which is located on the licensed premises or on premises owned by the licensee that are contiguous to the licensed premises and which is operated by and for the licensee. At such bona fide public eating place beer, wine, and brandy may be used in the preparation of food and beverages to be consumed on the premises.

(5) Produce spirits of wine and blend those spirits of wine into wine produced by the winegrower or sell those spirits of wine to an industrial alcohol dealer.

(b) A winegrower may also have upon the premises all beers, wines, and brandies, regardless of source, for sale or service only to guests during private events or private functions not open to the general public. Alcoholic beverage products sold at the premises that are not produced and bottled by, or produced and packaged for, the winegrower shall be purchased by the winegrower only from a licensed wholesaler.

(c) A winegrower shall actually produce on his or her licensed premises by conversion of grapes, berries, or other fruit, into wine, not less than 50 percent of all wines sold to consumers on his or her licensed premise or premises and any licensed branch premise or premises.

(d) The department may, if it shall determine for good cause that the granting of any such privilege would be contrary to public welfare or morals, deny the right to exercise any on-sale privilege authorized by this section in either a bona fide eating place the main entrance to which is within 200 feet of a school or church, or on the licensed winery premises, or both.

(e) Nothing in this section or in Section 23390 is intended to alter, diminish, replace, or eliminate the authority of a county, city, or city and county from exercising land use regulatory authority by law to the extent the authority may restrict, but not eliminate, privileges afforded by these sections.

(Amended by Stats. 2010, Ch. 129, Sec. 2. (AB 1649) Effective January 1, 2011.)



Ammended land use La Mesa Vineyards

1 message

Mary Pulskamp <pulskampmary@yahoo.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 9:06 AM

I am a resident of Amador county and have owned and operated businesses in the county since 1975. I came to Amador County back then partly because of it's beauty and charm. I urge the planning commision to protect that precious resource by being conservative on the changes made to the land permit to La Mesa Vineyards. For the sake of our county's precious charm and their closest neighbors, do not change the permitted use. But, instead invite them to open a tasting room and gallery/shop in Jackson! Oh that would be great for the city.

Thank You,
Mary Pulskamp
Sutter Creek



La Mesa Vineyards

1 message

George Reitter <gwr7@aol.com>

Sun, Feb 6, 2022 at 6:00 PM

Reply-To: George Reitter <gwr7@aol.com>

To: "planning@amadorgov.org" <planning@amadorgov.org>

Cc: George Reitter <gwr7@aol.com>, "jreitter@hotmail.com" <jreitter@hotmail.com>

Chairman and Members
Amador County Planning Commission

I'll be brief about my opposition to expanding the rights of La Mesa Vineyards.

1. La Mesa is a vineyard and should stick to that business of making and selling good wines. By wanting to expand into other operations they are saying they are unable to be successful as a winery.
2. La Mesa should not be a night club or bar. If they want to be in that business they should go to a more favorable area such as Jackson, Sutter Creek or Main Street Plymouth.
3. The rules for wineries in our county are not uniform
4. The county roads are poorly lit with narrow shoulders and are unable to handle an increase in traffic, specifically after dark.
5. The population is not large enough to support this activity without having people drive long distances from Sacramento, Reno, etc. Do we have the resources to handle this additional business?

Please do not approve the expansion rights for La Mesa Vineyards..

Thank you,

George W. Reitter
Fiddletown, CA



Krista Ruesel <kruesel@amadorgov.org>

AMA-49 La Mesa Vineyards

2 messages

Bauldry, Paul@DOT <paul.bauldry@dot.ca.gov>

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 9:26 AM

To: Krista Ruesel <kruesel@amadorgov.org>

Cc: OPR State Clearinghouse <State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov>, "Ponce, Gregoria@DOT" <gregoria.ponce@dot.ca.gov>

Ms. Ruesel,

Please see the attached Caltrans letter for the AMA-49 La Mesa Vineyards Project.

Should you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me at (209) 670-9488 or at paul.bauldry@dot.ca.gov.

Thank you.

Paul Bauldry

Caltrans District 10

Office of Rural Planning

Division of Planning, Local Assistance, and Environmental

1976 E. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.

Stockton CA 95205

Telework # 209.670.9488

 **AMA-49-PM 20.49 IS La Mesa Vineyards.pdf**
242K

Krista Ruesel <kruesel@amadorgov.org>

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 10:58 AM

To: Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Krista Ruesel

Planner|Amador County Planning Department

(209)223-6803|kruesel@amadorgov.org

[Quoted text hidden]



AMA-49-PM 20.49 IS La Mesa Vineyards.pdf

242K

California Department of Transportation

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT 10 PLANNING
P.O. BOX 2048 | STOCKTON, CA 95201
(209) 948-7325 | FAX (209) 948-7164 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



February 7, 2021

Krista Ruesel
Planner
Amador County Planning Department
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

AMA-49-PM 20.49
Use Permit (UP-19; 12-1)
Initial Study (IS)
SCH 2022010010

Ms. Ruesel,

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the La Mesa Vineyards Amendment request on the approved Use Permit (UP-19;12-1) and Initial Study (IS). The property is 24.83 acres and zoned, Single-family Residential and Agriculture (R1A). La Mesa Vineyards seeks to increase the limit on days of operation and special events from four (4) days per week and six (6) events per year with up to 100 attendees (with live and/or amplified music until 5:00 p.m.) to unlimited days. The applicant would also like to request flexible general hours of operation subject to indoor or outdoor amplified music limitation until 10:00 p.m. The events at La Mesa Vineyards would also coincide with the Amador Vintners Association-sponsored events, with up to 24 additional events with up to 125 attendees and up to 12 different events annually with up to 250 attendees.

La Mesa Vineyards is located at 13200 Shenandoah Road in Plymouth approximately six miles east of State Route (SR) 49 on property Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 014-140-054.

Caltrans has the following comments:

Caltrans has commented on this project previously on January 14, 2020, September 7, 2021, and January 11, 2021. Those comments still apply.

Senate Bill (SB) 743 is changing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis of transportation impacts commenting. It requires local land use projects to provide safe transportation system, reduce per capita vehicle miles of travel (VMT), increase accessibility by mode share of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

With the proposed project's significant generated trip per day especially during social gatherings or weddings, VMT reduction is necessary to meet the statewide GHG emissions. Caltrans suggests public transit route extension to and from La Mesa Vineyards.

Please forward the final Conditions of Approval to Caltrans, District 10 Office of Rural Planning, once available.

It is important to note that if any new advertising structures are visible to the National Highway System (NHS) it is subject to the provisions of the California Outdoor Advertising Act outlined in Business and Professions Code Section 5200 et seq. Any advertising structure that displays off-premise commercial advertising visible from the NHS will require a permit from the Office of Outdoor Advertising (ODA). Any advertising structure that only advertises goods and services available on-premise will not require a permit from ODA, provided it adheres to the provisions of Business and Professions Code Section 5272 and 5274 and California Code of Regulations 2243 and 2246. Each of the proposed advertising structures should refrain from operating in any of the conditions outlined in Business and Professions Code Section 5403. For questions related to the ODA permit application process please visit our website at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/oda>

Caltrans suggests Amador County Planning Department continue to coordinate and consult with Caltrans to identify and address potential cumulative transportation impacts from this project and other developments near this location. This will assist Caltrans in ensuring that traffic safety and quality standards are maintained for the traveling public on existing and future state transportation facilities.

Encroachment Permits

If any future project activities encroach into Caltrans Right-of-Way (ROW), an application is required for an Encroachment Permit to the Caltrans District 10 Encroachment Permit Office. Appropriate environmental studies must be submitted with this application.

Ms. Krista Ruesel
February 7, 2022
Page 3

These studies will analyze potential impacts to any cultural sites, biological resources, hazardous waste locations, and/or other resources within Caltrans ROW at the project site(s). For more information, please visit the Caltrans Website at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/ep/applications>

Please contact Paul Bauldry at (209) 670-9488 or by email: paul.bauldry@dot.ca.gov, or me at (209) 483-7234 (email: Gregoria.Ponce@dot.ca.gov) if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Gregoria Ponce

Gregoria Ponce, Chief
Office of Rural Planning

cc: State Clearinghouse



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

La Mesa

1 message

Daniel D'Agostini <daniel@dagostini.com>

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 9:34 AM

To: Amador County Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Please add this letter to the Planning Commission Meeting February 8th meeting,

Thank You,

Daniel D'Agostini



letter to p-c.docx

13K

This the situation that a business can override a resident's request that the county does not change the zoning because a businessman who does not even live in the county full-time wants his hobby business to be on a level competitive field with the 16 wineries out of the 48 who can stay open seven days a week compared to the 48 others who share the same hours as he. That can change the zoning and quality of the neighborhood compared to the desire valid from the man who lives in that valley his whole life and who shares the fence with this place saying wait a minute I don't want my quality of life or this part of the valley changed just because he wants to have a competitive equality with people in different zones. There's no private residence next to any of those facilities my Fenceline shares his Fenceline and his tasting room is less than 50 feet from my house and I can hear all the conversations all the outside guests and the music I can reach through my fence and touch their vehicles parked I think my request us more about it than his. I would hope that each person voting on this would come and look with their realize I'm not at some Google map it doesn't show anything of the reality what happening on the ground.

Entrepreneur & investor



Letter to Oppose Use Permit Amendment UP-19;12-1 La Mesa Tasting Room

1 message

Stephen Beckwith <stevesoe@hotmail.com>
To: "planning@amadorgov.org" <planning@amadorgov.org>

Sun, Feb 6, 2022 at 9:49 PM

Oppose "La Mesa Use Permit Amendment UP-19;12-1"

This letter represents the input over 3 Generations to our 1901 Family Owned Shenandoah Road Ranch Property including:

Virginia Upton Age 87 and Lifetime Amador County Resident and previous owner since 1985.

Kimberly & Stephen Beckwith current owners since 2017.

It saddens us all to not only hear but witness the impact that the owners of La Mesa Winery are having on the Long Standing residents, in particular their immediate neighbor - Daniel D'agostini. We were all surprised, even shocked, in just 2020 when approval was given for the La Mesa Tasting Room within such a close proximity to Daniels house. His Home.

As we ourselves prepare to build a new home on our Shenandoah Road property to raise our young family, we began to wonder if similar County decisions to accommodate commercial businesses over family residences would soon affect our plans. Our Grandma Virginia often speaks to us about how the landscape of the Shenandoah Road has changed dramatically, in particular over the last 20 years. Even as we write this letter, construction on the "scaled down" Blood Gulch Commercial project goes ahead with little or no consideration for the neighboring residences. Not neighboring businesses, but neighboring residences.

How long will it be before they request to upscale their project again with more events, longer operational hours, more noise and traffic?

And now within just 2 years of agreeing to the terms in their Tasting Room County Permit approval, La Mesa are requesting to run a significantly increased number of events, with increased guest numbers and to operate until 10pm. Seriously is this a joke?

What is the point in even writing the conditions (6), (7) and (21) into their original permit approval?

We would all like to think that the permits that are written and approved by the County hold merit to their word.

We have visited Daniel's residence on many occasions as customers and friends. The tranquility and serenity of Daniel's gardens as well as his way of life have already been seriously compromised. What was once a uniquely peaceful property is now a distraction of noise from vehicles, people and music.

You only have to visit Daniel during any weekend to understand this. Anyone who knows Daniel would agree.

I can only imagine that not a single member of the County Board who signed the original permit approval live next door to a commercial tasting room. And if they do, I would wager a bet that the tasting room is not right up against their property line or a stones throw from their house!

Additionally, Daniel is of the D'agostini Family, which pioneered the Shenandoah Valley. Do we not owe at the very least a level of respect to these Pioneering families who continue to live here?

We as residents, hope that the County Board strongly considers everything written in our letter to protect the current zoning, the current conditions to which the La Mesa Permit was originally approved and most of all to protect the residents of the area, particularly the immediate neighbors to any commercial establishment. We strongly oppose the La Mesa Amendment to Use Permit UP-19;12-1 in discussion.

Regards,

Virginia Upton, and
Kimberly & Stephen Beckwith.

Sent from my iPhone

La Mesa Vineyards
Côme Laguë, Owner/Winemaker
13200 Shenandoah Road
Plymouth, CA 95669
650-218-5207

Amador Planning Commission
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

February 7, 2022

Re: **Application to Amend Use Permit (UP-19:12-1) for La Mesa Vineyards**

My name is Côme Laguë and I am the owner and winemaker of La Mesa Vineyards. I want to thank the Amador Planning Department for their diligent work over the past 6 months and the Planning Commission for considering an amendment to our Use Permit.

Amador is My Home, I Care About It

I have been a resident here for more than 10 years now. During this time, I have made many improvements to the 25-acre property, including planting new vineyards, building a winery and a beautiful new tasting room, launching our wine business. The past 3 years have been very intense requiring much investment, construction of 4 buildings and navigating a complexity of local, state and federal approvals. As you can imagine the timing of the pandemic has proven to be exceptionally difficult. We face challenging times in the hospitality business and it has proven to be much harder than usual to attract customers to the area, especially with prolonged covid restrictions these past two years.

Inconsistencies/Non-Transparency of Winery Use Permits

When I first presented my use permit application to the Planning Commission back in 2020, I was not offered any details on the permits of the 50 or so other wineries that operate in the county, that information was not available. It was only after I was elected to the Amador Vintner Association (AVA) as a Board member that I became aware of the details of their permits and the Winery Ordinance. These details were first confirmed in discussions with Supervisors Brian Oneto, Pat Crew, Frank Axe, Richard Forster and Planning Director Chuck Beatty and upon my requesting the them subsequently after learning they were available.

At the time I was surprised to discover the broad conditions outlined in the Winery Ordinance applying to A/AG zoned properties and the varied and inconsistent Use Permits issued to other wineries with R1A zoning. Among the 50 wineries I mentioned, 44 are in zones A/AG which are governed by the Winery Ordinance, including the neighbor winery across Shenandoah Road, Belledor, and my immediate neighbor to the east Casino Mine Ranch. Under that Winery Ordinance a winery can operate 7 days a week, host 125-attendee events for 365 days a year, plus another 12 events per year of up to 450 attendees, with outdoor amplified music every night until 10 pm.

Other wineries zoned R1A appear to have no consistent Use Permit conditions. For example, all 7 major wineries I would consider to be like La Mesa Vineyards with Use Permits (**Andis, Borjon, Blood Gulch,**

Holdener, Plein Air, Three Graces and Sera Fina) are each permitted to operate 7 days a week, while we can only operate 4 days a week. They also have generous event permissions, including separately called out AVA events, vintage release events and other events they may organize beyond that, while I am limited to just 6 event days with no more than 100 attendees. Almost all of these wineries and all 45 under the Winery Ordinance may play amplified music outdoors until 10 pm any night, a condition which follows the General Plan and county noise ordinance that applies to everyone in the county. Yet my current Use Permit requires me to turn off all outdoor music at 5pm, which is not in line at all with the ordinance.

Why Events & Flexible Days/Hours Are Vital

After discussing with the Supervisors and Planning Director, and gaining access to the details of the various Use Permits issued to other similar wineries, it became apparent to me just how restrictive the terms are on our own existing Use Permit and how much this harms my fledgling business. Two conditions are particularly harmful: the number of events we can host each year, and the number of days per week we can operate.

Events are vital to the business because in steady state, a typical winery earns 75-80% of revenue from its Wine Club members, who are loyal, repeat customers year after year buying wine. Having events that regularly engage these customers repeatedly, and other new ones to recruit new members – vintage releases, winemaker dinners, behind the cellar door special sessions, member-only events etc – along with a beautiful venue and great wines - typically has the average wine club customer in Amador lasting 5+ years which provided steady repeat income. That greatly helps in growing grapes, using them in planned wine production and a steady reliable business model. In addition, as part of our AVA membership, we are required to host two major events in tandem with other Amador wineries: *Behind the Cellar Door* and *Big Crush*. Together, these two events add up to 6 event days each year, leaving us no ability to host any other events.

Regarding operating days, each of the aforementioned 7 wineries with Use Permits, and all 45 under the Winery Ordinance, are permitted to be open 7 days a week. Not all choose to be open all 7 days; in fact, we surveyed 35 wineries and at the time of research, we found 22 are open 7 days a week, while 13 others are open only on certain days, a choice they have made.

Being able to adjust our opening days and hours is vital because of long weekends and holidays. We should be permitted to open on certain weekdays when people actually visit Amador. For example, my winery participates with several other wineries on a local campaign called *Access Amador*, which seeks to attract guests on a Thursday or Wednesday. This gives them a quieter alternative day to visit tasting rooms, offsetting the peak demand on weekends. Also, prior to Covid, our many senior customers enjoyed visiting us on Mondays, yet now that day has very little traffic. I would prefer not to have to re-apply for a new Use Permit each time we need to open on a different day, just to adapt to the holiday schedule and changing market conditions. I am also unsure why we were treated differently than the other 7 wineries with Use Permits.

Consideration For Neighbor Concerns/Comments During the CEQA Process

I applied to amend our Use Permit 6 months ago. From the very start I received concerns and comments from my immediate neighbor adjacent to the tasting room, Daniel D'Agostini. Mr. D'Agostini and I have had an excellent relationship for the past 10 years and, as I have always done, I took his concerns very

seriously and addressed them in the process of working with the Planning Department for the past 6 months through the CEQA process, we significantly scaled back the permission requests, agreed to substantial mitigating measures, keeping in mind that the Planning Department aims to strike a reasonable balance between quality of life and viability of the business.

I am **not** asking for the same rights as the A/AG wineries covered under the Winery Ordinance, even though one of them is literally across the road from me and the other to my immediate east. In carefully considering the concerns that have been expressed by my neighbor and others, I am requesting a greatly reduced set of permissions to respect their wishes, while still allowing enough traffic and events to operate a successful business.

My Requested Conditions and Why They are Vital

The requests in our Use Permit Amendment are as follows:

- 1) **Flexible Opening Days**: While I don't foresee a need to open 7 days a week, I need the flexibility to open on certain days that are not currently permitted. For example, on a holiday long weekend I would like to be open during both the Friday and Monday of that weekend, as other wineries are. Since my full-time staff are hired to work for 5 days each week, it makes sense to open on days when traffic is expected to be higher, or when we want to participate in special events along with other local wineries. Being allowed to open 7 days a week like the other major wineries with Use Permits (Andis, Borjon, Blood Gulch, Holdener, Plein Air, Three Graces and Sera Fina) will give us the flexibility to set our own days/hours to market conditions.
- 2) **AVA Event Participation**: To be a member of the Amador Vintner Association, my winery must participate in 2 fundraiser events, *Behind the Cellar Door* and *Big Crush*, which provide the core funding for the AVA to operate. These two events span up to 3 days each (Fri-Sun). Almost every Use Permit I have seen includes the wording "Participation in events that coincide with the AVA" and calls out these events separately. My current allocation of only 6 event days per year therefore restricts me to these two 3-day events. So, in effect I am not even able to do my Wine Club vintage release events unless I choose to not be part of the vintner community through the AVA.
- 3) **24 Events Per Year, Up to 125 Attendees**: I am **not** asking for the ability to host 125-person events 365 days a year as is permitted for other neighboring wineries. I am only requesting the ability to have up to 24 events per year (around two events per month) where I could organize a special tasting at our tasting room or host an event at our winery building which is a quarter-mile further up the driveway from the tasting room in the opposite direction from my neighbor. This will allow me to engage with my Wine Club members effectively, recruit new ones, and ensure a sound business develops.
- 4) **12 Events Per Year, Up to 250 Attendees**: I am **not** asking for 450 person mega-events like my neighbor wineries are permitted to do. Rather, I am requesting permission to do up to 12 events per year (around 1 per month) with a higher attendance limit, again at our tasting room or at the winery. I am requesting up to 250 attendees as I anticipate that some of my events may occasionally exceed the 125-person limit.

- 5) **Outdoor Music:** Like many other wineries, we find that live music during afternoon hours provides an enjoyable tasting experience. My family has deep roots in the music industry and we know how hard musicians work to make a living. I like to think we are offering a valuable service to local musicians, giving them an opportunity to perform. Our music program typically runs on Saturdays, 1-4pm, occasionally on Sundays for AVA events or holiday weekends. The musicians we host are typically solo or duo acts, acoustic guitar and such. Our musicians play in front of a large volcanic rock outcropping which reflects sound away from my immediate neighbor, Mr. D'Agostini's property. I've gone to the effort of taking sound measurements when our artists play, and in every case we fell well below the 75 dB limit set in the mitigating measures. Any louder and our guests and staff cannot have conversations, which defeats the purpose. Not all our events involve live music, but if we have a local musician available to play I would very much like to continue to offer that experience to our patrons. Other wineries are able to offer evening music until 10 pm and we are currently restricted to 5pm. As some of our events may run into the evening hours, I have requested to follow the *County Code Section 19.24.045(D)(4b) and 9.24.040(A)(27e)(viii)*, any indoor or outdoor amplified music must be shut off at or before 10:00 pm. It is simply not fair for us to be singled out to operate differently than everyone in the county under the Ordinance.
- 6) **Traffic Safety Concerns and Mitigations** – Please have a look at the included letter from Richard Vela of Public Works, dated 11/8/21. Mr. Vela reviewed the traffic implications of our amended use permit and had no concerns. There is a brand-new commercial encroachment I spent \$30,000 to build so our visitors can safely enter and exit Shenandoah Road. We also have more than a quarter-mile driveway between Shenandoah Road and our tasting room, creating ample buffer space for cars. Helwig, a large winery close to ours with a similar-sized encroachment, are the only winery in Amador permitted to operate no less than 7 major music concert events with up to 750 attendees plus another 50 staff each. Their Use Permit has a mitigating measure to deploy staff at Shenandoah Road as needed to direct traffic and ensure no backups. We volunteered to adhere to the same mitigating measure to deploy staff to direct traffic as needed, despite our much smaller event size.
- 7) **Reporting Measure:** The Planning Department requested an extra condition for us to report annually on our events – date, number of attendees, live music, any traffic issues and any complaints – as a way to start gathering data on wineries and activity. While this is an added burden, I agreed and La Mesa Vineyards will be the first and only winery to do this. My hope is that the data will prove valuable to everyone.

Addressing Neighbor Concerns

My immediate good neighbor Mr. D'Agostini has commented and expressed concerns on my use permit application. Just as I have addressed his specific concerns with the county Planning Department process over the last six months, in the past when he has raised any concern I have done my best to address it promptly. Here are some examples:

- Mr. D'Agostini requested more privacy by establishing some kind of green fencing along the property line. I followed through and planted a 500' oleander hedge on my side, all at my own expense. With my watering and maintenance it is already flowering and growing well. In a few years it should completely obscure the tasting room and reduce sound transmission with a thick wall of greenery and white flowers.

- Mr. D'Agostini complained to me about smoke drift wafting onto his property from visitors who were smoking and vaping. I responded by implementing a no-smoking policy on our entire property and installed signs in the parking lot to remind guests, again all at my own expense.
- Mr. D'Agostini found it unsightly to see dog feces left on our side of the fence on occasions where guests walked their dog and did not clean up afterwards. Although our staff keeps the property immaculately clean, we can't police everything that happens on the spot. So, I put up a dog bag dispensing station and parking lot signs, again all at my own expense.
- When Mr. D'Agostini complained about dust from our parking lot, I added expensive decorative round river rock pea gravel sourced from Lake Amador to topcoat the entire parking lot, minimizing dust from vehicles, and then posted signs to reduce the speed limit to 5 mph on the driveway.
- I kept several large walnut trees that require costly ongoing maintenance, incorporating these into landscaping plans at great expense, to keep this key greenery in his line of sight.
- Mr. D'Agostini mentioned to me that he likes to sleep in his backyard under the stars, so I have arranged for our lights to shut off every night around 6pm, shortly after staff have safely left the property.
- Mr. D'Agostini is unable to access his own backyard because it is jammed with greenhouses, a large shipping container and other items that my guests find very unsightly. He has made no effort to clear or mitigate that, yet I have graciously continued to allow him access to his backyard through our property, with his truckloads of cow manure destined for his organic farming operation.
- Although I did not have to do any of this, I did it out of care and goodwill for my neighbor.

Regarding Other Comments

I have read through the extensive correspondence written about me by my neighbor Mr. D'Agostini and other parties to the Planning Department and Commission over these past months. I note that many of these individuals do not live in the area, or otherwise have certainly never met me, nor do they have any understanding of the facts. I would certainly have appreciated a chance to set the record straight with them before they raised their concerns.

Further, some of these letters contain hurtful statements about my intentions and character. Some of the more extreme comments amount to personal attacks and now are circulating online.

Some of the comments insinuate that La Mesa Vineyards is a hobby business for me. I live full-time in Amador, I enjoy being part of the community which is why I joined the Amador Vintner Association

Board and running this business is a (very) full-time job. I'm out in the fields, working with my own two hands, tending to grapes, making wine, kicking the shovel – daily.

I've built one of the most beautiful tasting rooms and vineyards in all of Amador, if you have not yet visited us I encourage you to do so. My architect, the same one who created Helwig, Iron Hub and Andis, has designed a modern yet unintrusive building to take advantage of views, yet blends into the natural landscape. We incorporated volcanic rock outcroppings, granite boulders from the property, kept old walnut trees that some of Mr. D'Agostini's family planted 75 years ago. We embraced the scenic views with glass walls and I am proud to say we are 100% powered by sustainable solar energy. This is not some tasteless design that was haphazardly assembled. People love visiting our winery, and I encourage you to check out our stellar reviews online.

I grow 11 acres of grapes which is ultimately the crop that funds everything we do in the business. As a small vineyard operator, it's nearly impossible to sell wine without a tasting room. When we are severely limited in the number of events we can host and additionally forced to adhere to inflexible opening days/hours, this greatly impacts our business potential.

The staff at La Mesa Vineyards includes five local residents; four work at the tasting room plus one vineyard manager. I also just issued 25 1099s to contractors who provided services to our winery last year; the vast majority of these contractors are locals. The sales tax we collect on our wines goes directly to Amador. My agritourism business keeps Amador in AG with scenic views. As a result, this beautiful property is not going to become yet another suburban Sacramento housing development.

I urge you to place your confidence in your county planning department staff, who for six months have worked diligently and carefully with their strict and detailed CEQA process, incorporating and addressing the neighbor concerns from the start through mitigation and reduced scope of permissions. They now have no objections to my requests with the mitigating measures I have outlined here.

Moreover, I ask you to recognize me for who I truly am, a person who cares deeply about his neighbors and is proud to call Amador home. I think I have been very reasonable in my requests in light of all the permission and rights granted to neighboring wineries and the needs of my business balanced with quality of life. I need to be able to make a success of my business. **I cannot operate with what amounts to the most restrictive use permit of virtually any winery in Amador County.** There needs to be a balance, like what is stated in the county's Economic Plan:

- *Goal E1: Develop and maintain a favorable business environment in the county.*
- *E-8.3: Provide for and support value-added agricultural activities designed to provide an additional source of farming income while maintaining the land for viable agricultural production.*
- *E-8.4: Promote development of support businesses associated with agri-tourism.*

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Côme Laguë

February 4, 2022

TO: Amador County Planning Commission

These are my concerns with La Mesa Vineyard use permit amendment request

1. Their requested amendments would put them into an event center category not a tasting room / vineyard

Requesting music events, open until 10 pm, and unlimited events would have a very negative impact on this area and negative impact on services throughout the county.

La Mesa Vineyards is located on the far eastern boundary of Amador County. We have very few County services now in this area, including Sherriff access, CHP, Fire Protection and County road maintenance. Shenandoah Road is currently in very poor condition and there are numerous vehicle accidents occurring from River Pines to Plymouth. On Shenandoah Road just 400 feet west of their entrance there have been 6 vehicles leave the road and hit this block wall. (Photo attached). On Shenandoah Road just 100 feet east of their entrance there have been many vehicles hit their fence or the opposite side of the road embankment.

Would La Mesa Vineyards be paying for the cost their request would incur or would the residence of Amador County be paying for the additional services that would be necessary for their requested expansion?

Sincerely

Cathy Landgraf

River Pines CA



RECEIVED

FEB 07 2022

**AMADOR COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**



La mesa vinyard permit

1 message

Kimberley Coburn <kimcoburn50@gmail.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 11:36 AM

Kim Coburn
13010 Steiner Rd, Plymouth, CA 95669

My concern is the location of La mesa which is across from me . I oppose of this permit due to loud music and drinking late at night. It will interfere with quiet time in the valley
It will create more traffic
Bad stretch of road
My dog barks
Accidents happen between Steiner rd to River Pines it's a liability to are properties.
Possible fire hazard.

I strongly oppose of the La mesa permit

Thank you
Kim Coburn
13010 Steiner Rd, Plymouth, CA 95669



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Feb 8 meeting Daniel D'Agostini support

1 message

PAUL MOERING <rrpaul@aol.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 2:14 PM

Please present my letter to the Planning Commission information for Feb. 8th's meeting.

Thank up

Paul Moering
rrpaul@aol.com

 **D Agostini vs. La Mesa request.pdf**
41K

February 7, 2022

Planning Commissioners, Amador County:

As a longtime friend and teaching partner of Daniel D'Agostini I am writing to you to express my concern and displeasure for the proposed expanded use of La Mesa Vineyard and Winery. I whole heartedly support Mr. D'Agostini's efforts to safe guard the serenity of his neighboring home and farm.

When the Amador County Planning Commission initially authorized the purchase of the La Mesa's vineyard and winery complex, they stipulated approval with limited business hours and activities. They did not approve the land's use for an evening, special event venue--and for good reason.

Daniel D'Agostini has his home and his Abbondanza Farm just yards away from the proposed event site. This proposal will add traffic noise, parking, loud music, and lighting, until 10 o'clock at night on a regular basis. It is unacceptable to have to tolerate the cacophony and commotion at Daniel's nearby residence. It should not matter that Daniel D'Agostini and his family have lived in this home for generations. It should not matter that the D'Agostini family winery in Amador County was designated as a California Historical Landmark.

The D'Agostini legacy is well known throughout the county, but common decency and respect for any neighbor—for me or for you—demonstrates the insensitivity of this proposal, adding evening events and entertainment adjacent to a neighbor's home. Would one of you commissioners be standing in front of this planning commission fighting to prevent nighttime events next door to your own home? I think so. If one examines how this impacts a neighbor's home, it is clear why the initial authorization was limited in scope.

This is not a request simply for late night family parties or summer barbecues. This is a request for large, profitable gatherings in an area that is pristine and pastoral. Wisely, the commissioners saw fit not to allow this type of venue at the outset when the land was purchased for the vineyard.

There is no reason for the commission to change that initial decision. Indeed, if the new owners had made this event proposal during the original approval process it would have been clear they intended to do more than just harvest grapes and bottle wine.

La Mesa should not be allowed to try to change its current status based on the argument that La Mesa should have an opportunity to “level the playing field”--leveling the playing field with whom? Does it follow, that “rules” should be changed now just so La Mesa can compete for more profit and business gain, at the expense of neighboring property? What assessments have been done to adequately address concerns and the impacts of the La Mesa Vineyard’s request?

Mr. D’Agostini has every right to protect the tranquility of his home and the historic peacefulness of the Shenandoah Valley. I suspect each one of us would be at this meeting, contesting the winery’s request if we faced the prospect of ongoing, late night events next door to our homes.

Honor the original agreement. Please deny this proposal.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Paul Moering

Davis, CA



Planning Commission Meeting Feb 8, Daniel D'Agostini support

1 message

vmoering <psmoering@gmail.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 2:18 PM

Please present my letter to the Planning Commission information for Feb. 8th's meeting.

Thank you

Vicki Moering
Davis CA

Vicki Moering
vmoering@aol.com

 Daniel D'Agostini support at Planning commissio .docx copy.pdf
29K

Planning Commission Amador County:

Driving in from the flat valley, the landscape starts to change, majestic valley oaks dotting the undulating hills of summer gold or winter green.

We know we are getting close to Plymouth and the iconic beautiful Shenandoah Road, winding through Amador County. As we drive this road we are transported into a “sense of place”, a magical place whose beauty, history, and quiet pastoral atmosphere quickly relaxes and restores all senses.

We have had the good fortune to know Dan D’Agostini and his family for 50 years. Although large commercial wineries have developed up and down Shenandoah, each time we visit, we are struck by this “sense of place”, this sense of history, and the peaceful countryside that still exists on certain “islands” of land, such as Dan D’Agostini’s home property. Dan D’Agostini has managed to preserve and even enhance his family property, respecting the land and utilizing it for educating others by creating a learning center for mindful farming and gardening. Hopefully, educating others with such intellect and knowledge will ensure that this sense of wonder about nature will be passed down to the next generations.

Now, an applicant, La Mesa, has come before the commission asking for a change in what he/she can offer on his/her property, meaning evening events, so that the playing field can be leveled. Leveling the playing field means business endeavors for profitable business gains. It does not level the playing field for Dan D’Agostini. It destroys his field. The original authorization for the purchase of La Mesa should stand, for nothing has changed, except for La Mesa’s over extending desire to expand without regard for a residential neighbor. Commercial endeavors can happen in many places, such as the town of Plymouth, and does not have to destroy the few oases left on Shenandoah Road.

Is the commission to lose its sensibility to this request that is in conflict with and does not respect the essence of Dan D’Agostini’s land and home, his home that will be subjected to commercial events that will bring parking and night noise issues?

Do the right thing and reject this application so that Amador County might have a chance to preserve what initially drew so many people to it—the quiet and stunning beauty of a countryside rich in natural wonder. Commercialization cannot be reversed, as it marches on. And there is much to lose, which will never be recovered.

“We need the tonic of wildness. We can never have enough of nature.”

“Wildness is preservation of the world “ --Henry David Thoreau

I hope you will honor Dan D’Agostini’s home.

Thank you for your time.

Vicki Moering



Use Permit for La Mesa Vineyards (UP-19:12-1)

1 message

Eric Rewitzer <eric@3fishstudios.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 10:37 AM

To: Amador County Planning Commission
RE: Amended Use Permit (UP-19:12-1) for La Mesa Vineyards

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

As a small business owner myself, I value the Amador County Planning Commission's efforts to support the local small business community. However, when that support starts to affect the quality of life within the community I live in and serve, it becomes problematic. This is the reason that I am writing today, to express my concern that amending the use permit for La Mesa Vineyards (UP-19:12-1) will affect not just the quality of life for Daniel D'Agostini, but affects the greater Amador community as well.

Daniel D'Agostini is arguably a local treasure, working directly with all members of the Amador community to discover invaluable connections between art, agriculture, healthy eating and respect for the land. I have seen this first hand with his work with local high school students through the Farms of Amador program, which I have had occasion to participate in and support. When he invites people to his farm, it not just his sanctuary and classroom, it is the theirs, too.

Which brings us to the problem at hand. La Mesa Vineyards could have built a tasting room in several other locations on their property. Through some oversight, it was approved to allow them to build within yards of Mr. D'Agostini's home and farm, which, in my opinion, is affecting not just his quality of life but also how he is able to continue his good work with the greater Amador community.

I ask you to consider Daniel's ongoing service to the community when making your decision to amended the use permit (UP-19:12-1) for La Mesa Vineyards, and vote to no to the extension. He deserves all the peace and quiet possible to do his good work.

Sincerely,

Eric Rewitzer
14881 Shenandoah Road
Plymouth, CA 95669



3 Fish Studios

Eric Rewitzer
Co-owner, Printmaker

3 Fish Studios
Artwork Made with Love in California

eric@3fishstudios.com 3fishstudios.com





Request for an Amended Use Permit (UP-19;12-1) for La Mesa Vineyards

1 message

Aaron Wittman <aaronmwittman@gmail.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Feb 7, 2022 at 10:45 PM

Hello -

I am writing as a resident, taxpayer, property owner, and member of the business community in Amador County to object to the request for an Amended Use Permit for La Mesa Vineyards (UP-19;12-1). My objection is rooted in the belief that should the Amended Use Permit be granted, it would: 1) go directly against the R-1A zoning allowances; 2) significantly deteriorate the character and environment of the Shenandoah Valley; and 3) open the way for future degradation.

Presumably La Mesa was permitted to operate in Shenandoah Valley as a winery, participating in the regional history of agriculture and viticulture. The requested list of expanded uses changes the nature of the La Mesa operation into essentially a events and party venue — a far cry from a winery. Such an allowance would be in direct conflict with the intent and protections of the R-1A zoning ordinances, would substantially change the character of the area, and also introduce a dangerous precedent that would jeopardize the rural character of the entire region. Should Côme Laguë desire to pursue such an entertainment venue, he should know that local cities would likely welcome such development — but it doesn't belong in the rural environs of Shenandoah Valley. As the zoning code already outlines, such operations as those proposed by Côme Laguë and La Mesa should only be allowed in locales better suited for traffic and noise. The character of this area itself is a great resource that should be protected and preserved — once it is gone there is really no getting it back.

Respectfully —

Aaron Wittman
c. (530) 228-2081



TAC Referral- La Mesa Vineyards Use Permit Amendment; UP-19;12-1; environmental review

Randy Livingston <randal_scott@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Feb 8, 2022 at 8:30 AM

To: Amador County Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Cc: Beth Livingston <beth.paulson@sbcglobal.net>, Côme Lagué <come@lague.net>, Daniel D'Agostini <daniel@dagostini.com>

I am submitting my comments on this project as referenced below regarding the expansion of use at La Mesa vineyards. While I'm fine with a modest increase of use for La Mesa/Come, I think the approach used for CEQA may set the County up for substantial legal costs and we need to be careful and review our approach.

I believe that the CEQA analysis for this project needs revision, and as written, it may open our County to unnecessary legal costs. I have discussed my concerns with several CEQA familiar attorneys, who shared my concern.

My concern is that just a few years back the County issued a permit which described the applicable conditions for a modest operation and impact for this project. That set in place the mitigated terms of operation to meet reasonable impacts. Apparently the owner of La Mesa has now realized that some of his neighbors have more "liberal" conditions, and wants to reset his baseline. With increased operation, impacts will increase, and appropriate mitigations need to be put in place. The baseline of when those impacts apply is critical to application of CEQA.

CEQA forbids piecemeal review of the impacts of a project. A project cannot be chopped into many little ones - each with a minimal impact - which cumulatively may have significant impacts. The permit was issued only a few years ago, with appropriate mitigations imposed by the County. Substantially increasing the project at this point - just to be consistent with other permits - could open up the County's review of impacts. What has occurred in this short time to make the County's recent mitigations subject to such substantial change?

The original environmental analysis did not include impacts of future expansion, and this changes the scope of the initial project and its impacts.

I am concerned that current conditions, after mitigation, are not tied to the baseline established by the County, subjecting to County to easy legal challenge.

Let's just be careful on this one. Appropriate wine and agricultural related events are consistent use.

Final minor comment - I think the permit should reference the County noise ordinance rather than referencing a dBA and location. That way the use stays consistent with the ordinance - which should be measured at the nearest receptor, not the furthest property line.

Randy

On Jan 19, 2022, at 12:14 PM, Amador County Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]



La Mesa Vineyards, 13200 Shenandoah Road, Plymouth, CA

1 message

Bill Dillian <pbdillian@aol.com>

Tue, Feb 8, 2022 at 12:17 PM

Reply-To: Bill Dillian <pbdillian@aol.com>

To: "planning@amadorgov.org" <planning@amadorgov.org>

Members of the Planning Commission:

Although I am a proud lifelong Shenandoah Valley resident and passionate about my home, it is not usually in my character to get involved in these matters. This time, though, I feel that I should. Granting the revised Amended Use Permit request would be a slippery slope. The Shenandoah Valley area is home to both residences and a thriving wine industry. One should not burden or overtake the other. Being familiar with the D'Agostini property and the unique situation of its exceptionally close proximity to the wine bar/tasting room, I urge you to put yourselves in Mr. D'Agostini's shoes. Please do the right thing and deny La Mesa Vineyards' revised request for amended use.

Respectfully submitted,

William L. Dillian
Shenandoah Valley

