



City of Calistoga
Planning Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DATE	March 25, 2015
ITEM	Draft Minutes of February 25, 2015 Meeting
COMMISSIONER ABSENCES	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
RECOMMENDATION	Approve minutes with any necessary changes

MINUTES

CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION

February 25, 2015

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, and
4 Commissioners Scott Cooper, Paul Coates, Tim Wilkes. Absent: None. 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 February 25, 2015 was accepted as presented.

11 E. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

12 None.

13 F. CONSENT CALENDAR

14 1. Commission Minutes

15 The February 11, 2015 minutes were unanimously adopted as presented.

16 2. General Plan Annual Report

17 A motion by **Chair Manfredi** to recommend that the City Council accept the
18 report was seconded by **Commissioner Coates** and approved unanimously.

19 G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

20 1. **Zoning Ordinance Amendment ZOA 2014-6:** Consideration of a
21 recommendation to the City Council regarding an amendment to the Downtown
22 Commercial Zoning District to allow off-site automated teller machines (ATMs)

23 **Senior Planner Lundquist** presented the staff report for the item. The
24 Commission considered a request to amend the DC Downtown Commercial
25 Zoning District to allow free-standing off-site ATMs at a public hearing on
26 January 14, 2015, and after discussion and public comments, continued the
27 matter in order for staff to work with the applicant on language that would allow
28 off-site ATMs to be integrated with an existing building. Staff has drafted
29 language that would allow off-site ATMs through the approval of a use permit,
30 with specific performance standards to ensure consistency with General Plan
31 policies and preserve, protect and enhance Calistoga's quality of life and rural
32 small-town character. The applicant has accepted the draft language.

33 **Chair Manfredi** noted that the proposed regulations would allow off-site ATMs in
34 the Community Commercial District as well as the Downtown Commercial
35 District.

36 **Chair Manfredi** opened and closed the public hearing after there were no
37 comments.

38 In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Lundquist advised that Bank
39 of America was considering applying for a use permit to keep the ATM in its
40 current location, but that would depend on what happens with the disposition of
41 the property.

42 A motion by **Commissioner Cooper** to adopt a resolution recommending that
43 the City Council amend the DC Downtown Commercial and CC Community
44 Commercial Zoning Districts to allow off-site ATMs was seconded by **Chair**
45 **Manfredi** and approved unanimously.

46 **2. General Plan Amendment GPA 2015-2 & Zoning Ordinance Amendment**
47 **ZOA 2015-4:** Consideration of a recommendation to the City Council regarding a
48 request to designate the properties located at 1213 and 1303 Foothill Boulevard
49 from Low Density Residential to Downtown Commercial General Plan land use
50 designation and to rezone the properties from R-1-10 One-Family Residential to
51 DC Downtown Commercial zoning district

52 **Mr. Lundquist** presented the staff report for the item. Although no formal plans
53 have been presented, the applicants intend to integrate the residence at 1303
54 Foothill Boulevard with the Craftsman Inn. Since the operation would be
55 considered a hotel instead of a bed and breakfast, the properties, which are
56 currently designated residential, must be reclassified to a commercial land use
57 designation and zoning district. The Craftsman Inn property already has a
58 commercial appearance. Designating the properties Downtown Commercial
59 would provide an opportunity to create a development that complements the
60 entry way. Through the redevelopment of the property, there is an opportunity to
61 achieve some of the pedestrian and bicycle improvements that would otherwise
62 not be provided by existing residences. However, the Land Use Element
63 prohibits the loss of housing through its conversion to commercial uses and
64 requires a one-for-one offset, so a replacement unit would need to be provided if
65 the expansion of the Craftsman Inn and conversion of the existing single-family
66 home occurs.

67 In response to a question from **Commissioner Bush**, Mr. Lundquist responded
68 that payment of an in-lieu fee would not be possible as the General Plan policy is
69 worded.

70 In response to questions from **Commissioner Wilkes**, Mr. Lundquist responded
71 that the setbacks for the Downtown Commercial District are less restrictive than
72 the R-1-10 District, however, a 20-foot setback is required from Foothill. The
73 allowable lot coverage and building height are also much more generous. The
74 DC District requires a five-foot side yard setback for the project adjoining a

75 residential district. An existing driveway also provides some separation from the
76 residence to the west.

77 In response to a question from **Commissioner Cooper**, Mr. Lundquist
78 responded that there is no set time frame for the City to consider rezoning the
79 properties back to residential if the project is not developed.

80 In response to a question from **Commissioner Wilkes**, Mr. Lundquist responded
81 that is not possible to “sunset” the reclassifications.

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

83 **Nick Kite**, applicant, reviewed his successful rehabilitation of the Craftsman Inn
84 at an important gateway to town. They would like to incorporate the adjoining
85 residence with the Craftsman Inn and give an integrated appearance to both
86 properties. They will return with specific designs as part of a use permit
87 application once this first step has been taken. They do not intend to construct
88 any buildings that are large or tall; buildings will be low-rise.

89 In response to a question from **Commissioner Wilkes**, Mr. Kite confirmed that
90 he had spoken with the neighbor to the west about his plans. They are on good
91 terms and the neighbor is aware of the proposed reclassifications. The
92 neighbor’s house has very few openings on the side adjoining the subject
93 properties. He will share any future plans with him. **Commissioner Wilkes** urged
94 the applicant to take the neighbor’s property into consideration when developing
95 plans for the project.

96 Mr. Lundquist confirmed that the neighbor in question had received a public
97 hearing notice for the proposed reclassification actions.

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

99 **Commissioner Coates** observed that the city’s housing stock is disappearing to
100 second home owners and the city does not benefit; he could easily see the
101 residence at 1303 Foothill being purchased as a second home. Rezoning the
102 properties to allow further commercial development would at least result in a
103 financial contribution to the community.

104 **Chair Manfredi** opined that the Commission should provide a recommendation
105 to the Council regarding the appropriateness of a development agreement for the
106 reclassifications and project, and comment on the internal conflict in the General
107 Plan as to whether the converted dwelling unit needs to be replaced. An in-lieu
108 housing fee could be exacted through a development agreement. However, he
109 doesn’t think the project is large enough to warrant a development agreement.
110 It’s up to the Council to decide how to make good on the loss of the unit.

111 **Commissioner Wilkes** observed that development agreements are usually
112 triggered by a need for housing for persons that will be employed by a project or
113 to off-set specific costs to the community from a project. Neither of those cases
114 exists in this situation. He supports the reclassification because it would support
115 the project the applicant has in mind, but would like to recommend to the Council

116 that if the project doesn't go forward, the reclassification be revisited after a
117 certain period.

118 **Chair Manfredi** proposed recommending that if the applicant hasn't made any
119 progress within three years on the project in the opinion of the Council, then a
120 possible rezone could be referred to the Commission. There was no objection to
121 this proposal from the applicant.

122 A motion by **Commissioner Wilkes** recommending that the City Council
123 redesignate the properties located at 1213 and 1303 Foothill Boulevard from Low
124 Density Residential to Downtown Commercial General Plan land use designation
125 and to rezone the properties from R-1-10 One-Family Residential to DC
126 Downtown Commercial zoning district, with an additional recommendation that
127 the Council reconsider the reclassifications in three years if no progress has
128 been made on developing the property, was seconded by **Chair Manfredi** and
129 approved unanimously.

130 **H. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS**

131 None.

132 **I. DIRECTOR REPORT**

133 Planning & Building Director Goldberg requested that the Commission cancel its
134 March 11th meeting due to a lack of items that are ready for its consideration, and
135 the Commission concurred.

136 **J. ADJOURNMENT**

137 The meeting was adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Lynn Goldberg
Planning Commission Secretary