



City of Calistoga
Planning Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DATE

April 12, 2017

ITEM

Draft Minutes of March 22, 2017 Meeting

RECOMMENDATION

Approve minutes with any necessary changes

MINUTES

CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION

March 22, 2017

A. ROLL CALL

1 Commissioners present: Chair Paul Coates, Vice Chair Tim Wilkes, Alissa McNair,
2 Walter Abernathy, Scott Cooper. Absent: None. Staff present: Planning and Building
3 Director Lynn Goldberg, Senior Planner Erik Lundquist.

4 B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

5 C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

6 None.

7 D. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

8 The meeting agenda of March 22, 2017 was accepted as presented.

9 E. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

10 A letter from Don Williams was distributed to the Commission regarding Item G.2.

11 F. CONSENT CALENDAR

12 1. Minutes for the February 22, 2017 Planning Commission meeting

13 The minutes were adopted as presented.

14 G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

15 1. **RO Repair (UP 2017-3):** Consideration of a use permit application to allow the
16 operation of an automotive and agricultural equipment repair business at 1506
17 Grant Street

18 **Senior Planner Erik Lundquist** presented the staff report. The business
19 provides an important service to the agricultural community. A limited amount of
20 work will occur outside of the building.

21 In response to a question from **Commissioner Abernathy** about future plans for
22 the property, Mr. Lundquist replied that no formal application had been filed yet
23 with the City. The tenant is aware of the possibility and has a short-term lease.
24 The exact improvements that the business will have to make to address the
25 safety requirements will likely be limited.

26 **Chair Coates** opened the public hearing.

27 **Adiran Orozco**, applicant, described his business as primarily doing mobile
28 repairs for large agricultural equipment. They have a need for doing work in a
29 sheltered area at times.

30 In response to questions from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, Mr. Orozco gave examples of
31 the largest vehicles they work on. All of their operations are located at the rear of
32 the building. They do not propose any signage because they are not open to the

33 public. Mr. Lundquist confirmed that the driveway is large enough to
34 accommodate the vehicles worked on by the business.

35 **Lori Bachman**, resident of 1508 Grant and also representing John Manderfeld,
36 is concerned about the proximity of the business to the schools and possible
37 safety problems. Grant Street is heavily traveled by vehicles, pedestrians and
38 cyclists. She is also concerned about noise in proximity to residents.

39 **Rita Squire**, co-owner of an adjacent building at 213 Wappo, observed that there
40 are already activities of this type on the site. A very loud pressure washer is
41 being used on a concrete pad and she is concerned about where the runoff goes.
42 She would like to see some baffling on the building to muffle the noise. She
43 asked how noise associated with outside repairs be monitored. She disagrees
44 with staff's finding that there are no sensitive noise receptors in the vicinity. She
45 asked about the length of the use permit's approval. Approval of the application
46 could be precedent-setting for adjoining vacant properties, which could be
47 developed with additional service businesses. She would like to see compliance
48 with several of the conditions of approval immediately, rather than within a longer
49 time frame.

50 **Shawn Paris** is an esthetician has a treatment room located on the second floor
51 of the adjoining building on Wappo that directly faces the business. There are
52 other noise-sensitive businesses in her building, such as yoga instructors and
53 massage therapists. This is not an appropriate location for the proposed
54 business due to its loud noise levels. She asked the Commission to consider the
55 impacts on other businesses.

56 **Ed Johnson**, owner of the office building at 211 Wappo, has an office on the
57 second floor overlooking the subject property. All of the tenants on the ground
58 floor are customer-serving businesses. He is concerned about fairly-loud noise
59 from equipment and air brakes that affect the value of the building's rents.

60 **Ron Rose**, massage therapist in the building at 213 Wappo, is greatly affected
61 by the noise. There is a lot of late afternoon noise from backing vehicles and
62 pressure washing. He is concerned about the business's use of toxic fumes and
63 materials, and air guns. This use is not compatible with his business and clients.
64 The area is becoming a health and healing center.

65 **Mr. Orozco** noted that there is a proposed condition of approval that prohibits
66 any on-site washing. There are also two tree companies occupying the property
67 that have trucks, which also contribute to the noise levels. They have been in
68 operation at this location for two years. They are willing to work to muffle noise as
69 much as possible. Also, they don't need to work outside and confine their
70 activities to within the building.

71 Mr. Lundquist reported that no noise complaints have been received about the
72 business since they have been in operation. He confirmed that pressure washing
73 would be prohibited by the proposed condition of approval. He explained that the

74 use permit would run with the property and would be active as long as this or a
75 similar business was in operation.

76 **Chair Coates** closed the public hearing.

77 In response to questions from **Commission Abernathy**, Mr. Lundquist
78 acknowledged that the maximum noise levels of 80 dBA at the property line, as
79 provided in the General Plan, could be enforced for the business.

80 In response to a question from **Commissioner Cooper**, Mr. Lundquist
81 acknowledged that there was a long history of unauthorized uses on the
82 property. The City is in frequent contact with the property owner to keep
83 unauthorized uses under control. He wasn't aware that Davey Tree Care Service
84 was operating on the site. The applicant was unaware that a use permit was
85 needed for his business and promptly filed an application when he was informed
86 of the requirement to obtain such a permit.

87 **Commissioner McNair** observed that it appears that the three tenants on the
88 property are all contributing to noise. Neighbors need to contact the City with
89 concerns or they won't know about it. The General Plan and Zoning Code allows
90 the proposed uses.

91 **Commissioner Abernathy** believes that the existing noise limitation of 80 dBA is
92 being exceeded. Mr. Lundquist suggests incorporating this limitation as a
93 condition of the use permit.

94 **Vice Chair Wilkes** wonders how the requirement could be imposed on one
95 tenant. It seems to be noises from the outdoor activities that are a concern, and it
96 appears that the applicant is willing to confine repair activities to indoors. It is
97 difficult to address back-up bell noises from trucks. Welding and cutting are not
98 noisy operations. He supports the proposed 80 dBA limitation at the property line.
99 The business has been in operation for several years, and the City operates on a
100 complaint-driven basis. Any use permit is revocable if its conditions are not
101 complied with, so complaints are one way for the City to know of violations. He
102 doesn't think that the statutory requirements contained in the conditions of
103 approval can be expedited; standards and criteria for hazardous materials have
104 to be met or the business cannot operate. Mr. Lundquist acknowledged that it
105 would be challenging to monitor the noise associated with the business alone,
106 but it could be investigated.

107 **Commissioner Cooper** noted that now that the City is aware of the business, it
108 can take steps to mitigate the noise associated with it. He supports the use
109 permit application.

110 **Chair Coates** observed that the applicant is willing to take steps, such as
111 installing insulation, to help address noise concerns. It sounds like there are
112 other businesses on the property with lots of related truck traffic that do not have
113 approval to be operating there. Staff needs to investigate these uses and
114 determine whether they are legally allowed to operate at this location.

115 A motion by **Commissioner McNair** and seconded by **Commissioner Cooper**
116 to adopt a resolution allowing the operation of an automotive and agricultural
117 equipment repair business at 1506 Grant Street, **with amendments per staff**, was
118 approved unanimously.

119 2. **Sunburst Restaurant and Guest Rooms (UP 2017-4 & DR 2017-3):**
120 Consideration of use permit and design review applications to allow 1) demolition
121 of the former restaurant building and 2) replacement with a two-story structure
122 with a restaurant on the ground floor and 12 guest units above located at 1880
123 Lincoln Avenue

124 Mr. Lundquist presented the staff report.

125 **Vice Chair Wilkes** reported that at the request of staff and on behalf of the City,
126 he was involved in discussions about the massing and three-dimensional aspects
127 of the building early in the design process.

128 **Chair Coates** opened the public hearing.

129 **Christian Strobel**, one of the project's owners, reviewed the project and the
130 design considerations that went into it. They originally planned to retain the
131 existing building, but decided that it wasn't practical due to its deteriorated
132 condition and that the proposed replacement building would improve the
133 appearance of the property. Scaling up the existing lodging rooms' design to two-
134 story would have appeared too boxy, so the proposed design breaks up the roof
135 line and massing. They've tried to keep some of the older character by using
136 board and batten siding, and a narrow corrugated metal roof. They deliberately
137 decided not to mimic the design of the existing buildings because they are not
138 attractive; however, the existing roof angles are reflected in the design. He
139 believes the concerns raised in Mr. Williams' letter will be addressed by the
140 project design as far as possible. They will cover the exterior lights so that they
141 project downward. Those will be installed with the landscaping improvements. He
142 agrees with staff's recommendation to maintain the northernmost driveway. The
143 southernmost driveway will be closed to simplify project access and minimize
144 crossing points over the pathway that will be constructed across the frontage.

145 In response to a question from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, the applicant confirmed that
146 samples of the project's actual colors and materials will be provided with the
147 building permit application.

148 **Jarrod Denton**, Signum Architecture, provided additional details of the project
149 design, including exterior materials and lighting. It will be possible to view through
150 the building to the pool area, which will be more engaging for the public than the
151 existing building. The design will be an appropriate transition to the nearby
152 agricultural area.

153 **Don Williams**, 59 View Road, can see the property from his home and
154 appreciates the owners' efforts to keep the lighting subdued. He likes the simple
155 and clean design lines of the existing motor court. It reflects the authentic style of

156 that period, contrasted with what people think Napa Valley architecture should
157 look like. The proposed building design isn't offensive, but it doesn't have the
158 same authenticity. He researched two-story motor court designs, and none have
159 wood, which is a contemporary feature. The siding on the mid-century designs
160 was always horizontal, which conflicts with the proposed vertical siding. He would
161 like to see simpler and cleaner lines on the building. The barn door and stained
162 siding is clearly incompatible with the mid-century look.

163 **Christian Strobel** agrees with some of Mr. Williams' points; he loves the motor
164 court look, too. However, he believes the proposed design features are
165 appropriate. He disagrees that the existing building is attractive and thinks that it
166 gives a very closed appearance to the public.

167 **Chair Coates** closed the public hearing.

168 **Vice Chair Wilkes** agrees that some of the proposed materials and elements of
169 the building's design are not authentic to the motor court design; however, the
170 intent is to morph into a more-contemporary spa/lodging facility. the proposed
171 design is successful in presenting a primarily one-story appearance to the street.
172 The scale is very close to what the rest of the facility is. He's very comfortable
173 with the massing. Calistoga is extremely eclectic in terms of design. He would not
174 want a 1940s-era building recreated on the site.

175 **Commissioner McNair** is a bit disappointed that the existing mid-century
176 building will be replaced with a contemporary ranch-style building, but thinks the
177 proposed design is very well-done and incorporates what is becoming known as
178 Napa Valley style. She has no problems with the massing and can't fault the
179 owners for wanting to modernize and construct what works best for them in the
180 future. She is somewhat concerned about the use of repetitive square windows,
181 which gives it a bit of a garage look, but that appearance will be addressed by
182 the materials and colors, and the low-slung design. She noted that even lighting
183 compliant with Dark Sky standards can be very bright.

184 **Commissioner Cooper** thinks the design brings the whole property into balance
185 and will provide a much-needed improvement to this entrance to town and to the
186 property.

187 **Chair Coates** agrees that the existing building is unattractive and that the
188 proposed replacement is an improvement. Controlling exterior lighting is very
189 important to minimize impacts on neighbors.

190 A motion by **Vice Chair Wilkes** and seconded by **Commissioner Cooper** to
191 adopt a resolution approving Use Permit 2017-4 and Design Review 2017-3 at
192 1880 Lincoln Avenue was approved unanimously.

193 H. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS

194 None

196 **I. DIRECTOR REPORT**

197 Ms. Goldberg advised the Commission that it appeared the City Council intended to
198 follow its recommendation to allow the outdoor cultivation of up to two marijuana
199 plants per household.

200 **J. ADJOURNMENT**

201 The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Lynn Goldberg, Secretary