

CITY OF CALISTOGA

STAFF REPORT

TO: CHAIR MANFREDI AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ERIK V. LUNDQUIST, SENIOR PLANNER

MEETING DATE: NOVEMBER 18, 2015

SUBJECT: CALISTOGA PET CLINIC – 2960 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD
USE PERMIT AMENDMENT UP 2014-15, VARIANCE
VA 2014-3 AND PARCEL MAP PM 2014-1

1 ITEM

2 Consideration of a parcel map to divide the property located at 2960 Foothill Boulevard
3 into 2 parcels, and a use permit amendment and variance to allow the existing
4 veterinary clinic to be located on a 1-acre parcel.

5 BACKGROUND AND REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

6 On December 10, 2014, the Planning Commission considered the subject applications
7 and, following the public hearing, continued the items in order to address concerns
8 raised by the Planning Commission and the public regarding drainage and vehicular
9 access.

10 On October 8, 2015, the applicant resubmitted a revised Project Description, Tentative
11 Parcel Map, Arborist's Report, Stormwater Control Plan and Drainage Analysis. The
12 revised Tentative Map proposes to divide the property into two parcels: a 1-acre parcel
13 containing the veterinary clinic (Parcel 1) and a vacant 1.16-acre parcel (Parcel 2). The
14 vacant parcel is intended for residential development but would be sold undeveloped.

15 Access to the vacant parcel would be via a 23-foot wide panhandle portion of Parcel 2
16 containing drainage, a 20-foot wide chip-seal driveway and utility easement in favor of
17 Parcel 1. City water would also be extended along the southeastern property line to
18 service future development and a new septic system would be installed for sewage
19 disposal on Parcel 2. The water line would be stubbed out to Parcel 2 prior to
20 recordation of the parcel map and the septic system would be installed at time of
21 development on Parcel 2. The existing septic system and trash enclosure on Parcel 1
22 would be relocated to accommodate the proposed driveway and utility improvements.

23 A use permit amendment and variance are still warranted in order to allow a veterinary
24 clinic on a 1-acre parcel. The use permit amendment is necessary in order to find that a
25 1-acre parcel is an appropriately-sized lot for a veterinary clinic since the Planning
26 Commission originally approved the use permit finding that the 2-acre parcel was
27 appropriate. The variance is necessary to allow the reduced parcel size rather than the

28 minimum lot size of 2 acres, as required for veterinary clinics in the RR District per CMC
29 Section 17.14.020(B)(3)(a).

30 **ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

31 A thorough analysis of the project was presented to the Planning Commission on
32 December 10, 2014 (Attachment 5). Much of the analysis and the recommended
33 conditions of approval are still applicable to the revised project. As such, the following
34 only addresses the concerns raised during the December 10, 2014 meeting and/or
35 matters resulting from the revised tentative parcel map. The draft resolutions show
36 modifications based upon the revised project in tracked changes.

37 Drainage: Hogan Land Services has prepared a preliminary drainage analysis based
38 on the revised parcel map and in conformance with the City's stormwater regulations.
39 To ensure that the post-construction runoff does not exceed the pre-construction runoff,
40 the existing retention basin will be removed and replaced with three bioretention areas.
41 New flowlines, piping and asphalt berms would also be installed to direct runoff to
42 acceptable locations. Drainage easements would be provided to convey stormwater
43 from Parcel 1 across Parcel 2.

44 Additionally, since the design and functionality of the drainage system depends on
45 periodic maintenance, a condition of approval has been incorporated into the project
46 requiring a maintenance agreement, which would include cleaning and ensuring flows at
47 the northeast corner of the property are not obstructed (there is a fence in the drainage
48 ditch at this location that catches debris).

49 The preliminary drainage study demonstrates that the drainage system will not result in
50 impacts. As such, staff is of the opinion that the Planning Commission can find that the
51 two 1-acre project sites are suitable and can accommodate the existing and anticipated
52 development, as conditioned.

53 Vehicular Access: The revised project would place the driveway and emergency vehicle
54 access (EVA) within the panhandle portion of Parcel 2. An EVA turnaround would also
55 be constructed near the shared property line between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. The Fire
56 Chief has reviewed this proposal and finds it acceptable. The revised proposal also has
57 less impact on trees and utilities, with exception to the proposed privacy screening
58 along the southern boundary.

59 The proposed privacy screening along the southeastern property boundary would
60 impact many oak trees. This fence does not appear to be necessary. The existing solid
61 wood-board fence should remain and/or be replaced in its current location after the
62 construction of the driveway. In the event that the fence does not allow a full 20-foot
63 wide driveway, the fence may be installed on top of the proposed asphalt berm.
64 Furthermore, since development is not proposed on Parcel 2, the privacy screening is
65 not necessary beyond the existing fence line. Agricultural fencing should be used in this
66 area to maintain the rural landscape.

67 Although the proposed driveway would serve the primary access needs of Parcel 1 and
68 2, the access easement over the adjoining property to the west would still exist. The

69 property owners may wish to exercise their right to use this easement in the future but
70 since it is unknown at this time if the property owners would use this easement,
71 roadway improvements are not warranted. Moreover, the maintenance agreement for
72 the easement already includes provisions for improvement and maintenance. The
73 affected property owners may wish to invoke the agreement, which would require the
74 property owner to contribute to the maintenance fund. As an alternative, the property
75 owners may wish to terminate the easement since adequate access would be provided
76 along the southern property boundary.

77 **FINDINGS**

78 To reduce repetition, all of the appropriate findings are contained in the attached
79 resolutions.

80 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

81 To date, no written comments have been received regarding the subject applications.

82 **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

83 These actions are not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under
84 Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines because it can be seen with certainty that
85 there is no possibility that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

86 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7 1. Approve the use permit amendment and variance with conditions
- 88 2. Approve the proposed parcel map with conditions

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Draft Use Permit Amendment and Variance Resolution (Tracked Changes Version)
3. Draft Use Permit Amendment and Variance Resolution (Clean Version)
4. Draft Parcel Map Resolution (Tracked Changes Version)
5. Draft Parcel Map Resolution (Clean Version)
6. Planning Commission Staff Report dated December 10, 2014
7. Planning Commission minutes excerpt
8. Project Description received October 8, 2015
9. Tentative Parcel Map received October 8, 2015
10. Arborist's Report received October 8, 2015
11. Drainage Analysis received October 8, 2015
12. Stormwater Control Plan received October 8, 2015

