

MINUTES

CITY COUNCIL – SPECIAL MEETING

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2012 - 6:30 P.M.

CALISTOGA COMMUNITY CENTER

A) CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Gingles called the Regular Session to order at 6:36 p.m.

In attendance were the following: Councilmember Chris Canning, Councilmember Gary Kraus, Councilmember Karen Slusser, Vice Mayor Michael Dunsford, and Mayor Jack Gingles.

Also present was City Manager Richard Spitler, Planning & Building Manager MacNab, Senior Planner Erik Lundquist, Public Works Director/City Engineer Dan Takasugi, Administrative Services Director Gloria Leon and Deputy City Clerk Amanda Davis.

B) SALUTE TO THE FLAG

C) ORAL COMMUNICATION ON CONSENT ITEMS OR NON-AGENDA ITEMS (6:37 p.m.)

George Caloyannidis, 2202 Diamond Mountain Road, spoke regarding the threat of growth and development and its impact on Calistoga's citizenry and said he had a petition signed by 300 individuals to Save Our Small Calistoga. He voiced concern regarding development causing significant tree removal, the town's fiscal problems, inactive goals of the Economic Vitality Report, struggling of businesses, and he asked for a common vision and action plan.

Clarence Luvisi, 285 Rosedale Road, said he worked on the Citizen Advisory Committee and thinks the most important issue is how the Council arrives at its decisions. There is frustration, fear of loss and failure, and stated the "us versus them" has begun. He knows the City's leaders care about the community and asked that the Council be careful in what they say, to listen actively, discuss issues, and to respect everyone.

Kurt Becker, 1715 Michael Way, thinks City officials and the school district are allowing development by increasing water rates and stating that the City is broke. He asked the Council to fix its deficit, curb spending, and he read a Letter to the Editor of March 8, 2010 regarding outside consultant fees and excessive pool project costs.

Michael Ryge, 2207 Diamond Mountain Road, said many people have differing opinions about developments. Intelligent growth is vital, but it is easy to say the City needs revenues, but the revenue cannot come at any cost. The notion of Enchanted Resorts and removal of over 8,000 trees is completely inappropriate, and he felt development of Silver Rose would not help businesses.. He thinks the General Plan is good. He is not a no-growther and asked that the project not be hurried.

Cara O'Neill, 1296 Diamond Mountain Road, said the Council has been tenacious in its protection of the community. She voiced opposition to the size of the Silver Rose and Enchanted Hills projects and likened the decisions as desperate. She encouraged the Council to listen to speakers who are concerned and dedicated to their community.

Norma Tofanelli, 1001 Dunaweal Lane, said she is moved by the comments tonight and felt residents want sustainable growth and that which is outlined in the General Plan. The large resorts are from developers far away and she suggested hearing what locals want for local business. She described her sadness in what happened with the Barberos family who wanted to build a house for their son on the vineyard and the town could not do this without requiring them to do a major subdivision.

Kerry Eddy, 3870 Highway 128, President of the CAPP, provided an update on the City's very successful pool season, and spoke of sponsored free swim lessons, scholarship awards, and reminded everybody of Saturday's Classic Car show, the Volunteer Fire Dept. Chili Cook-Off, and the official opening of the pool season.

David Moon-Wainwright, 1012 Pine Street, encouraged everyone to pull together, be transparent, work with civility and respect, have clear motivations, be upfront and honest, and hoped all conversation will be in that general direction.

D) ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

It was **MOVED** by Councilmember Kraus and **SECONDED** by Vice Mayor **Dunsford** to approve the Council Meeting Agenda. The Motion was carried unanimously.

E) PUBLIC HEARING (7:07 p.m.)

1) Consideration of a Zoning Text Amendment (ZO 2011-03), Preliminary and Final Development Plan (PD 2011-02), Conditional Use Permit (U 2011-14) and Design Review (DR 2011-12), Tentative Subdivision Map (TTM2011-01), and Development Agreement (DA2011-03) requested by Silver Rose Venture LLC, to demolish the existing resort and construct a new resort consisting of an 85-room hotel, restaurant, spa, expanded

winery and 21 single-family homes on a 22.5 acre site located at 400 Silverado Trail (APNs 011-050-035, 036, 037, 039 and 040) within the "PD", Planned Development District.

Planning & Building Manager MacNab stated the developer requested expedited processing and offered to fund a contract planning position chosen by the City. Joel Galbraith of Joel Galbraith and Associates was hired who was formerly a planner with the City of Santa Rosa.

Joe Galbraith, Galbraith and Associates, said the project was reviewed by the Planning Commission on March 28 and April 18, 2012. At the March hearing, the Planning Commission identified 21 topics requiring further information. The hearing was continued to April 18, 2012 and at this meeting these topics were addressed, some of which include things like short-term rentals, parking on Rosedale, building heights, general plan consistency, and others. The Commission agreed the project was consistent with the GP with the modification to delete all 7 single family homes that access from Silverado Trail, and that 5 hotel villa buildings be relocated away from the road. They believed this would reduce the intensity of the project and lessen visual impacts. The Commission also agreed that the deli should only be open to guests and residents to the resort. Some Commissioners felt short-term rentals were consistent for the 21 single family homes and recommended their use, with one Commissioner voting in opposition, who believed they were already an existing problem.

He stated the Commission adopted 5 resolutions which are before the Council as modified. The applicant requests the Council approve the project as originally proposed, with a change to lot 39 from a two story to a one-story residence. The applicant also submitted a revised landscape plan which increases the number and size of trees and applicant is present to discuss these proposed changes.

Councilmember Slusser requested Planning & Building Manager MacNab address planning issues she reviewed with him earlier in the day and how decisions were made on General Plan consistency. Mr. MacNab said one of the 21 items was whether the project conforms to the General Plan. The site is designated Rural Residential and is located in an entry corridor close to the edge of town. It also has visitor accommodation overlay which calls for this type of development and the Council adopted the Urban Design Plan Character Area Resort Character Overlay. The April 18th Planning Commission report discussed how the project meets the overlay criteria, but there are some with the opinion that the project does not go far enough in meeting the overlay criteria. Staff noted that there are a lot of competing policy interests and believes that the applicant has done an admirable job in addressing the criteria.

Kelly Foster, Silver Rose Ventures, introduced Project Manager Geoff Herbert, Kara Hill with Hill Glazier Architects, Inc. and Tom Morse with BKF Engineers. He gave a PowerPoint presentation and displayed a site plan showing changes made as a result of requests by the Planning Commission and staff. He said removal of 7 homes from the project is economically infeasible for them and cited financing difficulty. These residences represent 21% of the total square footage of the resort and can be sold early on to pay for the construction and pay down debt. Similarly, the loss of the hotel villas would also preclude their ability to get the project financed. He presented FAR issues and comparable downtown and community commercial FARs, stating the project's FAR is far below this.

In response to **Councilmember Slusser**, Mr. Foster briefly described the meaning of and how Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is measured, as well as the below grade parking locations.

Mr. Foster and the applicant team then reviewed a number of project issues raised during public discussion, including the overall appearance and aesthetic impact of the project as viewed from Silverado Trail, building heights and project landscaping.

Councilmember Slusser asked to show a depiction of the project without the trees, and Mr. Foster displayed a previous rendering of the hotel buildings from the core of the project which showed the roof pitch, stone work and architecture.

There were no questions of staff or the applicant.

Mayor Gingles opened the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Don Luvisi, 36 Magnolia, voiced concern with drainage infrastructure involving City and County drainage areas and the Luvisi ditch. He presented an overview of drainage conditions in the area. Mr. Luvisi showed photos from the 2005 flood that generated runoff from heavy rains into vineyards, buildings, roads, and homes. He asked that an evaluation be developed for infrastructure improvements to address these issues.

Clarence Luvisi, 285 Rosedale Road, echoed comments of his brother, Don, said they have raised this issue for over 20 years with small fixes, but there is total saturation before the ditches even run. There have also been times when roads have actually been covered with water.

Don Williams, 59 View Road, voiced concern over the size of the development, stating that the vision of the General Plan said Calistoga requires it to remain rural with low density zoning and commercial activity in the downtown. He asked to acknowledge the public's sensitivity, respect what residents are saying, and modify the proposal to something the people want. Objections are valid and unanswered; the proposal does not promote walkability, parking is not addressed, housing is not for additional workers

which do not minimize additional traffic, and he asked that the project be sent back to the Planning Commission.

Ken Flynn, 2025 Pickett Road, spoke of his concern on the scope of the project, thinks it should undergo an EIR process, and believes story poles are necessary.

RECESS

Mayor Gingles called for a 5-minute recess at 8:02 p.m. and reconvened the special meeting at 8:09 p.m.

Mayor Gingles allowed speakers to cede their time to George Karaondidas.

George Caloyannidis, 2202 Diamond Mountain Road, said he has no doubt that buildings were depicted correctly; however, the trees are shown to be 30 feet high which will require the developer to pay for trees in 6 foot boxes. He noted Elms are also deciduous and thinks the developer will go bankrupt from these costs. The project should maintain minimal visibility from the highway and trees would not be able to hide 30 foot structures. He cited density and feathering verbiage from the General Plan and disagreed that these comply with the General Plan or Urban Design Plan. The body of language in the law indicates that the development should not exceed one story in height, and when deducting the underground garage area of 3500 square feet, the FAR is .24 for Silver Rose which triples that of Solage, which is .08. Calistoga's developments must abide by the General Plan, and when buildings are four times as dense as Solage, but an alternate project may not measure up to the developer's high profit margin. He asked for story poles on the site and felt that no operator could manage such a large hotel and commercial operation nearby vineyard owners and residents, and asked that the project be returned to the Commission.

Michael Ryge, 2207 Diamond Mountain Road, said he concurs with the previous speaker's comments. The project is out of proportion in terms of size and intensity and he asked that it go back to the Commission, include story poles and more evaluation.

David Moon-Wainwright, 1210 Pine Street, discussed the removal of trees and how this will change the viewshed in a positive way. He thinks the front 7 houses along Silverado Trail need to be moved back to the rear of the property and questioned who would want to live along the Trail when there are private areas in the background. This allows the view of the front to be vineyard. Regarding sound, he is pleased to see 60 decibels at the property line; however, he questioned if it is A B, or C weighted, or whether it is RMS or peak which must be determined. He is also deeply concerned with the issue of set aside money for affordable housing, asked for clarity on private homes, guest homes, and the hotel resort and asked whether the project is a timeshare. He

also questioned if the CC&R's would be controlled by the resort or someone else.

Mr. Foster confirmed that there is no timeshare component to the project. The project has hotel rooms that are rented on a nightly basis and the residences are wholly owned and not fractional. They are proposing that the owners can put in the rental pool as managed by the hotel operator.

Dawnine Dyer, 1501 Diamond Mountain Road, asked for clarification on ownership and management, and asked and confirmed with Mr. Foster that the entity applying for the project is going to build all three elements.

Ms. Dyer said she hears there may be different hotel chains and asked if this is a single project, winery and hotel which she feels is critical for the City to know. She asked if there will be CC&R's for 21 lots only or whether they would be sold as finished homes. Regarding the size of the winery, it is currently a 5,000 case winery, but a 10,000 case winery is not unreasonable size; however, it takes more room than currently is on the property. She thinks there are people who would find it unusual as to what types of grapes will be considered or not, and she questioned whether the project would be successful.

Bill Dyer, 1501 Diamond Mountain Road, said the zoning ordinance has language that says a winery is an allowable use but subordinate to agricultural use to the land, and 6 acres or 30 tons would be slightly fewer than 2,000 cases. They have permits for 5,000 cases and he questioned why they would double to 10,000 cases.

Richard Svendsen, 1309 Diamond Mountain Road, asked whether the project is what the people of Calistoga desire or want, as entry corridors coming into Calistoga will be amassed with large resorts. He views taking away 7 homes as a threat and this should not be at issue, and the question of allowing a deli for guests only cannot be managed realistically. He and his wife left Danville to live in the ambience there is today. This and other mega-developments are what he and others do not desire. They read the City's vision statement and asked if this project maintains the charm of the town. He implored the Council to think of their children, grandchildren and the legacy left by this project. The project developers have quoted they are hiding the project because people do not want to see it, and he felt this is the real fact.

Jennifer Barkley, 216 Foothill Blvd., asked the Council the reason for hurrying the development, thinking there might be a nagging voice due to the election year, and feels citizens are not impressed. Comments appear to tell residents that decisions have already been made which is not sitting well. She thanked everybody for showing up but there is a pattern of inconsistency. She feels the Council is more concerned with the amount of money being made for the City and, while she appreciates the effort, she thinks the project should better benefit the City.

Dennis McNay, 2653 Foothill Boulevard, said on Highland Court and Foothill Boulevard sits a subdivision with two villas which have never been sold in 4 years. There will be 21 homes built and he questioned what the LLC will do when they do not sell. If the City wants to make TOT, he suggested asking the developers to build in phases, with the hotel first and housing second.

Kristin Casey, 1132 Denise Drive, said she has been told the developers have a problem with what low rise and small scale means. She asked the planning director at the time whether more clarity was needed, but he thought it was very clear that "low rise" meant one-story and low density. She voiced concern about the entry to Calistoga. Having something too dense will be a turn off to all tourists who love to come to town. She also acknowledged the difficulties of being on the Council or Planning Commission, but thanked all citizens who have come forward to voice their opposition.

Roger Clough, 1017 Cedar Street, owner of the historic Lerner Cottage, said he has been recording the history of Calistoga for 11 years through his pen and ink drawings and does not want the character of the town changed by oversized buildings along Highway 29 which do not fit the landscape. There are only 4 historic buildings left on Lincoln Avenue which he has drawn and he asked to have the City's character saved.

Norma Tofanelli, 1001 Dunaweal Lane, said she does not see how the Council can make a decision without erection of story poles. Silver Rose proposes a much larger development than the Brian Arden Winery on a parcel 10 times as big. In listening to the record instead of the summary minutes, the Commission struggled with the AutoCAD which are easy to manipulate. The General Plan requires a gradual transition from agriculture to urban and this is not gradual or low rise, and the only way its true impact can be visualized is via story poles and models. The project also conflicts with the General Plan density requirement. The density calculation uses the full 22.5 acres and claims that 21 units meet the mandatory. This works if there is no commercial component. Here, 22.5 acres is split into 4 parcels and 21 private lots, and the resort parcel consumes 13 acres. The real density is 2.4 units per acre for 9.5 acres. She read the mandatory verbiage from the General Plan Amendment and the newly written Urban Design Plan at LU-54, presented a letter from Shute Mihaly and Weinberger noting that mature trees must be retained, and lastly voiced a concern about large trucks with making turns from Silverado Trail onto Rosedale Road.

Michael Quast, 1300 Washington Street, spoke regarding the geothermal element and said mineral water will go down the sewer system; however, the developer will only be charged residential rates while people in town must pay resort rates. He thinks the full use of the geothermal should be explained to the public or that the Council should ask them to return with more detail.

Mayor Gingles asked Mr. Foster to address comments from the public.

Kelly Foster addressed comments, stating the homes will be governed by an HOA. They will be in a rental pool managed by the resort. There is an allowance for the HOA to decide to divorce from the resort and self-manage. TOT would be paid to the City on the non-owner homes. Regarding timing and ownership, he explained that Silver Rose Ventures would own the hotel, winery and vineyard. They would sell the 21 homes and these would be part of the HOA. They grow grapes on the property, some are sold and some are used to make wine. Many wineries make wine from fruit purchased elsewhere and therefore, they would grow and buy fruit to make wine. Regarding the combination of hotel, winery, deli, vineyard and private residence, they would have about 193 employees with expertise to do all related duties uses. This is not incompatible with the overall project. Regarding geothermal, he asked that Geoff Herbert address this.

Geoff Herbert, Project Manager, explained that the geothermal system is a proposed loop for the resort, stating they will put meters on each to track what is being used on site. The reinjection system is being used for a heating and cooling system and this is the same concept that Solage uses.

Mayor Gingles closed the public hearing at 8:57 p.m.

Councilmember Kraus referred to concerns about drainage, and asked if the project would exacerbate these issues. Mr. Foster said no, they have detention ponds and the grading plan provides enough retention during rainy season and 100 year flood events.

Councilmember Kraus asked if it was the intention of building and selling the homes first or to develop the resort first. Mr. Foster said everything would be built in parallel construction or at the same time for a 20-month build period, and they believe it is too small a project to phase.

Councilmember Slusser asked and confirmed homes would be sold pre- and post construction.

Mayor Gingles clarified with Mr. Foster that the equity investment has been secured. They would finance construction and need to obtain project approval prior to having construction drawings prepared and close construction financing.

Councilmember Canning referred to the perceived success of Solage Resort, and asked about what occurred with their equity partners with Solage. Mr. Foster described what happens when a project has no residential project to sell, stating in this case, their value became less than their debt. The only way to service the debt was to run the resort and get it to a profitable level over the course of years. He cited their opening at the downturn in the economy and while he did not know the particulars, most pure hotels at that time which did

not have a for sale product, the original equity was either wiped out or suffered a severe loss.

He said that Bald Mountain Development has never failed to get construction financing. They also have never flipped a project. They have a combined 6 resorts of this size across the country.

Councilmember Kraus said most people cannot afford \$1,000 a night hotel room and asked what the saturation point is in the valley for resorts of this type. Mr. Foster said hospitality industry experts indicate there is plenty of appetite for additional luxury rooms. **Councilmember Canning** added that there are 4.7 million visits and the average visitor comes 1.8 to 2 times to the Napa Valley.

Mayor Gingles said he remembers doomsday predictions for Solage. They built it for \$71 million and another \$16 million was put into it. They defaulted, but he would be curious as to what it did for the rest of the spas, feeling that it picked up business for them. Mr. Foster said Solage accelerated their average rate sooner than expected. It created the "Solage Glow" wherein they spent a significant amount of money on the resort. They have sold out rooms and some guests who cannot book rooms will go to other resorts, which Calistoga now sees as a result. They continue to see a benefit for the town.

Councilmember Canning noted that this will allow more tourists to go to other hotels and the town businesses have seen a benefit since the opening of Solage. He reiterated that it does not ruin the current hotel and restaurant business. Mr. Foster added that a wedding at Solage usually results in people calling Silver Rose hotel because Solage is full. Their tasting room also sees more traffic.

Councilmember Kraus questioned how successful the City was in receiving TOT collected, given the recession. **City Manager Spitler** replied that the City brings in over \$6.6 million for all TOT and Solage is the number one producer, or 1.7 times to the nearest competitor. They are also the City's number two in sales and property tax revenue and they have been an important component of the City's survival.

Councilmember Slusser questioned the number of weddings and noise they generate which may bother residents. Mr. Foster said they believe the resort will be an attractive venue for weddings. He presented areas where weddings occur depending on their size. The after party of weddings would be restricted after 10:00 p.m. in either below grade or in the main ballroom which is quite a distance from residences. There are also restrictions to 60 decibels as well as hours of operation. It is in the hotel's interest to keep noise down, given the comfort of other hotel guests.

Mayor Gingles said the Council has discussed this project as well as the Planning Commission at length, but he has not heard anything about housing for workers. He asked if in-lieu fees are being paid and noted that Solage

donated slightly below two acres for apartments. Mr. Foster said the development agreement requires them to pay \$500,000 into the housing fund.

Mayor Gingles referred to lighting that may intrude on neighbors and asked about security. Mr. Foster said they are amenable to conditions for down facing lighting on buildings and residences. Regarding security or video cameras, the first 92 cars would be safe in the parking garage but if there are problems, security measures could be reviewed for other parking areas.

Councilmember Slusser voiced support for the projects feathering, trees, and said a resort already exists on the property. She did not understand what people would otherwise want there and said the City does not often get an opportunity for development like this. The property owners need to be able to build on their properties. She said while she is not ready to vote on the project, she suggested people look at the project and how it might fit. The City must take applications seriously and allow owners to use their land. She is torn, but Calistoga has not developed anything in 30 years other than affordable housing and Solage. She suggested residents take time to look at the development and consider what is good in the development. She also noted that the Economic Vitality Group returned with the need for more resorts in Calistoga and this is what is being done.

Councilmember Kraus said there have been questions raised about the deli and restaurant. He confirmed there is one restaurant open to the public where people can dine. Councilmember Kraus asked to elaborate on how large the deli will be, whether the deli will cater for events at the facility. Mr. Foster said events would be catered out of the main restaurant and the deli is about 400 square feet.

Vice Mayor Dunsford said the idea that this will become a V. Sattui operation is absurd, and people are paying high costs to stay in very high end rooms. It is not a picnic ground but a five-star luxury resort and he did not want any restrictions on the deli. He felt competition is a good thing and said some people will go downtown and buy sandwiches from Cal Mart.

RECESS

Mayor Gingles called for a recess at 9:29 p.m. and thereafter reconvened the special meeting at 9:33 p.m.

Vice Mayor Dunsford requested a plan of the deli and asked for the Council to focus its conversation on just the deli. Mr. Foster displayed and described the floor plan for the 400 square foot deli and the remaining multi-function 900 square foot building, its parking, arrival point and gathering spot with mailboxes for the residential units, a library and lounge area, art display on the wall, a resort logo wear area and convenience area targeted for renters and homeowners. **Vice Mayor Dunsford** noted the Planning Commission's issue of restricting people to come in and he did not see many outside visitors that

would want to drive up and gather at the deli. He did not believe it would be a major food operation.

Councilmember Canning said if the project were approved, Solage does not have a deli option and he would love to see people be able to purchase sundry and deli items. There are guests that bike downtown and for him, the deli could be problematic.

Vice Mayor Dunsford believed these people typically drive downtown and would not be generally visiting the resort's deli.

Mayor Gingles said his concern is not the deli, but rather than 22 acres of development.

Councilmember Canning said 30 years ago, the County came together and made a decision about a WDO. Municipalities gave up being the commercial centers of the County. With this understood, the scale is what was intended for the WDO which came after the Agricultural Preserve. Communities were designed to be these commercial centers.

Mayor Gingles discussed when the Solage property was first purchased and no one in town had a problem with the resort and he would want to go back on the original plan for this resort. The Planning Commission requested deleting 7 units and he supported the deli operation and moving forward with the development.

Vice Mayor Dunsford voiced support for retaining the 7 homes, felt the project graduates, the feathering satisfies him, and he would like to see the project be successful.

Mayor Gingles asked that more funds be from the developer for affordable housing. Mr. Foster noted their total fees are actually about \$7 million. **City Manager Spitler** described the types of fees associated with the development and concurred, noting that the per-square-foot calculation is \$1.40/sq. ft. on commercial adopted resolution, plus \$18,000 for each residential unit.

Mayor Gingles questioned how to proceed with the staff recommendations, and **Planning & Building Manager MacNab** stated the resolutions and ordinances have been set up to reflect the Commission's recommendations, but should the Council wish to revert to the original proposal, the Council would direct staff to return to these and staff would return with the final language.

Councilmember Kraus noted that the original proposal included at least one or more two-story buildings in the cluster of 7 buildings. They reduced those to one story and added significantly to the landscaping and this is not the original proposal. **Planning & Building Manager MacNab** said the Council's option could be an approval adding back in the 7 homes and eliminating the restriction on the guest only use of the deli. The other changes for additional landscaping and one story homes would remain unchanged.

Vice Mayor Dunsford voiced concern with over-screening the property and thinks it adds massing to the project. He suggested a compromise in the middle for additional landscaping as having a wall of trees is not something the City may want, given the architecture. **Mayor Gingles** said he thinks Solage and Harvest Inn did a fantastic job with their landscaping.

Vice Mayor Dunsford confirmed that in the original approval, short-term rentals would be allowed for the single family residences, as well. **City Manager Spittler** noted that TOT will be collected from either the HOA or resort operator for the 7 homes.

It was **MOVED** by **Mayor Gingles** and **SECONDED** by **Vice-Mayor Dunsford** to adopt Resolution No. 2012-032 approving a **Mitigated Negative Declaration based on an Initial Study**.

Councilmember Slusser indicated she was not ready to vote and wanted the community to be able to review it further.

Motion was carried by the following vote:

AYES: Mayor Gingles, Vice Mayor Dunsford Councilmembers Canning, Kraus, and Slusser.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

It was **MOVED** by **Mayor Gingles** and **SECONDED** by **Vice-Mayor Dunsford** to **Introduce Ordinance No. 681** and waive the first reading approving a **Zoning Text Amendment** establishing the "PD 2011-02", **Silver Rose Resort Planned Development District**. Motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mayor Gingles, Vice Mayor Dunsford, Councilmembers Canning, Kraus, and Slusser.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

It was **MOVED** by **Mayor Gingles** and **SECONDED** by **Vice-Mayor Dunsford** to adopt Resolution No. 2012-033 approving a **Preliminary & Final Development Plan, Conditional Use Permit and Design Review**, restoring the 7 homes that the **Planning Commission** recommended eliminating, and also removing the restriction that the deli be used by guests only. Motion was carried by the following vote:

AYES: Mayor Gingles, Vice Mayor Dunsford, Councilmembers Canning, Kraus, and Slusser
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

It was **MOVED** by Mayor Gingles and **SECONDED** by Vice-Mayor Dunsford to adopt Resolution No. 2012-034 approving a Tentative Subdivision Map. Motion was carried by the following vote:

AYES: Mayor Gingles, Vice Mayor Dunsford, Councilmembers Canning, Kraus, and Slusser.
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

In response to a question posed by **Councilmember Slusser** regarding wine making operations, **Planning & Building Manager MacNab** clarified that the Rural Residential districts standards do not apply and therefore production limits and on site requirements do not apply. This is a project subject to the grape sourcing ordinance and the applicant has agreed that production at the winery be 75% Napa grapes. Mr. Foster clarified that the existing facility is adequate for production of 10,000 cases and with additional barrel storage.

It was **MOVED** by Mayor Gingles and **SECONDED** by Vice-Mayor Dunsford to introduce Ordinance No. 682 and waive the first reading approving a Development Agreement DA2011-2 for the Silver Rose Resort. Motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mayor Gingles, Vice Mayor Dunsford, Councilmembers Canning, Kraus, and Slusser.
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

F) ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Gingles adjourned the meeting at 10:03 p.m. to the next scheduled a joint meeting of the Calistoga City Council and the Napa County Board of Supervisors, on Tuesday, May 15, 2012, Calistoga Community Center, 1307 Washington Street, 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:



Prepared by: Amanda Davis, Deputy City Clerk


Approved by: Jack Gingles, Mayor

7

1

1