

CITY OF CALISTOGA**STAFF REPORT**

**TO: CHAIRMAN MANFREDI AND MEMBERS OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

FROM: ERIK V. LUNDQUIST, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

MEETING DATE: APRIL 14, 2010

**SUBJECT: BOUNSALL FAMILY WINERY PROJECT
CONCEPTUAL DESIGN REVIEW**

REQUEST:

1
2
3 Conceptual Design Review for the proposed Bounsall Family Winery Project on the
4 property located at 414 Foothill Boulevard (APNs 011-260-045 through 011-260-076)
5 within the "I" Light Industrial Zoning District. The project has been revised and now
6 proposes two wineries, a wine shop and deli, a retail/winery office building, picnic
7 grounds and a special event area with an adjacent reception building all contained on the
8 property.
9

10 **PURPOSE OF REVIEW & 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 and is
14 required for any subdivision project. Project recommendations provided by the Planning
15 Commission in this process are intended to serve as guidance only and shall not be
16 considered an approval of an application.
17

18 The Bounsall Family originally approached the City in August of 2008 with a request for
19 Conceptual Design Review for their proposed winery project located on their property (*A*
20 *complete project description of that concept plan can be found in the January 28th and*
21 *February 11, 2009 Staff Reports*). The Planning Commission toured the site and
22 reviewed the initial concept during their February 11, 2009 meeting.
23

24 Subsequent to the Planning Commission's initial review, the City Council on May 19,
25 2009 expressed their initial interest in the development concept and created an ad-hoc
26 sub-committee to meet with the project proponent and explore the development of a draft
27 MOU to guide the proposal. Ultimately, on December 15, 2009 the City Council
28 authorized the City Manager to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to
29 encourage the development concept.
30

31 The MOU does not commit the City to the project as initially proposed but is an
32 agreement to enter into a period of good faith negotiations to process a development
33 agreement and the associated applications. The MOU further stipulates that the
34 Bounsall's will "respond to the comments raised by City staff, the Planning Commission
35 and public speakers during the February 11, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting." Some
36 of the issues raised include, but are not limited to, property boundary and ownership,
37 design compatibility, scale and intensity of proposed uses, on-site circulation issues, and
38 area-wide access and circulation needs and river trail development.
39

40 In recent months, the Bounsall's have been working with their consultants and meeting
41 with staff in an effort to understand and respond to the previous comments, as agreed per
42 the terms of the MOU. On February 22, 2010, the Planning and Building Department
43 received a letter from the Bounsall's indicating that they would like to schedule another
44 Conceptual Design Review with the Planning Commission. On March 31, 2010 the
45 Planning and Building Department received revised concept plans contemplating the
46 previous comments. As a result of this request, Staff suggests that the Planning
47 Commission consider the historic record of February 11, 2009, discuss the concept plan
48 modifications, receive public comment and provide feedback to the Applicant and staff
49 regarding Commission review of the concept plans as revised giving particular attention
50 to massing, scale, height and compatibility of land uses.
51

52 **SUMMARY OF INITIAL CONCEPT REVIEW COMMENTS:**

53
54 A. **Recapitulation of Initial Planning Commission Comments:**

55
56 Subsequent to the "tour of inspection" and public meeting of February 11, 2009, the
57 Planning Commission, in summary, opined that the composition and treatment of the
58 buildings (i.e. materials, colors and textures) were appropriate to Calistoga and seemed
59 consistent with the character of the community.
60

61 The Planning Commission did, however, express concern with the site layout and
62 massing of the project. The Commission felt that the height of each individual building
63 seemed appropriate but since all of the proposed buildings were of similar bulk and
64 uniformity the site becomes too intensive. The Planning Commission identified that the
65 intensity could be reduced by scaling back the square footage and number of buildings. It
66 was stated that the buildings should be a mixture of building types, small and large.
67

68 The Planning Commission further considered the proposed land uses and their
69 compatibility. Overall, the variety and placement of the selected land uses seemed
70 disruptive since the vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns were conflicting and
71 mingled. The more noticeable winery traffic would have the potential to interfere with
72 the general automobile circulation. The Planning Commission also asked if the housing
73 unit(s) could be located off site and questioned the nature of the retail office space. The
74 Planning Commission voiced that the mixture of uses and the distribution of the uses on
75 the site needed to be revisited to create a harmonious relationship on the site by finding a

76 balance between variety and repetition while maintaining an understated visual
77 appearance.

78

79 Although, not as significant, the Planning Commission discussed and provided feedback
80 regarding the building setbacks from the Napa River and the proximity of the parking
81 area to Foothill Boulevard. The Commission viewed these matters to be secondary to the
82 physical improvements (i.e. structural design and layout) but did acknowledge the
83 importance of screening the parking and protecting the surrounding biological/natural
84 resources.

85

86 A complete excerpt of the February 11, 2010 Planning Commission meeting minutes are
87 attached to this Report.

88

89 B. Recapitulation of Initial Public Comments:

90

91 During the February 11, 2009 Planning Commission meeting both written and oral public
92 comments were received. The oral comments are summarized in the attached February
93 11, 2009 Planning Commission meeting minute excerpt. In addition, all written
94 comments received prior to April 2, 2010 have been attached for the Commission's
95 review.

96

97 Many of the public comments raised during the initial conceptual review will ultimately
98 be addressed in the formal environmental analysis prepared for this project. However,
99 some additional concerns relative to the more subjective design review were brought
100 forth regarding height, mixture and compatibility of proposed land uses, Napa River
101 setbacks amplifying the Planning Commission's concerns.

102

103 **REVISED CONCEPT PLAN DISCUSSION:**

104

105 As mentioned at the forefront of this report, the Bounsall's have been busy working with
106 their consultants to redefine the project in an effort to capture and address the issues
107 raised during the February 11, 2009 Planning Commission meeting. As a result, the
108 Bounsall's primary attention and focus has been on addressing the perceived scale and
109 intensity of proposed structures and uses, circulation and boundary and ownership.

110

111 On March 31, 2010 the Bounsall's Architect, Mary Sikes transmitted revised conceptual
112 plans including a Site Plan and Elevations that bring forth a reduction in the project's
113 massing and a reorientation of the internal vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian circulation
114 pattern. In summary, the revised concept plans include:

115

- 116 · Overall reduction of building square footages and heights; and
- 117 · Reduction of lot coverage; and
- 118 · Realignment of site entry; and
- 119 · Class I, bike path relocation; and
- 120 · Establishment of truck route; and

- 121 • Removal of Event Pavilion Building;
- 122 • Removal of Retail/Residence Building "E"; and
- 123 • Reorientation of Reception Building "D";
- 124 • Preservation of tree cover along eastern property boundary; and
- 125 • Establishing outdoor space behind reception building; and
- 126 • Provided variation in Architectural elevations; and
- 127 • Increased landscaping and open space.

128
 129 Table 1, below, is a comparison chart indicating the square footage difference between
 130 the initial concept plans and this subsequent conceptual design. As indicated, the overall
 131 square footage has been reduced by 12,722 square feet primarily as a result of removing
 132 the 10,698 square foot Residence/Retail Building 'E'. There is also shown a significant,
 133 3,801 square foot, reduction in Winery Building 'C'.
 134

135

TABLE 1									
	Old 1st Floor	Old 2nd Floor	Old Verandas & Decks	Total Old	New 1st Floor	New 2nd Floor	New Verandas & Decks	Total New	Difference
BLDG A	10,000	8,147		18,147	9,000	7,583		16,583	-1,564
BLDG B	5,402	2,460	8,178	16,040	4,536	2,460	8,178	15,174	-866
BLDG C	16,664	6,570		23,234	14,724	4,709		19,433	-3,801
BLDG D	4,849	N/A	617	5,466	6,126	N/A	627	6,753	1,287
BLDG E	4,978	3,036	2,684	10,698	0	0	0	0	-10,698
BLDG F	12,067	3,460		16,164	14,987	3,460		18,447	2,283
SUB TOTALS	53,960	23,673	11479		49,373	18,212	8805		
TOTAL				89,112				76,390	12,722
Total Lot Coverage	292,822	100%							
Building Coverage	49,373	17%							
Roads, Parking Bike Paths	86,629	29%							
Walks, Hardscape, Patio	23,083	8%							
Landscape	133,737	46%							

147
 148
 149 For a comprehensive list of revisions, please see the revised concept plans received
 150 March 31, 2010 by the Planning and Building Department and the revised project
 151 description received March 31, 2010, Attachment Nos. 13 & 14.
 152

153
 154
 155 Moreover, the Applicant's Planning Consultant, Jean Kapolchok received March 31,
 156 2010 addresses the project's intensity in terms of scale, massing and overall size as well
 157 as the number of uses and the way the project will operate as a whole. In summary, Ms.
 158 Kapolchok opines that the project, as designed, celebrates the agricultural heritage of the
 159 area through the inclusion of two wineries, wine tasting, a farm-stand/fruit stand and
 160 areas to show case local products. The site design and project architecture respects and
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165

166 enhance the gateway to the city. The site plan depresses the parking and screens it from
167 view through landscaping. The project will maintain nearly 46% of the site in open space
168 and 17% of the site is covered by structures. The proposed intensity of the structures and
169 the uses, together with the circulation pattern, are suitable for property and are
170 compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

171
172 With regard to the property and ownership concerns, the Bounsall's commissioned and
173 the County accepted for recording, on September 25, 2009, an Amending Record of
174 Survey, prepared by Howard W. Brunner that reflects an amended boundary line based
175 upon a Deed recorded in 1883, which is more closely akin to the Record of Survey
176 prepared by Michael Brooks recorded April 14, 2009 in the Record of Surveys Book 37
177 at Page 4. Although, the boundary line locations are not identical (difference of
178 approximately 3 feet), Staff is confident that the proposed project will be located entirely
179 within the property boundaries.

180
181 **RECOMMENDATION:**

182
183 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider the historic record of February
184 11, 2009, discuss the concept plan modifications, receive public comment and provide
185 feedback to the Applicant and staff regarding Commission review of the concept plans as
186 revised giving particular attention to massing, scale, height and compatibility of land
187 uses.

188
189 It should be noted that the Planning Commission comments received during conceptual
190 design review are advisory only and should not be considered by the Applicant to be
191 requirements or an endorsement of the project until a complete application is considered
192 through the formal review process.

193
194 **ATTACHMENTS:**

- 195
196 1. Aerial Map with Initial Project Overlay
197 2. February 11, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting Minute Excerpt
198 3. Letter dated July 7, 2009 from Elizabeth Hammond
199 4. Letter dated May 19, 2009 from Elizabeth Hammond
200 5. Letter dated February 3, 2010 from Paul Smith
201 6. Letter dated February 10, 2009 from Paul Smith
202 7. Letter dated February 11, 2009 from Elizabeth Hammond
203 8. Letter dated February 11, 2009 from the Napa County Farm Bureau
204 9. Letter dated January 28, 2009 from Kristin Casey
205 10. Letter dated December 15, 2009 from Kristin Casey
206 11. Letter dated December 15, 2009 from Kurt Larrecou
207 12. Conceptual Design Review request letter dated February 22, 2010
208 13. Revised Project Description dated March 30, 2010
209 14. Revised Project Plans (Site Plan, Elevations & Aerial Map Overlay)
210 15. Amending Record of Survey Recorded September 25th, 2009 (40 RS 15/17)
211

212 *The Planning Commission Staff Reports of January 28, 2009 and February 11, 2009 have been*
213 *redistributed to the Planning Commission and are available to the public upon request or via the*
214 *City's website at www.ci.calistoga.ca.us.*
215