

**CITY OF CALISTOGA  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT**

**Wednesday, September 26, 2007  
5:30 p.m.**

1

2 **A. ROLL CALL**

3

4 **Present:** Chairman Manfredi, Vice-Chairman Clayton Creager, Commissioners  
5 Paul Coates and Nick Kite. **Absent:** Commissioner Donna Dill. **Staff: Present**  
6 Charlene Gallina, Planning Director, Erik Lundquist, Associate Planner, Assistant  
7 City Attorney Benjamin Winig, and Kathleen Guill, Planning Commission  
8 Secretary.

9

10 **G. GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

11

12 **3. CDR 2007-05.** Conceptual Review of a 12-unit multi-family apartment project  
13 on the property located at 611 Washington Street (APN 011-260-027) within the  
14 "R3", Residential Professional Office Zoning District. The project will be reviewed  
15 and discussed in light of the Urban Design Plan discussions that have occurred  
16 relative to the land uses most appropriate in the Lower Washington Character  
17 Area.

18

19 **Paul Sannella**, representative of Rossi Development provided an overview of the  
20 proposed project suggesting desirability because it fits nice and would improve the  
21 area and provide affordable housing. He provided a summary of the design and  
22 site plan noting the apartments would consist of two bedroom/two bath facilities to  
23 accommodate new families, with a front exterior of wood and rear of stucco. Mr.  
24 Sannella referenced previous submittal of plans noting they were formerly  
25 approved, but noted he understood there are some design developments in  
26 progress.

27

28 **Associate Planner Lundquist** provided background reporting an original  
29 application in 2000; a Growth Management award in 2005, the Conditional Use  
30 Permit and Design Review approval in July 2005, and Building Permit processing  
31 completed in September 2006. He reported due to various concerns the applicant  
32 decided not to pull approved building permits and all previous permits have now  
33 expired. Associate Planner Lundquist referenced the Urban Design Plan (UDP)  
34 noting it is an implementation measure to the general plan to enhance the  
35 community vitality. Within the UDP the project area is called out to be a lively area  
36 and have a mix of zoning uses. The UDP shall be coming forward to the City  
37 Council and these policies shall be discussed. He questioned is there a need to

38 redesign and/or a need to alter the site layout and site design of this project and/or  
39 does it meet the existing standards.

40

41 **Chairman Manfredi** opened discussion to public comments at 6:30 PM.

42

43 **Richard Chicorelli**, 3460 Calistoga Road stated it appeared the general design  
44 desire was to create larger units. He further noted it appeared there was stucco in  
45 the front elevation as well as the rear.

46

47 **Paul Sannella** responded reporting there was some stucco on the front elevations  
48 on the towers. Further noting the unit size and lot size were felt appropriate.

49

50 **George Caloyannidis** stated even though the project is relatively small the  
51 implications that flow out of it are huge when related to the Urban Design Plan. He  
52 reported over and over the public input has been we don't want to loose the  
53 downtown to the chic, so the committee/planning consultants have identified that  
54 some businesses in the area like Su Yuan may not be able to survive on Lincoln  
55 Avenue, therefore they would like to see a planning instrument put in place to give  
56 opportunity for such business to survive and provide resident serving business in a  
57 mono-cultural use location such as lower Washington, making it more interesting  
58 and attracting more people. Therefore long term success lies in having multi use  
59 and requiring such on each individual property as developed. He suggested the  
60 Planning Commission request different uses, i.e. housing and something else on  
61 same property with interesting architecture to create this unique district. In  
62 conclusion he noted one use for one lot is a missed opportunity.

63

64 **Chairman Manfredi** closed the public discussion at 6:37 PM.

65

66 **Commissioner Kite** suggested options to frame the discussion identifying 1) is  
67 this potentially an appropriate development; and 2) providing the desired  
68 appropriate development guidance for the applicant.

69

70 **Chairman Manfredi** questioned how the Commissioners feel about this project  
71 and how the project relates to the UDP.

72

73 **Vice-Chairman Creager** noted as a representative on Urban Design Plan  
74 Committee he feels the Urban Design Plan is important and emerging. It would  
75 have been a mute issue when the original plan was approved if it had been built  
76 back then. However with current redevelopment the Farris property has complied  
77 and there is an emerging pattern that should continue. Consistent guidelines  
78 should apply to all future development. The Urban Design Plan has been a public  
79 process and other applicants have done a lot to be consistent. Vice-Chairman  
80 Creager concluded he thinks this is fair and equitable and we should apply the  
81 lessons being established by Urban Design Plan.

82

83 **Commissioner Kite** stated he wanted to reinforce the comments by Vice-  
84 Chairman Creager, agreeing we have had public input and should encourage  
85 developments to be consistent with the Urban Design Plan, plus it is not obvious  
86 this project is moving forward.

87

88 **Commissioner Coates** stated he was not here when the applicant went through a  
89 lot of effort the first round of approvals and he was curious why the applicant did  
90 not follow through. With that said, he agreed with the other Commissioners.

91

92 **Chairman Manfredi** stated he was surprised the applicant would come back with  
93 the same project. He reported this is a wonderful opportunity for the Rossi  
94 Development Team to come up with an interesting and creative multi use project  
95 and maybe use the river as an asset. He suggested a project with live work units,  
96 retail at the ground floor level and housing on the second story.

97

98 **Vice-Chairman Creager** suggested drawing on the talents of Urban Design Plan  
99 group, reporting successful collaboration between the Urban Design Plan team and  
100 another applicant, noting it is not required but it has been an effective tool to  
101 consult on possible modifications.

102

103 **George Caloyannidis** stated he was sure committee members would be willing to  
104 discuss the project.

105

106 **Director Gallina** reminded we are soon adopting an ordinance to create a Design  
107 Advisory Panel and we can always invite members of the Over Site Committee to  
108 attend if needed. At this time the issue the Rossi Development team will have to  
109 address is if they want to pursue a multi-use project. Due to the direction provided  
110 tonight the applicant will have to come up with a strategy for Growth Management  
111 for a mixed project. Note all Growth Management Applications are due no later  
112 than Friday, September 28, 2007.

113

114 **Chairman Manfredi** provided comment stating he would like to see parking in the  
115 rear and the applicant could possibly build the project closer to the street. As far  
116 as recommendations for types of commercial he would not dictate such, but would  
117 like to see a commercial retail/ live work situation.

118 **Commissioner Kite** stated he would like to see development of something with life  
119 in the day and life in the evening. The current residential proposal has only life in  
120 evening. The kind of development he would like to see would have some form of  
121 commercial activity in the day time.

122

123 **Commissioner Coates** noted the project could include light industrial and/or  
124 commercial with a multi use. This actually gives the applicant more flexibility. He  
125 urged the developer be more adventurous and bring it forward quickly.

126

127 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated he would not be opposed to commercial space  
128 facing the river, noting someday a path will be placed along the side of the river  
129 there. If a business faced the river it could be part of the attraction and he would  
130 be in favor of that.

131