

CITY OF CALISTOGA

STAFF REPORT

TO: CHAIRMAN MANFREDI AND PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

FROM: ERIK V. LUNDQUIST, SENIOR PLANNER

MEETING DATE: JULY 13, 2011

SUBJECT: BRIAN ARDEN WINERY – REVISED CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW (CDR 2011-01), 331 SILVERADO TRAIL (APN 011-050-030)

1
2 **ISSUE:**
3

4 Review of revised conceptual development plans for development of the Brian Arden
5 Winery located at 331 Silverado Trail (APN 011-050-030) within the “PD”, Planned
6 Development Zoning District. The proposed structures and site improvements planned
7 on the 2.25 acre site have been modified based upon feedback received during the
8 Planning Commission meeting of June 22, 2011.
9

10 **PURPOSE OF REVIEW AND BACKGROUND:**
11

12 The Calistoga Municipal Code (CMC) encourages Conceptual Design Review for any
13 project that would benefit from early consultation with the Planning Commission. Project
14 recommendations provided by the Planning Commission in this process are intended to
15 serve as guidance only and shall not be considered an approval of an application.
16

17 The Applicant’s, Burt and Brian Harlan originally approached the City in May of 2010
18 with a request for Conceptual Design Review for their proposed winery project. The
19 Planning Commission initially reviewed the project during a public meeting of June 22,
20 2011. *(A complete project description of that concept plan can be found in the June 22,*
21 *2011 Staff Report, Attachment 4).*
22

23 Over the last few weeks, the Harlan’s have been working with their consultants and
24 meeting with staff in an effort to understand and respond to the comments received
25 from the Planning Commission and public. On June 23, 2011, the Planning and Building
26 Department received an email from the Harlan’s indicating that they would like to
27 schedule another Conceptual Design Review with the Planning Commission for July 13,
28 2011. On July 5, 2011 the Planning and Building Department received revised concept
29 plans and written narrative addressing the comments received during the June 22, 2011
30 review through a significant redesign of the project. As a result of this request, Staff
31 suggests that the Planning Commission consider the historic record of June 22, 2011,
32 discuss the concept plan modifications, receive public comment and provide feedback

33 to the Applicant and staff regarding Commission review of the concept plans as revised
34 giving particular attention to agricultural predominance, massing, scale, height and
35 compatibility of land uses.
36

37 **SUMMARY OF INITIAL CONCEPT REVIEW COMMENTS:**
38

39 A. Recapitulation of Initial Planning Commission Comments:
40

41 The Planning Commission was split regarding whether the winery use was permissible
42 in the Maxfield/Adams Beverage Company Properties Planned Development Overlay
43 designation. Commissioner Coates and Moye were of the opinion that the language
44 contained on Page LU-31 of the General Plan, "*Development of these parcels shall be*
45 *varied and shall not include a single land use or predominant use such as visitor*
46 *accommodations or wineries on each lot*", precludes development of a winery on this
47 property since a winery already exists on the adjacent parcel. As such, Commissioner
48 Coates and Moye were reluctant to provide additional design critique.
49

50 Chairman Manfredi and Commissioner Kite agreed with Staff's interpretation expressing
51 that the General Plan policy language was intended to ensure an appropriate mix of
52 land uses was developed on the Maxfield/Adams Beverage Properties rather than a
53 prohibition of similar uses. Based upon this opinion, Chairman Manfredi and
54 Commissioner Kite further considered and offered their feedback on the proposed site
55 plan, architectural design and land uses.
56

57 Chairman Manfredi and Commissioner Kite felt that the design was innovative,
58 interesting and attractive. However, Chairman Manfredi and Commissioner Kite did
59 express that the overall project was too intense for the property and the proposed
60 special events were potentially to impacting. They expressed that the project should be
61 scaled back to reduce intensity allowing more land area to plant the property more
62 predominantly with vineyards. They further suggested relocating the structures outside
63 of the neighboring property's conical view shed and screening the parking away from
64 Silverado Trail.
65

66 The June 22, 2011 Planning Commission Staff Report (without attachments) is attached
67 to this Report.
68

69 B. Recapitulation of Initial Public Comments:
70

71 During the June 22, 2011 Planning Commission meeting both written and oral public
72 comments were received. Written and oral comments are available online on the City's
73 website. In addition, all written comments that were received after June 23, 2011 are
74 attached for the Commission's review.
75

76 General Plan consistency issues continue to be a concern to those citizens opposed to
77 the project. Specifically, those expressing opposition believe that this winery project

78 does not achieve the policy direction of the Maxfield/Adams Beverage Planned
79 Development and Entry Overlay General Plan land use designations and therefore
80 should not even be discussed. Additionally, many of the other public comments such as
81 traffic, hydrological and groundwater impacts raised during the initial conceptual review
82 will ultimately be addressed in a formal environmental analysis prepared for this project.
83

84 **REVISED CONCEPT PLAN DISCUSSION:**
85

86 As mentioned at the forefront of this report, the Harlan's have been busy working with
87 their architect to redefine the project in an effort to capture and address the issues
88 raised during the June 22, 2011 Planning Commission meeting. As a result, the
89 Harlan's primary attention and focus has been on addressing the perceived scale and
90 intensity of proposed structures and uses.
91

92 On July 5, 2011 the Harlan's Architect, Carlo Difede transmitted revised conceptual
93 plans including a site plan and elevations that bring forth a reduction in the project's
94 massing, reorientation of the structures and parking and planting vineyard. In summary,
95 the revised concept plans include:
96

- 97 • Overall reduction of building square footages and heights; and
 - 98 • Removal of Hospitality Center; and
 - 99 • Removal of Wine Cave Entry Feature; and
 - 100 • Removal of Tower/limousine lounge; and
 - 101 • Reduction of lot coverage; and
 - 102 • Reorientation of Winery Building and Winery Operations Building; and
 - 103 • Increased landscaping and open space.
- 104

105 The overall square footage has been reduced from 15,503 square feet to 7,180 square
106 feet primarily as a result of removing the 3,500 square foot Hospitality Center, 6,000
107 square foot barrel storage room and 600 square foot cottage. The total lot coverage
108 has been reduced from 11.4% to 7.3%. For a comprehensive list of revisions, please
109 see the revised concept plans received July 5, 2011 by the Planning and Building
110 Department and the revised project description dated July 13, 2011, Attachments 2 & 3.
111

112 Staff finds that the site design and architecture revisions address the Commission's
113 direction to reduce the scale of the project and respect and enhance the gateway to the
114 city. The site plan strategically places the parking amongst vineyard screening it from
115 view. The proposed intensity of the structures and the uses, together with the circulation
116 pattern, are suitable for property and are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
117 The agricultural use (i.e. vineyards) is now the predominant use on the property.
118

119 **RECOMMENDATION:**
120

121 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider the historic record of June
122 22, 2011, discuss the concept plan modifications, receive public comment and provide

123 feedback to the Applicant and staff regarding Commission review of the revised concept
124 plans giving particular attention to agricultural predominance, massing, scale, height
125 and compatibility of land uses.

126
127 It should be noted that the Planning Commission comments received during conceptual
128 design review are advisory only and should not be considered by the Applicant to be
129 requirements or an endorsement of the project until a complete application is
130 considered through the formal review process.

131

132 **ATTACHMENTS:**

133

- 134 1. Vicinity Map
- 135 2. Revised Project Description dated July 13, 2011
- 136 3. Revised Project Plans received July 5, 2011 (Site Plan & Elevations)
- 137 4. Planning Commission Staff Report dated June 22, 2011 (without attachments)
- 138 5. Letter dated July 5, 2011 from David Goodrich
- 139 6. Email dated July 5, 2011 from Mitch and Tracey Hawkins
- 140 7. Email dated July 6, 2011 from Dave Dexter
- 141 8. Letter from Joe Briggs dated July 7, 2011

142

143 **OTHER REFERENCES:**

144

145 The June 22, 2011 Planning Commission meeting video is available online at
146 <http://vimeo.com/25795387>

147