

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES EXCERPT  
APRI 09, 2006**

1 **A. ROLL CALL**

2 **Present:** Chairman Jeff Manfredi, Vice-Chairman Clayton Creager, Commissioners  
3 Carol Bush, Paul Coates, and Nicholas Kite. **Staff Present:** Charlene Gallina, Planning  
4 and Building Director, Kenneth MacNab, Senior Planner, Dan Takasugi, Director of  
5 Public Works, Bill McBride, Maintenance Superintendent, and Kathleen Guill, Planning  
6 Commission Secretary. **Absent:** Erik Lundquist, Associate Planner.

7  
8  
9 **H. PUBLIC HEARING**

10 2. **ZO 2008-02.** Consideration of a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, initiated by  
11 the City of Calistoga, Chapter 17.38 General Provisions and Exceptions of the Calistoga  
12 Municipal Code, in order to allow limited increases in lot coverage within residential  
13 zoning districts. This proposed action is exempt from the California Environmental  
14 Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. (This item was  
15 continued from the Planning Commission Regular meeting of February 13, 2008.)

16  
17 **Commissioner Coates** stated this is one of the best Staff reports provided in a long  
18 time.

19  
20 **Planner MacNab** summarized advising the base lot coverage in the zones are generally  
21 adequate, but direction suggested flexibility was needed on applying the standard to  
22 secondary or ancillary structures. Staff suggested three alternatives rather than changing  
23 the zoning ordinance to accessory structures, i.e. a regulatory approach; a range of  
24 percentage of increase; or a limited increase with a credit provision. Staff provided an  
25 overview of regulatory alternatives as follows:

- 26 • Allow an increase for shade structures only;
  - 27 • Second allow an increase for all accessory structures, no performance criteria; or
  - 28 • Allow an increase for any accessory building or structure with performance criteria.
- 29 He stated this is the most discretionary of all three alternatives, but does provide  
30 guidance.

31  
32 **Commissioner Coates** liked option three, which provides staff flexibility to allow an  
33 increase for any accessory building or structure within guidance criteria.

34  
35 **Commissioner Bush** agreed stating alternative three was the most appealing, and  
36 allowed the means for aesthetically integrated structures.

37  
38 **Commissioner Kite** stated option three was the way to go, so if a project is ugly,  
39 obtrusive and out of character in the neighborhood an applicant has a problem, but it  
40 gives staff reasonable latitude.

41  
42 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated he liked alternative three if we can include some  
43 provision for neighborhood review to be imposed.

44  
45 **Chairman Manfredi** concluded stating he also had no problem with alternative three.

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES EXCERPT  
APRI 09, 2006**

46

47 **Planner MacNab** posed the question as to what percentage of increase would be  
48 appropriate and recommended some zoning districts be excluded. He provided an  
49 overview of the zoning districts concluding the two districts to have the most impact or  
50 benefit would be the R1 and R3 area's. Visual comparisons of square footage were  
51 provided.

52

53 **Commissioner Kite** asked how frequently we approach the allowed coverage, R1 and  
54 R3 where we are focusing .

55

56 **Chairman Manfredi** reported in preparation of the General Plan we came to agreement  
57 to preserve space on R1 lots

58

59 **Planner MacNab** stated the 40 percent coverage is an anomaly.

60

61 **Commissioner Kite** questioned if R3 already has 40%, couldn't R1 be 40% also.

62

63 **Commissioner Coates** reminded R3 is also multi family.

64

65 **Vice-Chairman Creager** noted the percentage was created to preserve character, in  
66 rural you see accessory structures and a wider variability of lot size, and that is where a  
67 flat percentage does not work. He could see a sliding range.

68

69 **Planner MacNab** noted with base standards the impact is in the middle categories,

70

71 **Vice-Chairman Creager** noted that is also where there is more impact on neighbors.

72

73 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested it was wise to focus on R1 and R3 only.

74

75 **Commissioner Coates** concurred.

76

77 **Planner MacNab** continued his presentation exploring square-footage "credit" including  
78 eaves less than two feet not counted in coverage, and new structures with pervious  
79 ground surface or that discharge roof-collected stormwater. He advised consideration for  
80 capping the amount of credited area, with a base allowance.

81

82 Additional credit provisions could be provided to benefit and not penalize an owner by  
83 counting an area that would not otherwise be counted. However the negative would be  
84 this requires additional documentation and staff time and could be cumbersome.

85

86 **Planner MacNab** stated the alternative could be to establish a base percentage  
87 increase, and a second level of increase, subject to notification of surrounding property  
88 owners and possible review by the Planning Commission.

89

90 **Director Gallina** noted anything over the second tier would trigger a variance application.

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES EXCERPT  
APRI 09, 2006**

91

92 **Paul Knoblich**, 1019 Cedar Street, stated he didn't hear the discussion regarding  
93 "integrated" and asked if it meant attached or aesthetically integrated.

94

95 **Ken MacNab** noted the intent was aesthetically integrated.

96

97 **Paul Knoblich** provided review of a presentation (attachment 1), and asked if there were  
98 a building with 28% coverage, could staff administratively approve an additional structure  
99 with 7% more lot coverage.

100

101 **Planner MacNab** stated it would be dependent if the Commission adopts a flat  
102 percentage increase and if notification of neighbors is required then it could only be  
103 administrative with neighbor consensus.

104

105 **Commissioner Kite** asked if existing non-conformance was typical of properties.

106

107 **Planner MacNab** stated he did not have data on structures, only lot size, however Staff  
108 does see lots with coverage maxed out.

109

110 **Commissioner Kite** stated he was inclined to consider the tier two proposal.

111

112 **Commissioner Coates** he was agreeable with consideration if a property is at 28%  
113 coverage and wants flexibility to 35%, but to tier anything over the 35% should be  
114 reviewed by the Planning Commission.

115

116 **Chairman Manfredi** stated the consensus is we don't want anything in R1 over 35% in  
117 the first tier. Process anything over that as a use permit as a variance.

118

119 **Commissioner Kite** clarified the primary plus ancillary structure would be allowable up to  
120 35%.

121

122 **Vice-Chairman Creager** further clarified the eaves credit was no longer a consideration  
123 with the tier proposal.

124

125 **Planner MacNab** stated we may not have the regulatory ability with a flat percentage.

126

127 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated he was not crazy about the tier two, unless criteria could  
128 be included, requiring provisions an applicant must infiltrate runoff into the yard rather  
129 than dispersing the runoff off property.

130

131 **Commissioner Coates** suggested for provisions over the 5% the entire property should  
132 be designed to be filtered through the ground in entirety.

133

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES EXCERPT  
APRI 09, 2006**

134 **Vice-Chairman Creager** was agreeable with two tiers as long as there would be tools for  
135 review and provisions for Staff to grant additional lot coverage or an option to forward any  
136 tier level to the Planning Commission if needed.

137

138 **Director Gallina** advised Staff would research the current practice and if provisions were  
139 not in place Staff will integrate environmental sensitive language into the new test  
140 amendment.

141

142 **Planner MacNab** asked if notification of neighbors would be required.

143

144 **Director Gallina** suggested Staff send out a notice and with no objections Staff could  
145 administratively approve.

146

147 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated he would be comfortable with a 5% increase with staff  
148 approval. Anything staff is disagreeable with or in excess of the 5% should be elevated  
149 to the Planning Commission.

150

151 **Commissioner Kite** stated the key is he did not want to close the door to good creative  
152 suggestions.

153

154 **Planner MacNab** recap:

155 • Allow percentage increase for all accessory structures if integrated and if they do  
156 not impact the neighborhood.

157 • Consideration for an increase is authorized up to 5%, or elevate anything in  
158 excess of the 5%

159 • Possibly require storm water management that staff will explore

160 • This flexibility applies only on properties within R1 zoning.

161

162 There was brief discussion on the level of percentage increase ranging from 3%/5%  
163 upper, 5%/5% upper to 7% upper.

164

165 Chairman Manfredi reminded these things would have to fit into the setbacks. The  
166 Commissioners concurred with up to 5 percent administratively and 2% on the second  
167 tier.

168

169 There was motion by **Chairman Manfredi**, seconded by **Commissioner Coates** to  
170 continue this item to the regular meeting of April 23, 2008 for final review. **Motion**  
171 **carried: 5-0-0-0.**

172

173

174

175 Kathleen Guill

176 Secretary to the Planning Commission

177

178 Attachment 1 (Knoblich presentation)