



City of Calistoga
Planning Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DATE

August 24, 2016

ITEM

Draft Minutes of July 27, 2016 Meeting

RECOMMENDATION

Approve minutes with any necessary changes

MINUTES

CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION

July 27, 2016

1 **A. ROLL CALL**

2 Commissioners present: Vice Chair Tim Wilkes, Alissa McNair, Scott Cooper,
3 Walter Abernathy. Absent: Chair Paul Coates (excused). Staff present: Planning and
4 Building Director Lynn Goldberg, Senior Planner Erik Lundquist.

5 **B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

6 **C. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

7 None.

8 **D. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA**

9 The meeting agenda of July 27, 2016 was accepted as presented.

10 **E. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE**

11 None.

12 **F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

13 **1. Planning Commission Minutes**

14 The minutes for the May 25, 2016 meeting were unanimously adopted as
15 presented.

16 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

17 **1. Rancho de Calistoga Street Vacation SV 2016-1:** Consideration of a General
18 Plan consistency determination for a proposal to abandon/vacate a public right-
19 of-way within the Rancho de Calistoga Mobile Home Park at 2412 Foothill Blvd.

20 Senior Planner Lundquist presented the staff report for the application. The
21 mobile home park was approved in the 1970s with a condition that required the
22 dedication of a right-of-way to connect Cedar Street to then-vacant property that
23 was subsequently developed with the Heather Oaks Subdivision. The street
24 connection was never improved and the park manager's unit was inadvertently
25 placed on the ROW. It also accommodated a water line that was recently
26 relocated within a recorded easement. The Commission is charged with making
27 a recommendation to the City Council whether the requested vacation is
28 consistent with the General Plan.

29 **Vice Chair Wilkes** open and closed the public hearing after there were no
30 comments.

31 A motion by **Commissioner McNair** and seconded by **Commissioner**
32 **Abernathy** to adopt a resolution recommending to the City Council that the
33 vacation of an unnamed paper street and utility easement located at 2412

34 Foothill Boulevard is consistent with the Calistoga General Plan was approved
35 unanimously.

36 2. **Aubert Winery Expansion UP 2016-3 & Design Review DR 2016-11:**
37 Consideration of use permit and design review applications allowing an increase
38 in production up to 30,000 gallons annually and an addition of 10,080 square feet
39 for new tank rooms, office space and covered crush pad at 333 Silverado Trail

40 Senior Planner Lundquist presented the staff report for the applications. He
41 corrected the requested number of cases and the amount of additional floor area,
42 which differ from the agenda summary and staff report's figures. The project site
43 is located in a two-parcel planned development zoning district, which was
44 created in 2002 and at the time reflected a very conservative approach to
45 agriculture protection by requiring that agriculture be the predominant use on the
46 two-acre property. Since the district's creation, the 2003 General Plan was
47 adopted and addresses the preservation of agriculture more broadly and not on a
48 site-specific basis. Therefore, the property's zoning provisions appear to be
49 inconsistent with the General Plan. In order for the project to proceed, the
50 language requiring that agriculture be the predominant use on the property needs
51 to be removed from the district's regulations through a Zoning Code amendment.
52 Removing the agriculture requirement would also allow more parking to be
53 provided, which would minimize the current practice of employees parking along
54 the access easement from Silverado Trail. This planned development zoning
55 district does not have an associated grape-sourcing requirement; however, the
56 applicant would be willing to comply with the standard. Staff is seeking direction
57 from staff regarding the potential Zoning Code amendment.

58 In response to a question from **Commissioner Cooper** regarding why the
59 vineyard had been removed from the property if agriculture was required on-site,
60 Mr. Lundquist replied that staff only became aware of it when this application was
61 filed.

62 In response to a question from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, Mr. Lundquist confirmed that
63 the applicants propose to apply the grape-sourcing requirement only to the
64 increased production and not to retroactively apply it to current production.

65 **Vice Chair Wilkes** opened the public hearing.

66 **Donna Oldford**, representing Aubert Winery, reiterated that no increase in
67 employees or visitors is requested. The applications would allow only for
68 increased production and storage, and safety improvements. Additional parking
69 would allow the separation of employee and visitor parking. The applicant
70 understands the need and basis for revising the zoning district's language to
71 remove the agricultural predominance requirement. The proposed project would
72 then be consistent with the General Plan. Having to enforce the 51% requirement
73 for on-site agriculture would jeopardize a large number of oak trees. She
74 reiterated that the parcel is not located in the General Plan's Entry Corridor
75 overlay.

76 **Commissioner McNair** asked about the proposal to replace the former
77 grapevines with olive trees.

78 Paul Bartelt, Bartelt Engineering, responded that olives are a more-feasible use
79 of on-site treated wastewater disposal. Grapes would be lower-quality because of
80 the amount of wastewater that would be applied to them. Olives could be sold or
81 olive oil could be produced.

82 **Vice Chair Wilkes** asked that if the zoning district is revised to remove the
83 agriculture requirement, is it still the intention of the applicants to plant olive
84 trees. He is concerned about intermingling them with the property's oak
85 woodland and feels that the priority should be protecting the woodland while
86 accommodating wastewater disposal.

87 Mr. Bartelt responded that irrigation is only one of many wastewater disposal
88 options, such as disposal into the municipal sewer or a subsurface disposal
89 system. He believes that whatever wastewater disposal option is pursued, it can
90 be done in a manner that avoids removing any oak trees. In response to a
91 question from Mr. Lundquist about the potential effect on the number and size of
92 the proposed irrigation water storage tanks if the agriculture requirement is
93 removed, Mr. Bartelt responded that it is likely that the tanks would be reduced
94 since the irrigation need would be lowered.

95 Ms. Oldford indicated that the applicants want to maintain the option of a hold-
96 and-haul approach to the winery's wastewater, especially since it's a very small
97 operation and there are good traffic conditions on Silverado Trail.

98 **Vice Chair Wilkes** expressed concerns about fire suppression and whether the
99 Fire Department would have sufficient access to the back of the enlarged
100 building. In response to questions from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, Ms. Oldford
101 explained that the applicants want a more-efficient means of handling
102 fermentation and storage, and there is a need for additional space even if they
103 weren't planning on increasing production.

104 Joshua Lowell, Aubert Winery, advised that they have come close to producing
105 10,000 cases, which is 400 barrels. It's not a comfortable situation in the existing
106 facility.

107 Mr. Lundquist noted that the crush operations that are currently occurring outside
108 could be moved inside if the building is enlarged.

109 Mr. Bartelt reported that with additional parking at the rear of building, a fire
110 equipment turnaround area could be provided. Three irrigation storage tanks
111 could be removed if the agriculture requirement is removed. Crushing activities
112 would be inside or under a covered area, in compliance with state regulations.

113 In response to questions from **Commissioner McNair**, Mr. Bartelt clarified that
114 the resulting lot coverage with the proposed building expansion would be 19.8%,
115 which is below the maximum 25% allowed by the Zoning Code.

116 **Vice Chair Wilkes** closed the public hearing and asked for commissioner
117 comments.

118 **Commissioner Abernathy** supports the elimination of the agriculture
119 requirement for the zoning district.

120 **Commissioner Cooper** wants the 75% Napa Valley grape-sourcing requirement
121 applied to the winery's increased production. He likes the preservation of the
122 property's oak woodland rather than the planting of olive trees.

123 **Commissioner McNair** supports removal of the agriculture requirement because
124 it applies only to this parcel and there would be no problem with lot coverage.
125 Most of the site will remain in open space.

126 **Vice Chair Wilkes** supports removal of the agriculture requirement; it appears to
127 be a bit of a dinosaur. The amendment would bring the City more into
128 conformance with the County's approach to a similar project. He favors making
129 woodland preservation a primary goal for the project; any subsequent agriculture
130 should be subservient. The applicant should work with staff to provide adequate
131 fire equipment access to address potential perimeter fires, since the property
132 backs up to a large open space. He views the project as completion of the
133 building rather than an expansion of it.

134 It was the consensus of the Commission to support a Zoning Code amendment
135 to eliminate the zoning district's agriculture requirement.

136 **H. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS**

137 None.

138 **I. DIRECTOR REPORT**

139 Planning and Building Director Goldberg reported that there are no items ready to be
140 agendized for the August 10 meeting and the Commission agreed to cancel the
141 meeting.

142 **J. ADJOURNMENT**

143 The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Lynn Goldberg, Secretary