



City of Calistoga
Building Standards Advisory and Appeals Board
Agenda Item Summary

DATE	April 11, 2018
ITEM	Minutes of February 1, 2017 Meeting
RECOMMENDATION	Accept minutes with any necessary changes

MINUTES

CALISTOGA BUILDING STANDARDS ADVISORY AND APPEALS BOARD

February 1, 2017

1 **A. ROLL CALL**

2 Board Members present: Chair Paul Coates, Vice Chair Tim Wilkes, Jim Flamson,
3 Shelby Valentine, Bill Nance, Beverly More. Absent: Kate Coates (excused). Staff
4 present: Planning & Building Director Lynn Goldberg; Building Official Brad Cannon,
5 Fire Chief Steve Campbell.

6 **B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

7 None.

8 **C. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA**

9 The meeting agenda of February 1, 2017 was accepted as presented.

10 **D. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE**

11 None.

12 **E. CONSENT CALENDAR**

13 **1. Minutes**

14 The minutes for the November 3, 2016 Board meeting were unanimously
15 adopted as presented.

16 **F. NEW BUSINESS**

17 **1. Election of 2017 Board Officers**

18 Board Member Coates was re-elected as Chair. Board Member Wilkes was re-
19 elected as Vice Chair.

20 **2. Extensions for Compliance with Seismic Retrofit Regulations:** Consider
21 approving time extensions for compliance with unreinforced masonry seismic
22 upgrade plan submittal deadline

23 **Board Members Nance and More** recused themselves from this item due to
24 economic conflicts of interest.

25 Building Official Cannon presented the staff report on the requested time
26 extensions for two unreinforced masonry buildings.

27 In response to a question from **Board Member Valentine**, Planning & Building
28 Director Goldberg explained that staff will require input from a qualified
29 architectural historian on any proposed alterations to the two structures related to
30 the seismic retrofits because they have been to be historically-significant.

31 In response to a question from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, Mr. Cannon explained the
32 coordination that will have to occur during retrofitting of the two adjacent
33 buildings.

34 **Bill Nance**, representing both properties, explained that the building at 1339
35 Lincoln Avenue does not have a northern wall and that the southern wall of the
36 building at 1343-1347 Lincoln Avenue supports the building's roof. The
37 improvements need to happen simultaneously to avoid a hazardous situation.

38 In response to a question from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, Mr. Cannon confirmed that
39 the property owner of the 1339 Lincoln building or his agent haven't provided
40 support for the statement in the time extension request regarding their inability to
41 obtain financing for the retrofit.

42 In response to a question from **Chair Coates** regarding the anticipated timeframe
43 for the retrofit work from start to finish, Mr. Nance explained that the property
44 owners are still considering options, so there are no preliminary timeframes at
45 this point. The spa building has many challenges, including its structural integrity
46 and the many alterations that have occurred over the years.

47 **Chair Coates** expressed concern about the potential negative effective by
48 historic conservation measures on the feasibility of the retrofits.

49 **Board Member Flamson** suggested giving both buildings six-month time
50 extensions, since it seems that more than six weeks will be needed to prepare
51 plans for the 1339 Lincoln building. **Chair Coates** noted that they can request
52 another extension, if necessary.

53 **Bruce Kendall**, owner of the 1339 Lincoln Avenue building, explained that it is a
54 very complicated building and he would like to request a six-month extension
55 rather than the originally-requested timeframe. He believes that it will have to be
56 a separate building, which it is not currently; it's the only safe and sensible way to
57 do it. The building's stones are very large and in poor condition.

58 **Mr. Nance** shared that they were considering keeping the front façade and
59 constructing a new building behind it.

60 **Board Member Valentine** believes that public safety should trump historic
61 concerns. The question of whether the building should be demolished should be
62 left to the Building Official to determine.

63 **Vice Chair Wilkes** wants to ensure that this unsafe condition is addressed within
64 the six-month time extension period. He asked for monthly progress/status
65 reports. Mr. Kendall agreed to the request and reiterated his desire to demolish
66 the building to correct the unsafe situation.

67 A motion by **Board Member Valentine** and seconded by **Vice Chair Wilkes** to
68 adopt a resolution approving compliance extensions for the unreinforced
69 masonry buildings located at 1339 Lincoln and 1343-1347 Lincoln, amended to

70 reflect a six-month extension for 1339 Lincoln and a requirement for monthly
71 progress/status reports on the property's retrofit, was approved unanimously.

72 3. **Policies, Procedures and Interpretations:** Discussion regarding potential
73 topics for the adoption of policies, procedures and interpretations

74 Mr. Cannon explained that the purpose of adopting policies, procedures and
75 interpretations is to help provide guidance on implementing the building and
76 safety codes. He listed those that are currently in place. He asked the Board
77 members to share with him any issues that need to be addressed in this manner.

78 4. **Unreasonable Hardship Request – 1422 Lincoln Avenue (Azusa)**

79 **Board Members More and Flamson** recused themselves from the item due to
80 potential conflicts of interest.

81 Mr. Cannon presented the staff report. He recommends that the Board finds that
82 it would be an unreasonable hardship for the business to alter the business's
83 entrance to meet accessibility standards due to the disproportional cost of the
84 required improvements to the overall project cost.

85 In response to a question from **Board Member Valentine**, Mr. Cannon confirmed
86 that the request is identical to a previous situation with the ramp angle at Pacifico
87 Restaurant.

88 In response to a question from **Vice Chair Wilkes**, Mr. Cannon confirmed that it
89 would cost more than 20% of the total project cost to mitigate the accessibility
90 barrier. The path of travel within the store is being improved to facilitate
91 accessibility but there are no other improvements that can be made.

92 **Beverly More**, architect for the project, explained that they are closing the
93 second entrance to the tenant space because there is a step. The one under
94 discussion is more accessible. They plan to smooth out the threshold to improve
95 accessibility. The ramp is in the Caltrans right-of-way.

96 **Chair Coates** cautioned that is very difficult and time-consuming to work with
97 Caltrans. Modifying the threshold so that it slopes more gently would improve
98 access and would have a nominal cost..

99 In response to a question from **Vice Chair Wilkes** as to whether the ramp could
100 be extended into the store, Ms. More explained that it is prohibitive cost-wise
101 because they would have to cut into the floor and lower the door. It would cost
102 much more than the 20% of the project cost that they are required to spend.

103 **Mr. Flamson** reported that he tried to figure out how to get rid of the ramp for
104 many years because it's a trip hazard. He's tried to block it with a potted plant but
105 Caltrans makes him remove it.

106 A motion by **Board Member Valentine** and seconded by **Chair Coates** to
107 approve the unreasonable hardship application, with a requirement to modify the

108 door sill to improve accessibility, was approved unanimously (abstentions by
109 Flamson, More).

110 **G. MATTERS INITIATED BY BOARD MEMBERS**

111 None

112 **H. BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT**

113 Mr. Cannon shared information and materials from recent trainings that he had
114 attended.

115 **I. ADJOURNMENT**

116 The meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Brad Cannon, Board Secretary