

# MINUTES

## CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION

March 12, 2014

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

### 2 A. ROLL CALL

3 Commissioners present: Chair Jeff Manfredi, Vice Chair Carol Bush, Commissioners  
4 Scott Cooper, Tim Wilkes. Absent: Commissioner Paul Coates (excused). Staff  
5 present: Planning & Building Director Lynn Goldberg, Senior Planner Erik Lundquist.

### 6 B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

### 7 C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

8 None.

### 9 D. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

10 The meeting agenda of March 12, 2014 was accepted as presented.

### 11 E. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

12 Three items of correspondence related to Item G.1. were distributed to the  
13 Commissioners.

### 14 F. CONSENT CALENDAR

- 15 1. Minutes for the February 12, 2014 Planning Commission meeting
- 16 2. General Plan Annual Report
- 17 3. Resolution recommending the City Council adopt residential design guidelines  
18 and rescind Chapter 17.34, Single-Family Residential Standards

19 The Consent Calendar was unanimously adopted as presented.

### 20 G. NEW BUSINESS

- 21 1. **Municipal Code Amendment MCA 2014-2:** Amendments to the Calistoga  
22 Municipal Code to add Chapter 6.06, Domestic Chicken Keeping, and amend the  
23 RR, R-1/R-1-10, R-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts to allow the keeping of domestic  
24 chickens as an accessory use

25 Planning and Building Director Goldberg reviewed the proposed Municipal Code  
26 amendments that would allow the keeping of chickens as an accessory use in  
27 the residential zoning districts, with the exception of the Mobile Home Park  
28 District. Four to six chickens would be allowed, depending on the zoning district.  
29 General regulations would also be added to the Animals title of the Municipal  
30 Code. She noted that letters had been received in support and in opposition to  
31 the proposed amendments. Staff doesn't believe it is appropriate to classify  
32 chickens as household pets.

33 **Commissioner Wilkes** thanked staff for the extensive research involved in the  
34 preparation of the proposed amendments.

35 **Chair Manfredi** summarized his conversation with staff earlier in the day, during  
36 which he suggested requiring an administrative use permit to allow chicken  
37 keeping in all but the Rural Residential Zoning District in order to notify the  
38 neighbors.

39 Ms. Goldberg explained the administrative use permit process and associated  
40 cost.

41 In response to a question from **Commissioner Wilkes** about what would occur if  
42 there were neighbor objections to a proposed chicken keeping application, Ms.  
43 Goldberg explained that staff's decision could be appealed to the Commission, or  
44 staff could choose to refer the application to the Commission without taking  
45 action.

46 **Commissioner Cooper** thinks that requiring an administrative use permit for four  
47 chickens is excessive. He asked if a provision could instead be added to the  
48 proposed regulations requiring the discontinuation of the chicken keeping based  
49 upon the number of complaints received. Ms. Goldberg replied that such a  
50 situation could be addressed through the routine code enforcement process.

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

52 **Jeanette Squire** spoke in support of being able to keep back yard chickens. She  
53 has chickens and did not realize that they are not currently legal. Allowing four to  
54 six chickens seems like the normal amount. The 20-foot minimum setback to a  
55 neighboring home for a coop is excessive. The administrative use permit process  
56 would be costly and cumbersome.

57 **David Moon-Wainwright**, 1210 Pine Street, has chickens and has not heard any  
58 concerns about them. The neighborhood dogs are louder. Chickens only make  
59 noise when laying eggs. Many cities, such as San Francisco, San Jose and Los  
60 Angeles, allow chicken keeping. It is not a big nuisance. He is saddened by the  
61 possibility of a \$50 fee to get approval for chicken keeping, and the fact that the  
62 City would contact the neighbors rather than the property owner. The maximum  
63 number of chickens proposed per lot is low; perhaps a greater number could be  
64 allowed based upon the lot size.

65 In response to a question from **Louise Hardesten**, Franz Valley School Road,  
66 Ms. Goldberg answered that the proposed regulations prohibit the keeping of  
67 roosters.

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

69 **Vice Chair Bush** grew up with chickens in a city and does not find issue with the  
70 proposed ordinance.

71 **Commissioner Wilkes** grew up in Los Angeles and had all types of animals,  
72 including chickens. In response to a question from **Commissioner Wilkes**

73 regarding the amount of chickens that would be appropriate to produce eggs for  
74 a family, Mr. Moon-Wainwright noted that after about two to three years, the hens  
75 lay sporadically, so more than four could be needed to supply a family.

76 In response to questions from **Commissioner Wilkes** about the proposed  
77 minimum lot size for chicken keeping, Ms. Goldberg responded that her intent  
78 was to ensure that there was sufficient area in general to minimize potential  
79 problems, and she tried not to get into "quality of life" requirements, such as a  
80 minimum number of square feet for coops or roaming area. Situations where  
81 owners currently exceed the maximum number of chickens would be addressed  
82 on a complaint basis.

83 **Commissioner Cooper** raised chickens in Alaska and leans toward allowing six  
84 rather than four chickens per lot. Requiring an administrative use permit to allow  
85 chicken keeping does not make sense in this situation.

86 **Commissioner Wilkes** believes that a public notice requirement would be calling  
87 attention to an extraordinary situation, which chicken keeping isn't. He supports  
88 the ordinance without the administrative use permit process.

89 **Vice Chair Bush** agrees with the ordinance as written.

90 **Chair Manfredi** did not grow up with chickens. He suggested the notification  
91 process to get neighbors talking and reduce potential post-approval complaints to  
92 the City. But he has no problem with not requiring the administrative use permit;  
93 it was just a suggestion. He thinks the overall concept is a great idea; he just  
94 hopes that people inform their neighbors.

95 A motion by **Vice Chair Bush** and seconded by **Commissioner Wilkes** to adopt  
96 a resolution recommending the City Council approve amendments to the  
97 Municipal Code to allow chicken-keeping on residentially-zoned properties and  
98 adopt provisions regulating this use, was approved unanimously.

99 **2. Zoning Ordinance Amendment ZOA 2014-1:** Consideration of amendments to  
100 Calistoga Municipal Code Chapter 17.06, Design Review

101 Ms. Goldberg explained that a number of amendments to the Design Review  
102 Chapter of the Zoning Code need to be amended to require the consideration of  
103 the residential design guidelines that the Commission had recently  
104 recommended to the City Council in reviewing design review applications, delete  
105 the "guidelines" section of the chapter, and add a "findings" section. A number of  
106 other amendments are recommended to clarify design review authority and  
107 application submittal requirements, delete unnecessary language and add a  
108 process for time extensions of approvals.

109 **Chair Manfredi** wondered how you get people to participate in the Design  
110 Advisory Panel.

111 Ms. Goldberg noted that the City once had a Design Review Board but it was  
112 disbanded and replaced with the Design Advisory Panel that would include

113 members with design expertise to provide design advice to the City on large  
114 projects, which at times is difficult to find in a small community.

115 **Commissioner Wilkes** noted in his experience, members of the planning  
116 commission were able to participate on such a panel. Having a separate design  
117 review chapter makes it easier to find these provisions in the Zoning Code.

118 A motion by **Chair Manfredi** and seconded by **Commissioner Cooper** to adopt  
119 a resolution recommending the City Council rescind Chapter 17.06, Design  
120 Review, and adopt a new Chapter 17.41, Design Review, was approved  
121 unanimously.

122 3. **Maxine's UP 2014-3: Application withdrawn by applicant**

123 A motion by **Chair Manfredi** and seconded by **Vice Chair Bush** to table the  
124 matter was approved unanimously.

125 **H. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS**

126 None

127 **I. DIRECTOR REPORT**

128 Ms. Goldberg requested that the Commission cancel the March 26, 2014 meeting  
129 due a lack of business items, and the Commission concurred.

130 **J. ADJOURNMENT**

131 The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m. to April 8, 2014, at 5:30 p.m.

---

Lynn Goldberg  
Planning Commission Secretary