

MINUTES

CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION

November 13, 2013

1 The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm.

2 A. ROLL CALL

3 Commissioners present: Chair Jeff Manfredi, Vice-Chair Paul Coates,
4 Commissioners Scott Cooper and Walter Kusener. Commissioners absent: Carol
5 Bush (excused). Staff present: Planning & Building Director Lynn Goldberg, Senior
6 Planner Erik Lundquist.

7 B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

8 C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

9 There were no public comments.

10 D. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

11 The meeting agenda of November 13, 2013 was accepted, with item G.1. moved to
12 the end of the agenda.

13 E. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

14 Letters from Paul Dohring, Carolynne Wilkinson Claire and Louise Della Maggiora
15 regarding Item H.2. were distributed to the Commission.

16 F. CONSENT CALENDAR

17 1. Minutes for the October 9, 2013 Planning Commission meeting

18 The October 9, 2013 Minutes were accepted as presented.

19 G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

20 1. **Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (CI 2013-1):** Consideration of a
21 recommendation to the City Council to adopt guidelines to be used in reviewing
22 the design of new single-family dwellings and additions to existing single-family
23 dwellings

24 Planning Director Goldberg reviewed the revisions that had been made to the
25 draft guidelines in response to comments received at the October 9th meeting
26 and a suggestion subsequently submitted by Commissioner Cooper. She asked
27 the Commission to provide comments on the revised draft design guidelines.

28 **Chair Manfredi** suggested an additional design objective of safeguarding the
29 privacy of neighboring properties.

30 **Commissioner Kusener** supports the concept of "feathering" the heights of a
31 project's buildings, with lower heights at a project's periphery. He likes the fact
32 that the draft guidelines have been revised to primarily use "should" instead of
33 "shalls."

34 The Commission voted unanimously (Chair Jeff Manfredi, Commissioners Scott
35 Cooper and Walter Kusener) to recommend that the City Council adopt the
36 guidelines. Ms. Goldberg advised that the Commission's recommendation will be
37 formalized in the future once the multi-family design guidelines have been
38 finalized.

39 H. NEW BUSINESS

- 40 1. **AT&T Telecommunications Facility Use Permit (UP 2013-15):** Public hearing
41 to consider a use permit to allow the installation and operation of antennae and
42 an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility at the Napa County
43 Fairgrounds located at 1435 N. Oak Street

44 Senior Planner Lundquist presented the staff report and recommended approving
45 Use Permit UP 2013-15 with conditions.

46 **Chair Manfredi** opened the public hearing.

47 **Christy Beltran Roberts**, representing AT&T, believes that the project will be
48 very beneficial to local AT&T wireless customers and the community at large,
49 since it will be used by emergency responders and rent will be paid to the
50 fairgrounds.

51 **Chair Manfredi** closed the public hearing.

52 In response to questions from **Commissioner Kusener**, Mr. Lundquist explained
53 the required finding that projects help support the local visitor economy. Ms.
54 Beltran Roberts explained that the antennae will provide additional capacity and
55 expanded coverage for wireless products such as smart phones and computers.
56 The technology types will also be upgraded. The antenna would not provide
57 additional services, such as digital TV. There will be a notice posted on the
58 antennae that they be shut down if work is needed on the light standard; it will
59 provide a contact number. The building will have a neutral earth-tone appearance
60 and will be surrounded by trees, so there isn't a need to provide additional
61 screening for aesthetic purposes.

62 In response to a question from **Vice-Chair Coates** about whether a fail-safe
63 mechanism will be provided if maintenance workers are not informed about the
64 need to shut down the antennae prior to working on the lights, Ms. Beltran
65 Roberts explained that the entire facility would be fenced in a locked enclosure
66 and there won't be any ladder rungs on the pole that could be used by
67 maintenance personnel.

68 **Commissioner Cooper** feels that since the project is essentially an upgrade to
69 existing equipment, it is not a new facility that needs close scrutiny, and it will
70 benefit the community.

71 A motion by **Commissioner Cooper** and seconded by **Commissioner Kusener**
72 to adopt a resolution approving UP 2013-15 with conditions was approved
73 unanimously.

74 **2. Schrader Cellars Office Use Permit (UP 2013-14):** Public hearing to consider a
75 use permit to allow the conversion of a triplex located at 1406 Fair Way to an
76 office

77 **Chair Manfredi** stated that he had visited the project site but had not met with
78 anyone.

79 **Senior Planner Lundquist** presented the staff report and noted that three letters
80 had been received regarding the item. The applicants plan to bar public visits to
81 their office in order to avoid having to improve the structure for disabled access.
82 A recommended condition of approval requires the payment of an affordable
83 housing in-lieu fee to partly address the loss of a housing unit, as required by the
84 Zoning Code. The fee would be approximately \$3000. The project meets all
85 development standards with the exception of the proposed parking arrangement.
86 He has met several times with the applicants to explore options to providing
87 compliant parking. The Zoning Code requires a 24-foot wide driveway for two-
88 way access, whereas the existing driveway is narrows to 10 feet at one point.
89 Therefore, staff recommends a one-way entry to the parking via Fair Way and
90 one-way exiting via Park Street, as shown in Attachment 6 to the staff report.
91 Due to the tight turning movements and proximity of the driveways to the
92 adjoining properties, staff also suggests that the driveways and back-up areas be
93 constructed of asphalt or concrete, rather than gravel. Surfacing the driveway
94 would also reduce ponding and noise. Staff does not support the applicants'
95 request to defer the landscaping until after the certificate of occupancy; perhaps
96 a minimal level of landscaping could be installed in the interim.

97 **Vice-Chair Coates** complained about correspondence regarding the project
98 being received at such a late date. It is difficult to consider it with insufficient time.

99 In response to questions from **Commissioner Kusener**, Mr. Lundquist confirmed
100 that there would be three parking spaces. He confirmed that a section of the
101 existing driveway does not comply with the required minimum width.

102 In response to questions from **Commissioner Cooper** about the possibility of
103 providing two-way access from Park Street, Mr. Lundquist noted that there are
104 several choke points that would have insufficient width.

105 **Chair Manfredi** opened the public hearing.

106 **Fred Schrader**, applicant, thanked City staff for helping them get to this point.
107 They are doing everything they can to restore the building.

108 **Carol Schrader**, applicant, feels that the property speaks to them and that it is
109 an important part of town.

110 **Doug Donmon**, Dimensions 4 Engineering, distributed photos of the property to
111 the Commission showing the renovation work to date. After the applicants initially
112 met with the City, they were under the impression that they would be able to use
113 the existing parking and driveway. After issues were raised by staff, they met on-
114 site and determined that a lot line adjustment would be needed to provide

115 adequate driveway width. Given that there are only going to be a few office
116 employees, the driveway won't really need to operate as a two-way driveway.
117 Requiring the establishment of a driveway across the adjoining property doesn't
118 seem fair. Staff is recommending a large amount of paving, which would have an
119 associated cost of approximately \$30,000. The total site improvement costs
120 would probably rise to \$50,000 once the frontage improvements are included.
121 Gravel surfacing of the driveway would work; it could be laid over base rock to
122 help minimize the noise. One of the reasons that their correspondence was
123 submitted today was because they received the staff report only a few days ago.
124 They would be willing to hydroseed the vacant area in the interim before
125 completing the full landscaping.

126 In response to a question from **Chair Manfredi** about the planned appearance of
127 the landscaping, Mr. Donmon explained that the applicants are working with a
128 landscaper but haven't finalized the landscaping plans since they didn't know
129 what the final access plan would be.

130 **Commissioner Kusener** believes that additional parking spaces would be
131 needed for visitors to the site, if not now, then for a future office tenant. The
132 street is very narrow and on-street parking is limited. Mr. Donmon reiterated that
133 only three employees are planned for the office. Mr. Lundquist confirmed that
134 three parking spaces are the minimum required by the Zoning Code, based on
135 the size of the proposed office.

136 **Vice-Chair Coates** observed that he has two parking spaces beyond the
137 minimum requirement for his office, which is not open to the public, and they are
138 seldom used.

139 **Carolynne Wilkinson Clair**, owner of the adjoining Hideaway Cottages, thinks
140 that the applicants' restoration of the house is marvelous. She has no objections
141 to the project as neighbors, but there are only 21 to 28 inches between the
142 driveway and one of their cottages. Restrictions on operating hours for the office
143 use are difficult to enforce and traffic using the driveway could disturb their
144 guests. Therefore, she requests that the driveway adjoining their property not be
145 used. The driveway has not been used for many years. She would like the
146 Commission to consider the impact of the driveway's use on their rental units.
147 You can't adequately mitigate the problem of passing vehicles.

148 **Doug Cook**, manager of the nearby Chelsea Garden Inn, is happy to see that
149 something is being done with the property and he doesn't have an objection to
150 the office use. He would like to see the vacant part of the property landscaped as
151 soon as possible. In response to a question from **Commissioner Kusener**
152 about whether his customers complain about noise from the Inn's gravel
153 driveways, Mr. Cook acknowledged occasionally receiving complaints when
154 they're used during early or late hours.

155 **Carol Schrader** stated that they will not be using the driveway early in the
156 morning. One of the employees will live in the adjoining house on Park Street, so

157 they won't be parking on the property. She plans to install a beautiful heritage
158 garden on the property; however, they don't want to develop the landscaping
159 plan until they know what the parking arrangement will be.

160 **Chair Manfredi** closed the public hearing.

161 **Commissioner Cooper** believes it's important to promote the hospitality
162 business and therefore explore driveway alternatives that avoid using the existing
163 driveway because of noise.

164 In response to questions from **Commissioner Kusener**, Ms. Clair responded
165 that she was aware of the intent of the applicants to convert the structure to an
166 office when she sold them the property. However, she wasn't aware of the
167 specific design. She believes the cottage units were constructed in the mid-
168 1940s. The driveway is very narrow and consideration should be given to limiting
169 access to Park Street.

170 **Vice-Chair Coates** wonders why Ms. Clair didn't condition the sale of the
171 property to preclude the driveway's use. Given the hours of operation, there
172 would be very little impact, especially if the driveway were asphalted. However,
173 he doesn't have a problem with it having a gravel surface. The driveway has
174 historically been used, and it's not fair to expect the applicants not to use it.

175 **Chair Manfredi** believes that the driveway is a driveway. He likes the access
176 approach proposed by staff. There wouldn't be any office traffic on weekends.
177 Having the secondary Park Street access could address future demands.
178 However, he doesn't support a 24-foot driveway to accommodate two-way
179 access from Park Street because it would take too much property; that would
180 excessive.

181 **Ms. Clair** questioned whether the property's sale could have been conditioned to
182 preclude the driveway's use. She noted the existing driveway apron on the
183 southeast side of the house could be used to access parking.

184 **Commissioner Cooper** would like to receive project correspondence earlier in
185 the future.

186 **Vice-Chair Coates** supports staff's access recommendation, except for the
187 asphalt surfacing requirement.

188 **Commissioner Kusener** supports staff's access recommendation, but with
189 gravel surfacing for the driveways.

190 **Mr. Lundquist** confirmed that the driveway could be surfaced with 6-inch deep
191 compacted gravel that is 3/4-inch in diameter or less.

192 **Ms. Clair** suggests having the parking enter on Park and exit on Fair Way to
193 minimize noise impacts.

194 **Mr. Lundquist** stated that it would be easier to access parking space No. 1 if the
195 entrance was from Fair Way.

196 **Mr. Cook** questioned the safety of exiting on to Fair Way; it is very busy with
197 traffic and visibility is limited.

198 **Mr. Donmon** believes it is safer to exit on Park Street.

199 **Howard Clair, Hideaway Cottages**, thinks both exit points are difficult. Their
200 primary concern is early morning noise, which could lead to guest complaints.

201 **Vice-Chair Coates** believes that seeding the vacant area of the property makes
202 sense since winter is starting soon.

203 **Commissioner Cooper** is not concerned about delaying the formal landscaping,
204 since the vacant part of the property has been in that state for a long time.

205 **Commissioner Kusener** supports allowing interim landscaping.

206 **Mr. Lundquist** clarified the revised wording of condition of approval No. 14 to
207 allow gravel surfacing of the driveways.

208 A motion by **Commissioner Kusener** and seconded by **Vice-Chair Coates** to
209 adopt a resolution approving UP 2013-14 with the amendment to Condition No.
210 14 was approved by a vote of 3 to 1 (Cooper dissent).

211 **Ms. Clair** expressed concern about the deprecating comments made regarding the
212 condition of the property when it was under their ownership.

213 **3. Francis House Conceptual Review (CDR 2013-1):** Review of conceptual plans
214 for the rehabilitation and reuse of the historic Francis House and its adjoining
215 properties located at 1403 Myrtle Street

216 **Vice-Chair Coates** recused himself from the item because he may be assisting
217 the applicant with the project in the future and left the meeting.

218 **Senior Planner Lundquist** provided an overview of the proposal and the various
219 actions that would be required to approve the project. He requested that the
220 Commission provide preliminary comments on the proposal, including the
221 questions posed in the staff report.

222 In response to a question from **Commissioner Kusener** about the proposed
223 locations of staff parking and service trucks, Mr. Lundquist noted that it's unlikely
224 that all of the units would be occupied at one time, so there would probably be
225 adequate parking for staff. The applicant is also considering off-site parking
226 alternatives.

227 **Chair Manfredi** agrees that consideration has to be given to employee parking.
228 Previous proposals for the property contemplated off-site parking on nearby
229 properties.

230 **Chair Manfredi** opened the public hearing.

231 **Mario Sculatti**, applicant, has had a long-time interest in restoring the property.
232 This proposal would make the restoration economically viable. The previous
233 proposal for the property was more intense. He understands the need for parking

234 for employees and is exploring options. He is very concerned about potential
235 neighborhood impacts. He wants to begin negotiations with the City Manager that
236 will include a complete proposal. The proposed PD zoning would allow flexibility
237 in design and landscaping. The design of the new buildings would be based on
238 previous structures on the property and would not compete with the unique
239 design of the Francis House. He hopes to be able to restore the house before it is
240 lost. He plans to make unique, historic wines available to guests of the project.

241 **Commissioner Cooper** thinks that the proposal appears very viable and
242 supports it.

243 **Commissioner Kusener** likes the initial project layout. He noted that hedges
244 and landscaping will be needed to provide screening. He wondered whether any
245 special events would be open to the public. He would like to see some stone
246 incorporated into the new buildings to tie them to the Francis House.

247 **Mr. Sculatti** responded that he wants to make the facility available to the public if
248 it's at all possible; further discussion is needed. They are considering including
249 stone on the ground floor elevations of the new buildings.

250 **Chair Manfredi** applauds the effort to restore the property. Regarding the
251 questions raised in the staff report, he believes that the project would meet the
252 City's historic preservation objectives, that PD zoning is appropriate, and that it
253 remains to be seen whether the project design is compatible with surrounding
254 uses.

255 **Commissioner Kusener** is open to amending the General Plan and believes
256 that a proposal to save the property should be accommodated by the City.

257 **Chair Manfredi** closed the public hearing.

258 **I. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS**

259 None

260 **J. DIRECTOR REPORT**

261 Ms. Goldberg reminded the Commission that the November 27, 2013 meeting had
262 been cancelled because of the Thanksgiving holiday and advised them of items for
263 the December 11th meeting.

264 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

265 The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m. to December 11, 2013.