

# CITY OF CALISTOGA

## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** CHAIRMAN MANFREDI AND MEMBERS OF THE  
PLANNING COMMISSION

**FROM:** ERIK V. LUNDQUIST, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**MEETING DATE:** FEBRUARY 25, 2009

**SUBJECT:** GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA 2009-02) & ZONING  
ORDINANCE MAP AMENDMENT (ZO 2009-01) FOR  
LANDS OWNED BY CHRISTOPHER AND ADELE  
LAYTON

---

1  
2 **REQUEST**  
3

4 Consideration of an amendment to the General Plan Overlay Districts Map,  
5 Figure LU-6 designating the properties located at 1001 and 1007 Myrtle Street  
6 (APN 011-256-005 & 004) within the Visitor Accommodation Overlay designation.  
7 The Planning Commission will also consider a Rezone (Zoning Ordinance Map  
8 Amendment) of the properties located at 1001, 1007, 1013 Myrtle Street (APN  
9 011-256-005, 004 & 003) including them within the "VA", Visitor Accommodations  
10 combination district. These requests have been filed by the property owners  
11 Christopher and Adele Layton. The proposed amendments to the General Plan  
12 and Zoning Ordinance are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act  
13 (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.  
14

15 **BACKGROUND**  
16

17 This matter was originally scheduled for the February 11, 2009 Planning  
18 Commission meeting. Although, prior to that meeting staff and the Applicants  
19 (Christopher and Adele Layton) requested that this item be continued to tonight's  
20 meeting to allow staff the opportunity to conduct additional research and to  
21 prepare a new staff report. During this time questions have also been raised  
22 regarding the history of land use requests on these properties and the validity of  
23 this current request in light of previous determinations.  
24

25 As a result, this report presents a historical account of the Applicant's land use  
26 requests and seeks to gain direction from the Commission regarding whether or  
27 not an amendment to the General Plan and Zoning District Maps, as requested  
28 by the Applicant or as presented herein, is appropriate at this time considering  
29 the current environment.

30 **HISTORY**

31  
32 The Layton's have had a long standing interest in promoting visitor  
33 accommodation land uses on their Myrtle Street properties (1001, 1007 and 1013  
34 Myrtle Street). Initially during the General Plan update process, the Layton's  
35 raised the question through the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) whether or  
36 not visitor accommodation land uses would be appropriate for this neighborhood.  
37 During the Planning Commission deliberations of February 26, 2003 and October  
38 16, 2002, the Commission determined that a Visitor Accommodation Overlay  
39 land use designation was not appropriate in the area at Pine and Myrtle Street.  
40 The Council agreed with the Commission during the City Council's December 10,  
41 2002 study session, and suggested that site-specific proposals, such as the  
42 Layton's request, be reviewed on a case-by-case basis through individual private  
43 party sponsored applications.<sup>1</sup>

44  
45 On May 22, 2007 the Layton's submitted a conceptual review application to seek  
46 further guidance from the Planning Commission regarding their interests.  
47 Although prior to the matter being considered, the Layton's requested that the  
48 item be tabled until such time that the Urban Design Plan (UDP) is finalized.

49  
50 The City Council directed staff to undertake an assignment established in the  
51 General Plan to develop the UDP for central Calistoga. The purpose of the UDP  
52 was and is to revisit and clarify land use direction and policies for selected areas  
53 in the community to better guide redevelopment and new development efforts to  
54 insure that the character of Calistoga is maintained and enhanced over time.  
55 Throughout this process, the Layton's have submitted several requests for  
56 adding emphasis and/or policies direction in the Draft UDP that would ultimately  
57 support visitor accommodations on their Myrtle Street properties. It should be  
58 noted that the Draft UDP is still under consideration, although, to date the Draft  
59 UDP does not recognize the Layton's properties as requested by the Layton's.

60  
61 As a result of unsuccessful attempts to have their properties designated for  
62 visitor accommodation land uses through these aforementioned City initiated  
63 projects, the Layton's are now sponsoring a request to amend the General Plan  
64 and rezone their properties located at 1001, 1007 and 1013 Myrtle Street so that  
65 they may be developed overtime with visitor accommodation uses.

---

66  
<sup>1</sup> Upon Staff's review of the historical record, it appears that Figure LU-6 of the General Plan Land Use Element has inadvertently included and/or mapped the property located at 1013 Myrtle Street within the Visitor Accommodation Overlay Designation. In light of this information, the property does not appear to be within the Visitor Accommodation Overlay as previously noted in the February 11, 2009 Staff Report.

67 Originally, and as presented in the February 11, 2009 Staff Report, the Layton's  
68 requested an amendment to the General Plan Overlay Districts Map, Figure LU-6  
69 designating the properties within the Visitor Accommodation Overlay designation.  
70 They also have requested a Rezone of the properties to include them within the  
71 "VA", Visitor Accommodations combination district. However as a result of recent  
72 communications and dialogue between Staff and the applicant, it was determined  
73 that rather than present a single option for Commission consideration it would be  
74 more effective to present various land use options for evaluation in order to  
75 determine which option best achieves the City's desire to protect the community  
76 character of the surrounding neighborhood and address the Layton's request to  
77 enhance their properties. As such, Staff is presenting the following land use  
78 options for Commission consideration.

79

### 80 **LAND USE OPTIONS**

81

82 Land Use Option No. 1 (Visitor Accommodation Overlay): This land use option  
83 would entail amending the General Plan Overlay Districts Map, Figure LU-6  
84 designating the properties within the Visitor Accommodation Overlay designation  
85 and a Rezone of the properties to within the "VA", Visitor Accommodations  
86 combination district, as originally requested by the Layton's (see Attachment No.  
87 5).

88

89 As noted above, this option was previously considered by the Commission and  
90 the Council during the General Plan update and was rejected on the basis that  
91 the visitor accommodation land uses would have the potential to alter the  
92 neighborhood character. Although, the Commission may wish to re-evaluate this  
93 determination if it is found that the disposition has changed.

94

95 Land Use Option No. 2 (Planned Development Overlay): This land use option  
96 would entail amending the General Plan designating the properties, or portions  
97 thereof, within the Planned Development (PD) Overlay land use designation and  
98 rezoning the properties within the "PD", Planned Development Zoning District  
99 (see Attachment No. 6).

100

101 As described on Page LU-25 of the General Plan, the PD Overlay land use  
102 designation is applied to large land holdings with unique features, parcels that  
103 are located in sensitive environmental and transitional areas, and in areas where  
104 innovative design standards are to be applied to achieve a superior design or to  
105 permit dedicated affordable housing. Specific guidance for each PD is discussed  
106 further within the General Plan text. There are currently only 3 PD designation  
107 within the City; 1) Bounsall Property, 2) Maxfield / Adams Beverage Company  
108 Properties and 3) Myrtle / Spring Property (Francis House).

109

110 Designating the Layton's properties, or portions thereof, within the PD overlay  
111 land use designation would provide general development goals for the property.  
112 Subsequently, specific development standards would be established to ensure  
113 that the goals were implemented through a rezone to add the PD Zoning District  
114 to the subject properties. The PD Zoning District would clearly define the  
115 purpose and intent of the property and its development limitations or allowances.  
116

117 This particular option is more preferred by the Layton's since they believe that it  
118 will achieve the mutual objectives, as noted in their letter dated February 15,  
119 2009 (see Attachment 1).  
120

121 Land Use Option No. 3 (Commercial Land Use Designation): This land use  
122 option would entail amending the General Plan designating the properties, or  
123 portions thereof, within the Downtown or Community Commercial land use  
124 designation and rezoning the properties within a Commercial Land Use Zoning  
125 District (see Attachment No. 7).  
126

127 Staff finds that this option may not be the most attractive since it is huge  
128 departure from the desired goal to protect the commercial creep into this  
129 primarily residential neighborhood. Although, designating only a small portion  
130 toward the rear of the properties located at 1001 and 1007 may have merit and  
131 perhaps will achieve the mutual objectives without resulting impacts.  
132

133 Land Use Option No. 4 (No Project): This land use option would include no  
134 change to the existing General Plan land use designations and/or zoning  
135 districts. The properties would remain within the High Density Residential/Office  
136 land use designation and "R3", Residential/Professional Office Zoning District.  
137 The only opportunity for additional visitor accommodation units in this scenario  
138 would be for the Layton's to seek entitlements to expand their existing B & B use  
139 on the property located at 1013 Myrtle Street; however, ancillary amenities such  
140 as a pool could not be permitted on an adjoining lot.  
141

## 142 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

143  
144 In light of this additional information and the Applicant's letter dated February 15,  
145 2009, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission evaluate the various land  
146 use options, receive written and oral reports by the Staff, and receive public  
147 testimony. Subsequently, should the Commission find that one particular option  
148 is more desirable, the Commission should instruct Staff to appropriately support  
149 that option and bring it back to the Commission for formal consideration.  
150

## 151 **ATTACHMENTS**

- 152  
153 1. Applicant's written submittal letter dated February 15, 2009

- 154 2. Existing Land Uses Map
- 155 3. Existing General Plan Land Use Designations
- 156 4. General Plan Pages LU 25 through LU 31
- 157 5. Proposed Land Use Option No. 1 (Visitor Accommodation Overlay)
- 158 6. Proposed Land Use Option No. 2 (Planned Development Overlay)
- 159 7. Proposed Land Use Option No. 3 (Commercial Land Use Designation)
- 160 8. Staff Report dated February 11, 2009