

# City of Calistoga Planning Commission Agenda Item Summary

**DATE** January 26, 2022

ITEM Review Compliance with Conditions of

Approval, Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-0, and Design Review DR 2021-2 – Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12

APPLICANT Syed (Rick) Ali

PROPERTY ADDRESS 345 Silverado Trail

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOS. 011-050-032

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION Rural Residential

**ZONING DISTRICT** PD 2002-2 Maxfield Planned Development

**District** 

STAFF CONTACT Samantha Thomas, Associate Planner

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS None

**RECOMMENDATION** Consider approving the use permit amendment

and design review with conditions (including prohibiting aviaries, open flame on entry gate and relocation of metal barn outside setbacks.)

SUGGESTED MOTION "I move that the Planning Commission adopt a

Resolution approving a use permit amendment and design review application subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in the Resolution for the property located at 345 Silverado Trail."

# CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

To: Calistoga Planning Commission

From: Jeff Mitchem, Planning & Building Director

Samantha Thomas, Associate Planner

Meeting Date: January 26, 2022

Subject: Review Compliance with Conditions of Approval

Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 & Design Review DR 2021-2

Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12

#### INTRODUCTION

14

15

16

17

This continuation item is a concurrent Use Permit Amendment and Design Review 2 application (submitted September 24, 2021) to legalize several unpermitted improvements to a 7.37-acre parcel (APN 011-050-032) at 345 Silverado Trail (see 4 Attachment 1 for Resolution PC 2022-XX). At the October 13, 2021 public hearing, the Planning Commission considered compliance of the improvements with Title 17 Zoning 6 of the Calistoga Municipal Code (CMC.) Also discussed during the hearing were alleged violations to other CMC titles for which the Planning Commission is not the administering 8 or enforcing body. After presentations and considering public comments, Staff requested that the Planning Commission continue the item to October 27, 2021, to allow time to 10 coordinate with the Applicant and discuss with the City Attorney. Refer to Attachment 2 11 for Staff Report - October 13, 2021 Planning Commission Hearing, Applicant's Updated 12 Action Items Letter, and Public Comments. 13

During coordination, the Applicant conveyed their intent to comply with CMC requirements, thereby obviating the need for several use permit amendments and clarifying the violation resolution process. The Applicant submitted all required documentation demonstrating compliance with the CMC by December 22, 2021.

Based on new information submitted by the applicant, several of the items previously 18 presented to the Planning Commission were determined to be Staff actions under code 19 regulations (see below, Items Not Subject to Planning Commission Review Authority). 20 Furthermore, in discussions with the City Attorney it was also determined that some items 21 were strictly code enforcement matters and should be dealt with through the City's 22 existing enforcement processes. Therefore, the improvements subject to Planning 23 Commission consideration for this entitlement are: 1) Aviaries; 2) Entry Gate; and 24 3) Metal Barn. A detailed description of these items is provided below in 25 Discussion. 26

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 2 of 8

#### BACKGROUND

# **Applicable Regulations**

The proposal is subject to the following regulatory provisions under the Calistoga Municipal Code (CMC), Title 17 Zoning: 1) Chapter 17.24, Article II, Maxfield Planned Development District Planned District PD 2002-2; 2) Chapter 17.40, Use Permits; and 3) Chapter 17.41 Design Review. To be approved, the proposal must be found to comply, or be conditioned to comply, with these provisions. For a summary of how the improvements meet or are conditioned to meet these provisions for the items under review herein, please refer to **DISCUSSION**, below.

# Procedural History

The proposal is also subject to restrictions placed by a previously issued entitlement:

Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12. On February 25, 2004, the Calistoga Planning Commission approved a mitigated negative declaration, and design and conditional use permit application to establish a residential development. Construction of the residence was completed in 2008, followed by solar installation in 2012. Additional unpermitted improvements have continued to occur on-site since the original construction.

The Helmer Residence Use Permit (U 2003-12) contains Conditions of Approval that pertain to the proposed improvements considered herein. They are attached hereto as Attachment 3 and summarized below in Discussion, <u>Items Subject to Planning</u> Commission Review Authority. Refer to Attachment 4 for Vicinity Map.

## Items Not Subject to Planning Commission Review Authority

After thorough analysis of the previous subject site entitlement and CMC administrative and enforcement rules, the items listed below are CMC violations (pursuant to Notice of Violation issued to Applicant on July 29, 2021, and Addendum on August 3, 2021) not subject to Planning Commission review authority and have been removed from consideration for the subject entitlements considered herein. Please note that for each of these items, Staff specifies the regulating CMC Code Citation, identifies the responsible enforcement body, and outlines the appropriate procedural process for resolving the violations. Note: Abatement will be enforced pursuant to the required actions specified in Notice of Violations (issued to Applicant on July 29, 2021, August 3, 2021 and January 19, 2022) and is conditioned herein (see Attachment 1). Refer to Attachment 5 for Photo Exhibit.

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 3 of 8

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

76

77

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

88

89

- 1) **Noise** violations related to any on-site activity, most germanely that related to aviary use.
- Regulation. Noise is regulated by CMC Title 6, Animal Control and Chapter 8.20 Nuisances.
- Enforcement Body. Calistoga Police Department and Planning & Building
   Department.
  - Resolution Process. The Applicant has agreed to remove the nuisance birds to another property under common ownership outside City limits. The removal of the birds will be enforced through compliance with CMC Chapter 1.12, Nuisance Abatement. Calistoga Police Department and the Building Official shall enforce nuisance abatement 30 days post-adoption of Resolution herein. To be enforced by Planning & Building Director pursuant to required actions specified in Notice of Violations issued to Applicant on July 29, 2021, and August 3, 2021 (and reissued on January 19, 2022).
- 2) Erosion Control Plan triggered by tree removal and associated grading abutting the
   City's access road to Mt. Washington.
  - Regulation. Erosion control is regulated by CMC Chapter 19.08 Conservation Regulations and tree removal is regulated by CMC Chapter 19.01 Trees.
- Enforcement Body. Calistoga Public Works Department.
  - Resolution Process. Calistoga Public Works Department. Staff to review Erosion Control Plan and implementation of mitigation requirements assuring hillside stabilization, and enforce mitigation of unpermitted tree removal, such as replacement of removed trees. Applicant shall submit an Erosion Control Plan to the City's Public Works Department for review and implement mitigation requirements for hillside stabilization as well as unpermitted tree removal within 30 days post-adoption of Resolution herein.
- 3) **Concrete Slabs** within wetland boundaries previously red-tagged by City Planning & Building Department Staff.
  - Regulation. Wetland preservation is regulated by CMC Chapter 19.08 Conservation Regulations.
- Enforcement Body. Calistoga Planning & Building Department, U.S. Army Corps of
   Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Resolution Process. Applicant provided a Wetland Delineation Report and has agreed to remove the slabs; therefore, the Applicant will be responsible for working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine the appropriate course of action to remove the concrete slabs from the property and

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 4 of 8

- implement all mitigation measures found to be required, restoring the disturbed footprint to its previous condition.
  - 4) **Storage Shed** (112 square feet) on an approved concrete pad near the entrance of the property (not included on the approved plans under U 2003-12). Based on information submitted by the applicant and a review of the structure, staff has determined the entitlement mandate is building code compliance.
- Regulation. CMC 17.24.160 Design Review requires review of structures or buildings 120 square feet or larger in size.
- Enforcement Body. Calistoga Planning & Building Department.
  - Resolution Process. Calistoga Planning & Building Department Staff to inspect and require necessary mechanical, electrical, and/or plumbing permits. Applicant shall obtain all required permit(s) within 30 days post-adoption of the Resolution herein.
  - 5) **Access Road Lighting** consisting of 6W dimmable LEDs per lamp (not included on the approved plans under U 2003-12).
    - Regulation. CMC 17.24.020 A. 2.b. Design Review provides Planning & Building Director review approval for minor exterior alterations including lighting.
- Enforcement Body. Calistoga Planning & Building Department.
  - Resolution Process. Calistoga Planning & Building Department Staff to inspect and require necessary electrical permit and ensure compliance with International Dark Sky Standards as required by the City's General Plan. Applicant shall obtain all required permit(s) and schedule an inspection with the Building Official within 30 days post-adoption of the Resolution herein.
  - 6) Helicopter "Sculpture" is a non-operational helicopter located in the center of the site and screened from public view.
    - <u>Regulation</u>. CMC 17.41.020 C. 2. Design Review Applicability and Review Authority provides Planning & Building Director review approval for minor exterior alterations such as the subject "sculpture".
  - Enforcement Body. Calistoga Planning & Building Department.
    - <u>Path to Resolve</u>. Calistoga Planning & Building Department Staff to inspect and confirm compliance with applicable CMC regulations. Applicant shall schedule an inspection with the Building Official within 30 days post-adoption of the Resolution herein.

#### **ANALYSIS**

96

97

98

99

100

101

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

122

123

124

125

126

128

129

General Plan

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 5 of 8

The project site is designated in the City's General Plan Land Use Element (as updated in 2015) as Rural Residential with a Planned Development Overlay (Silverado Trail Planned Development Overlay (PD-1)). This designation is applied to large land holdings with unique features, parcels that are located in sensitive environmental and transitional areas, and in areas where innovative design standards are to be applied to achieve a superior design. Development on these large parcels along Silverado Trail shall be designed to be visually suitable for its entry corridor location on the edge of town and should contribute to the economic and/or community vitality of Calistoga. They are also subject to design review.

The existing residential development was determined to be in substantial conformance with the goals and policies of the City's 2003 General Plan as conditioned under U 2003-12. The Planning Commission had determined that although the project was quite large, the proposed structure (i.e., a one-story single-family residence) was proportionate to the large size of the project site and, more importantly, Mt. Washington effectively screened the project from public view.

Pursuant to the findings specified in the Resolution and conditioned therein, the Planning Commission determines the improvements are determined to be compatible in land use intensity, architectural style and detailing, and reflect the eclectic mix of architectural styles in Calistoga and do not conflict with the character of the surroundings.

### CMC Title 17, Zoning

The project site is zoned Planned Development PD 2002-2 and is regulated by CMC Chapter 17.24, Article II, Maxfield Planned Development District Planned District PD 2002-2.

17.24.120 Purpose. This planned development district regulates development of a two-acre parcel of land located at 333 Silverado Trail (APN 011-050-031), and the subject site, a 7.37-acre parcel of land located at 345 Silverado Trail (APN 011-050-032). The "PD 2002-2 Maxfield Planned Development District" is important to the community, as it contains two large parcels located at a key entrance to town in an area of outstanding natural beauty and surrounded by open space and Mt. Washington as a unique backdrop. Therefore, development of this planned development district shall be visually sensitive to the rural scale of the parcel and its surroundings. Unless otherwise provided below, all proposed uses in this planned development district shall require a use permit.

Pursuant to the findings specified in the Resolution and conditioned therein, the Planning Commission determines the improvements meet the purpose of this

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 6 of 8

standard and applicable development standards of this Chapter as they are visually integrated into, and harmonious with, the natural character and rural nature of its surroundings.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Staff recommends the following actions with respect to the improvements under review herein to bring the property back into compliance with PD 2002-2 and Use Permit U 2003-12.

# **Items Subject to Planning Commission Review Authority**

After thorough analysis of the CMC administrative and enforcement rules, CMC Title 17 regulations, and previous entitlements on the subject site, the items listed below are unpermitted improvements subject to Planning Commission review authority pursuant to the citations noted. Refer to Attachment 6 for Site Plan (illustrating and noting all abatement).

- 1) **Aviaries**. Containing 12 peacocks (approximate) and other non-native bird species in two structures totaling 7,500 square feet (approximate) with a maximum height of 20 feet and located outside of required setbacks (see Attachment 7).
  - a. <u>CMC Title 17 Citation</u>. Pursuant to CMC 17.24.120 Article II PD 2002-2 D., an aviary is not an allowed use because it is not specified as such in the Municipal Code Section applicable to the Maxfield PD District and uses not specified are prohibited per Section 17.24.130.D. None of the uses listed in Section 17.24.130 A. or B., which govern the Maxfield Planned Development District, apply to an aviary. Thus, per Section 17.24.130.D., the use "aviary" is prohibited.
  - b. Entitlement (U 2003-12). Through the course of this subject review amending U 2003-12, as conditioned in the Resolution herein, removal of the aviaries, the improvements are consistent with Helmer Use Permit U 2003-12. Specifically, compliance is assured for Conditions of Approval 1 (CMC consistency), 2 (Title 17 consistency), 9 (Design Review requirement), 10 (Planning Commission review), and 12 (Design Review requirement). Applicant shall obtain a demo permit (if applicable) and remove the aviaries and support bird cages within 30 days post-adoption of Resolution herein.
- 2) Entry Gate. Located 147 feet from the property line, a 9 feet tall stone wall with swinging wood gate doors. Decorative metal fence toppers on either side (i.e., flaming phoenix balls) that ignite and display open flames contained within spark arrestor screen mesh (see Attachment 8).

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 7 of 8

- a. <u>CMC Title 17 Citation</u>. Pursuant to CMC 17.24.120 Article II PD 2002-2 C., an entry gate is an allowed accessory use triggering Design Review (pursuant to 17.41 Design Review). As constructed, it is consistent with applicable development standards specified in CMC Section 17.24.140 and 17.24.150. However, with respect to the phoenix fireballs, CMC Section 17.24.120 states that development of the Maxfield PD District "shall be visually sensitive to the rural scale of the parcel and its surroundings." The flaming aspect of the phoenix ball structures are not considered to be "visually sensitive to the rural scale of the parcel and its surrounding." Thus, per Section 17.24.120, the flaming component (i.e. gas supply and igniter system) of the phoenix ball structures are prohibited.
- b. Entitlement (U 2003-12). Through the course of this subject review amending U 2003-12, as conditioned in the Resolution herein, to remove the flaming component (i.e. gas supply and igniter system) of the phoenix ball structures, the improvement is consistent with Helmer Use Permit U 2003-12. Specifically, compliance is assured for Conditions of Approval 1 (CMC consistency), 2 (Title 17 consistency), 9 (Design Review requirement), 10 (Planning Commission review), 12 (Design Review requirement), and 19 (setback and Design Review). Applicant shall remove the flaming component (i.e. gas supply and igniter system) of the phoenix ball structures and obtain all required building permit(s) for the entry gate within 30 days post-adoption of the Resolution herein.
- 3) **Metal Barn**. An unpermitted metal building located on the west side of the existing pond along the property's western boundary line adjacent to Solage and within the side yard setback (see Attachment 9).
  - a. <u>CMC Title 17 Citation</u>. Pursuant to CMC 17.24.120 Article II PD 2002-2 C., a barn building is an allowed accessory use triggering Design Review (pursuant to 17.41 Design Review). As constructed, the barn is located on the property line within the property's 10-foot side yard setback. As conditioned in the Resolution herein, to move the barn outside of the setback (refer to Attachment 6, Sheet A3.1), it is consistent with applicable development standards specified in CMC 17.24.140 and 17.24.150.
  - b. Entitlement (U 2003-12). Through the course of this subject review amending U 2002-12, as conditioned in the Resolution herein, the improvements are consistent with Helmer Use Permit U 2003-12. Specifically, compliance is assured for Conditions of Approval 1 (CMC consistency), 2 (Title 17 consistency), 9 (Design Review requirement), 10 (Planning Commission review), and 12 (Design Review requirement). Applicant shall obtain all required building permit(s) for the metal

Planning Commission Staff Report Review of Compliance with Conditions of Approval Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review 2021-2 Originally Helmer Conditional Use Permit U 2003-12 January 26, 2022 Page 8 of 8

barn and relocate it outside of the side yard setback within 30 days post-adoption of the Resolution herein.

#### **OPTIONS**

235

236

237

238

239

240

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

261

The following options are available to the Planning Commission:

- 1) Adopt *Resolution PC 2022-XX* amending Use Permit U 2003-12 subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in the Resolution.
- 2) Continue the hearing in order to obtain further information or for the applicant to make any requested revisions to the project.
- 3) Deny the applicant's request and direct Staff to prepare a Resolution of Denial.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

- 1) open the public hearing and take evidence;
- 2) consider the evidence received during the public hearing;
- adopt Resolution PC 2022-XX to approve Use Permit Amendment UP 2021-9 and Design Review DR 2021-2 to allow the previously unpermitted improvements specified herein, subject to the conditions of approval; and
- 4) take such additional, related action as may be appropriate.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- 1. Resolution PC 2022-XX
- Staff Report October 13, 2021 Planning Commission Hearing; Applicant's Updated
   Action Items Letter; Public Comments October 2021
- 255 3. U 2003-12 Findings and Conditions; 02-25-04 and 10-13-2021 PC Meeting Minutes
- 4. Vicinity Map
- 5. Photo Exhibit
- 6. Site Plan (illustrating and noting all abatement)
- 7. Aviaries Plan Sheet and Photos
- 8. Entry Gate Plan Sheet and Photos
  - Metal Building Plan Sheet and Photos