

# ROMAN SPA

*Hot Springs Resort*

RECEIVED

AUG 11 2021

City of Calistoga

August 10, 2021

Planning Commission of Calistoga & Planning Director Tusinger  
City of Calistoga  
1232 Washington St.  
Calistoga, CA 94515

RE: August 11, 2021 Public Hearing Item Mt. View Hotel and Restaurant Parking

Dear Commission and Director,

I wish to support the added value of an outdoor dining venue at the Mount View Hotel vs a parking lot; yet since each business needs some level of parking to operate, this change would remove all of their parking.

**The facts as I see it:**

- The Mount View Hotel and Restaurants are on Lincoln Ave. and will need to acquire in lieu parking at the Tier 2 level fee structure.
- This application for permanent use is basically a new and expanded use for the restaurant and appears it should be evaluated in that context. In the past, whenever I have approached the Planning Department, this has always been the method implemented. In this particular case, the expanded use in spaces or footage is not fully cited in the attachments and the public cannot evaluate the amount of additional parking needed. The full amount of the expansion should be identified and delineated for the public. Also, does the application require a reevaluation of the hotel, spa, and the amount of worker parking required? I know I have had to provide this information in the past for our business.
- This expanded business and loss of parking will directly affect the Roman Spa Resort by having added worker parking demand on First St from early morning until at least 10 pm.
- The Parking ordinance states that businesses cannot overlap their time and use of shared parking. Previously, Staff have informed me that hotel parking requirements are 24 hours and thus cannot share parking spaces with any other business during the operation of the hotel. Although I do not agree with this method, I have been informed this is currently how the ordinance was written and is applied. Thus, the restaurant could not use the current hotel spaces in their calculations. The Staff report seems unclear and needs to be further delineated for the public.
- By industry standards, the current Parking Ordinance overstates the parking requirement by more than 23%, however, we all recognize some parking spots are needed. I am concerned that the current ordinance is detrimental to both the City and to businesses. Currently, the Parking Ordinance focuses the City staff on the creation of parking lots with low property assessments rather than vibrant downtown spaces which have more property value and uses (which should be the preferable focus).

- The Parking Ordinance also does not recognize adjacent spaces to a business as being available for use related to parking. Many other communities apply this method.
- There is a burden of ADA handicapped parking that is not being met with this application and has been removed.
- Currently, the only municipal parking available are the Police station or the Fire Station parking lots which are a considerable distance for hotel check in/out but suitable for diners who could walk the block and a half. Maybe a drop off and pickup area should be available at the front of the building to support the hotel guests similar to what European Hotels do in smaller towns.
- Having an outdoor dining area is much more appealing and supportive of a vibrant downtown atmosphere than a parking lot.

Overall, the applicant has requested removal of all parking spaces on the property, a noticeably expanded use of the restaurant, no drop off area, loss of all ADA parking, and a need for in lieu parking due to the loss of spaces and expanded use.

**Current Solutions: In my opinion, there appears to be three options**

1. Apply the Parking Ordinance and evaluate the full in lieu Tier 2 parking fee on the lost spaces and the expansion of both the restaurant with evaluation of the properties full parking needs.
2. Throw out the Parking Ordinance and create a system to accommodate some parking and some in lieu parking, which may be difficult to administer.
3. The applicant comes to some agreement contractually with the City in a Development Agreement.

**Best Solution:**

1. The best solution would be to revamp the parking ordinance, yet this will not help this application.

**My Suggestions:**

- Some available parking should be entertained if possible, especially with ADA spaces.
- If all parking is to be removed, application of the Tier 2 level parking fees would apply.
- The ADA Parking still needs to find a home; will the City charge an extra in lieu fee to create this ADA parking in front of the Hotel? Is it possible to immediately apply these in lieu funds to the Fairway extension thus the City and business community would see 50-80 spaces created fairly quickly for \$200,000 to \$350,000 in estimated fees? It seems that paving this area would be more effective than purchasing property to create parking lots.
- Maybe the Hotel could mitigate or discount some of the costs by voluntarily instituting a guest fee to be given to the City such as \$5-8 a room per night for the parking impact. This fee would immediately go into a fund that goes directly to paving a new City parking lot such as the Fairway extension.
- Change the City Parking tier structure. Possibly adding a new middle tier (maybe \$10-12,000) for walkable guests who could park at the Fire Station lot and walk to the restaurants and spa.

I hope the City and Mount View can negotiate a combination of methods that will work, otherwise, it appears this issue should be delayed by extending the temporary time period until the City revamps its Parking Ordinance or proposes expanding the public lots to benefit everyone.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael Quast". The signature is written in black ink and features a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right from the end of the name.

Michael Quast