

CITY OF CALISTOGA
HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
December 20, 2021 via Zoom at 5:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Committee members present virtually: Chair Laurel Gourd, Vice Chair David Shaw, Lana Richardson, Laurel Rios, and Cathy Schwamberger. Staff members present: Brad Kilger, Jeff Mitchem, Samantha Thomas.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments received. Staff member Kilger introduced the City's new Planning & Building Director, Jeff Mitchem to the committee. Staff member Mitchem provided a brief background of his experience.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Draft Minutes from October 18, 2021, and November 15, 2021.
Meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Update and Discussion on Housing Element Project/Potential Sites

Sung Kwon at M-Group clarified there would be a recap of the City's RHNA numbers and Potential Sites that were discussed at the previous meeting for the benefit of the public. Chair Gourd inquired why one of the potential sites was removed from the map. Mr. Kwon clarified that a site was removed as the property owner indicated they do not wish to develop housing. Committee member Richardson inquired what criteria was used to select the sites. Mr. Kwon clarified that the sites were reused from the 5th cycle with size limitations set by HCD, so anything under ½ an acre or over 10 acres were not included as HCD has determined these sites would not be suitable for affordable housing. Then M-Group prepared fair-housing maps which fit into HCD's category, where a number of 5th cycle sites were then eliminated from the 6th cycle list. Committee member Richardson inquired why the Earl and Eddie site that the city owns as well as the site on Mitzi were not included in the 6th cycle. Staff indicated they would look into why those sites were not included on the potential sites map. Chair Gourd inquired if other property owners were contacted. Mr. Kwon and staff member Thomas clarified all were contacted and 2 property owners had responded – staff would follow up with any interest for the 6th cycle.

M-Group staff provided a presentation for the Site Selection Workshop as part of the Housing Element Project. They requested the committee members select a site or sites for the 6th cycle and clarified that the city needs 9 very low units, 2 moderate units, and 19 above moderate units to meet their RHNA numbers. Committee members briefly discussed the site options map and opened the discussion up to the public. One public comment was received for Site C requesting notice to neighbors of any potential projects proposed for that site. Mr. Kwon clarified notice would be given to neighbors if the project does not require ministerial approval and that no response had been received from the owners of Site C. A second public comment was received regarding Site D requesting why only 20 units are proposed. Mr. Kwon clarified that only a portion of the property, fronting Lincoln Avenue, would be utilized for housing. The commenter also recommended distributing the proposed affordable

housing throughout the city rather than grouping it all in one location – recommending shying away from Site C and possibly considering a combination of Site A with several of the proposed 4-unit affordable housing sites.

Committee member Richardson inquired if Site's A and B were for sale, where Vice Chair Shaw indicated he wasn't sure as he hadn't been by those sites in some time. Committee member Schwamberger recommended selecting multiple sites if it's not too overly complicated. Mr. Kwon responded that it wouldn't be. Staff member Mitchem indicated that from his experience there is a benefit to distributing housing and clarified for committee members to keep in mind that the city is in business of entitling housing not building housing. Committee member Rios expressed her concern with Site F given its current traffic congestion issues.

Committee member Richardson indicated she would select Site E, and then A or B as best locations for housing. Committee member Rios would like to select Site C although the neighborhood already has traffic congestion issues. She further stated that she believes Sites A, B, and E should be pursued. Chair Gourd was interested in pursuing Sites A and B and would like to keep F on the table as a potential option based on response received from the property owner. Vice Chair Shaw shared his concern with Sites A and B, stating that building housing right on the entrance to town may not be a good fit and wasn't sure how that would go over with the public. He also shared how he wasn't sure without consent from the property owners how affordable housing would get built and thought this exercise was premature. Committee member Richardson stated that she agreed with Vice Chair Shaw's statement regarding Sites A and B, but that they are viable sites depending on how the developer lays out the buildings on the parcels, incorporating the proper setbacks from Lincoln Avenue, etc. She indicated there could be a lot of community objection if 3 story buildings are proposed and wondered if the developers could get the units required to make the project affordable without constructing 3 story buildings.

Committee member Rios explained that based on the amount of economic growth the city has had in the past 10 years and because most of Calistoga is already built, we need to accept the fact that we can't just take affordable housing and stick it in a corner – that having an empty field developed for housing is something we'll need to get used to. She further stated that we owe it to those who work in this town to provide them with an affordable place to work and live instead of having to commute 45 minutes to 1.5 hours to work. Sites A and B were her choice for housing as she believes they would have the least amount of disruption for existing residents in Calistoga – the amount of people surrounding the sites is much lower than others. Committee member Schwamberger agreed with committee member Rios.

Staff member Mitchem clarified with the committee that staff would be reviewing and approving projects as they come in at a staff level, through a ministerial and objective process. Chair Gourd confirmed with M-Group that the feedback requested was received. Mr. Kwon stated that he believed Sites A and B were the preferred sites expressed by committee members, as well as Site E, and if just Sites A and B were considered, the city would meet their RHNA numbers. He indicated that it's up to the committee if they would like to include all 3 sites. Committee member Schwamberger and Richardson expressed that they don't see a downside to include all 3 sites and would prefer to include more as opposed to less. Chair Gourd stated it would also further support housing mobility as people's lives change. Currently,

there are few options for those who want to downsize and stay in the community. Committee member Rios stated that a lot of the people that would be moving into these affordable housing units probably already work in town, so traffic may decrease from neighboring communities into Calistoga as well.

Staff member Mitchem recommended a broad strategy to address HCD housing requirements. He indicated that staff should keep the site selection options open for future development and recommended moving forward with Sites A, B, E, and F, but also keeping Sites C and D as potential options although there may be some access challenges associated with them. Committee member Schwamberger agreed with the proposed approach. Committee member Rios stated that developing these properties would ultimately be up to the property owners, so keeping site options open would be best. Chair Gourd stated she believes that Sites C and E are owned by the same entity and inquired if there would be any possibility in moving the line. Staff member Mitchem confirmed it would be possible. Committee member Richardson wanted to clarify with the committee that there are no other sites that can provide the same amount of housing with this proximity to Lincoln Avenue, access to downtown, and services – these are the sites. Staff member Mitchem requested a recommendation to move forward with all of the sites from Mr. Kwon. Mr. Kwon indicated that if the committee would like to use all the sites, the city can – then once the sites have been decided, those sites would be utilized in the administrative draft of the Housing Element. He further clarified that these sites are all from the 5th cycle, so the inclusion of them in the Housing Element is not dependent on owner responses. Mr. Kwon clarified that during the public review period, if a property owner comes forward stating they do not want their property on the list, the list can be reevaluated at that time, which is an advantage to including all of the sites as the list can be scaled down if needed and still meet the City's RHNA numbers.

Mr. Kwon requested feedback/general direction from the committee on policy themes to have an administrative draft before Planning Commission relatively soon. The committee would later be invited to a joint meeting with the Planning Commission as part of the public review of the Housing Element once the policies are bit more refined. M-Group staff briefly went over the Housing Element outreach efforts, survey results, and proposed policy themes identified through public feedback. Committee member Richardson inquired how #6. *Vacation homes (not occupied) should be limited*, would be implemented – would they be deed restricted? Committee member Schwamberger stated she could see this being hard to implement. Committee member Richardson also inquired why #7. *Allocated workforce housing* is on the list when it's something we're already identifying with the sites we have on the list. Staff member Mitchem clarified that these proposed policy themes would be used in the administrative draft to create policies and programs that have applicability. Committee member Schwamberger requested #6 be reworded that vacation homes be made available for long-term use versus not occupied. M-Group staff clarified that #6 was a compilation of a number of comments that were received from community members/renters expressing frustration for the amount of vacation homes within the city that reduce the availability of housing. Staff member Mitchem recommended conducting workshops annually to educate homeowners on the viability for long-term rentals within vacant vacation homes – a program the city could potentially develop based on this proposed policy theme.

Staff member Mitchem inquired if the committee is broadly in support of the proposed policy themes. Chair Gourd confirmed and requested some background from M-Group staff on #9. *Appeal to 18-24 years old*. M-Group staff clarified that comments were received where people stated Calistoga is a great place to visit but doesn't appeal to the young adults or they can't afford to live in the city, which could be linked to the amount of workforce labor available (i.e., servers and retail workers). Committee member Rios explained that she believes the city could achieve #9 by achieving some of the other proposed policy themes on the list. Committee members agreed and staff member Mitchem confirmed this sentiment and further indicated that some of these themes would overlap with other elements within the City's General Plan.

M-Group staff clarified that the committee is largely in support of diving into the proposed policy themes, except for #9 as it could be included in the other policy themes. M-Group staff stated they also heard the committee would like to dive more into #6 as far as clarification as to what the process would entail. M-group staff mentioned an upcoming event of a joint Planning Commission and Housing Advisory Committee meeting, where the details are still to be determined. Chair Gourd requested a timeframe for the meeting, where Mr. Kwon further indicated it would be held within Q1 of 2022. Chair Gourd requested to work with staff members Mitchem and Thomas to decide on a date that would work for the committee.

B. Goals Setting for 2022

Chair Gourd recommended moving this item to the next meeting in January 2022. Committee members agreed and committee member Rios further commented this item may take an hour to get through.

C. Continued Discussion of Shared Readings

Chair Gourd commented that she appreciated the article on SB9 that committee member Richardson shared and would like to give the item an appropriate amount of time to discuss as well. Committee members agreed to move this to the next meeting in January 2022. Committee member Richardson requested input from city staff on SB9, specifically whether the city has evaluated which sites within the city meet the criteria under SB9. Staff member Mitchem provided some brief input and staff member Kilger indicated that the city will need to work on design criteria under SB9 within the first 60 days of the next calendar year – but that it does not seem that Calistoga is under any initial threat from the passage of SB9. Committee member Richardson further mentioned SB9 may be on the ballot next year as well so it may end up not being an issue. Staff member Mitchem further explained that SB9 will entail objective design standards and site specifics – it is not a one size fits all. Committee member Richardson further recommended that the video on the City's Housing Element Project page be revised to depict the elderly in a different way other than behind a walker. The recommendation was noted by staff member Thomas. Motion to move items 4b. and 4c. to the next meeting in January 2022 was approved unanimously.

5. **COMMITTEE MEMBERS' IDEAS & REQUESTS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION**

Committee member Richardson requested the link to the next meeting be provided on the city's home page.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.