

**CITY OF CALISTOGA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2008
5:30 PM
Calistoga Community Center
1307 Washington St., Calistoga, CA**

**Chairman Jeff Manfredi
Vice- Chairman Clayton Creager
Commissioner Carol Bush
Commissioner Paul Coates
Commissioner Nicholas Kite**

“California Courts have consistently upheld that development is a privilege, not a right.”

Among the most cited cases for this proposition are Associated Home Builders, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek, 4 Cal.3d633 (1971) (no right to subdivide), and Trent Meredith, Inc. v. City of Oxnard, 114 Cal. App. 3d 317 (1981) (development is a privilege).

1 **Chairman Manfredi** called the meeting to order at 5:33 PM.
2

3 **A. ROLL CALL**

4 **Present:** Chairman Jeff Manfredi, Vice-Chairman Clayton Creager, Commissioners Carol Bush,
5 Nicholas Kite and Paul Coates. **Staff Present:** Charlene Gallina, Planning and Building Director,
6 Ken MacNab, Senior Planner and Kathleen Guill, Planning Commission Secretary. **Absent:** Erik
7 Lundquist, Associate Planner.
8

9 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

10
11 **B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

12 **Jim Barnes, 1710 Michael Way**

13 Read a statement aloud for the record. Please see attached.
14

15 **Tom Balcer, 1705 Michael Way,** requested a status update on the Vineyard Oaks project.
16

17 **Chairman Manfredi** replied to Mr. Balcer advising someone would contact him to provide updated
18 information on Vineyard Oaks.
19

20 **C. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA**

21 There was motion by **Vice-Chairman Creager**, seconded by **Commissioner Bush** to approve the
22 agenda as provided. **Motion carried 5-0-0-0.**
23

24 **D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

25
26 **E. TOUR OF INSPECTION**

27
28 **F. PUBLIC HEARING**

29
30 **G. NEW BUSINESS**

31
32 **1. PA 2008-02, CDR 2008-02:** Conceptual Design Review for subdivision of a 5.85 acre parcel
33 into 31 single-family residential lots for development of affordable housing. The project site is
34 located at 2008 Grant Street (APN 011-010-033) within the “R1”, Single Family Residential Zoning
35 District.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 2 of 15

36

37

Chairman Manfredi introduced the topic and noted Staff will be keeping track of questions raised by the public and respond once the public portion of discussion is closed.

38

39

40

Planner MacNab opened discussion reminding the Commission and audience this is only a conceptual design review. This process provides an opportunity to present a development concept, before a lot of money is spent for formal documents and studies related to the project and it is helpful to the applicant when he prepares for the formal submittal. During this process we are not asking for an endorsement or approval, just direction.

41

42

43

44

45

46

Planner MacNab apologized reporting the omission of a letter received from Kurt Becker, and summarized three issues expressed within the letter. He stated review of the project should not be permitted until they have received a Growth Management Allocation for this project; secondly a previous submittal by Homecoming had been less intense than this proposal and was not supported by the neighbors; and finally the project would impose a negative impact on neighbors privacy and value of property.

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

Kurt Larrecou, 1707 Michael Way reported the Calistoga Planning Commission Rules of Procedure states the correct order of testimony, is the Chairman should announce the topic, which is followed by a staff report and then the public hearing is opened for testimony.

54

55

56

57

Director Gallina reported recent discussions on the review process of an application and it is believed the best process is initiate discussion with a presentation by the applicant, because they know the project the best. Followed with an assessment report by Staff to lay out the foundation for discussion by the Planning Commission.

58

59

60

61

62

Kurt Larrecou stated the change should be added to the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure.

63

64

65

Chairman Manfredi stated this will be addressed in the future.

66

67

Erica Sklar, Executive Director, Calistoga Affordable Housing (CAH) provided introductions to the project team, Bob Fiddaman, President of the Board, Ross Chapin, national renowned Architect, Beth Painter, Balanced Planning, and Kevin Moss, of Adobe Associates. She reported the goal is to provide homes for all ages and all levels of means, and promote the health of the community for ourselves and neighbors. Ms. Sklar gave an overview stating Calistoga has been losing affordable housing stock, plus there is a significant decrease of new housing units, and at the same time we have non residents investing in a second home in town causing a loss of key contributors to our local economy. She stressed the need to provide housing, jobs and training, and maintain a diversity of choices, keeping family and friends together. It was reported this is the opinion of many in our community, while she reminded they had received 100 local applicants for the Saratoga Manor project, of which 70 qualified but there were only 18 to sell properties available in the project. The current 24 unit project on Brannan Street has generated an overwhelming response of applications, with an anticipated 500 applications. The proposed Cottage Glen project has generated interest from 70 persons even prior to any project announcements. The interest has been from local fireman, City employees, teachers, non profit agency staff members, and small

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 3 of 15

82 business owners, all interested in applying. CAH has identified the need, and they are collecting
83 information on housing, employment, income, demographics and new housing production.
84

85 **Erica Sklar** advised the report that there are plenty of homes available is not true. Unfortunately,
86 the down turn in the market has not had a huge affect in Calistoga, values in Calistoga have
87 remained stable. She raised the question, what price is affordable, and reported to afford a
88 \$400,000 home requires an income above \$100,000 per year, and a majority of the community is
89 far below this. In addition and more compelling, she drew attention to the affordability State and
90 Federal dollars that can be brought into the community. Finally, she directed attention to the
91 positives when integrating a community, even knowing there is fear of the unknown or perceived
92 threat, and she hoped the development team could reduce those fears. Their hope is to harness
93 the energy to promote Cottage Glen and integrate the community's best ideas and create strong
94 bonds.
95

96 **Bob Fiddaman**, CAH stated there is a great need for affordable housing and this proposal will help
97 fill the need and provide a benefit to the neighborhood. He reported they anticipated the neighbors
98 fear of the proposal and went to great lengths to provide information including providing a special
99 project specific web site, scheduling a neighborhood meeting as well as offering individual
100 meetings. Although neighborhood concerns were expected he was surprised and disappointed
101 with the volume generated and notably the majority of objections that were from the neighborhood.
102 However as we progress more letters have been received expressing support from groups
103 representing many people including the Calistoga Association of Teachers, The Chamber of
104 Commerce and local employers. Mr. Fiddaman reminded this is only the beginning of a very long
105 process to work toward a final plan. CAH is faced with initiating the financing process, preparation
106 of significant technical studies, and improvement of infrastructure to end with a new neighborhood
107 we can be proud of. He provided a brief summary of financing, construction costs, and the real
108 estate market, and reminded the project won't be ready for about two years so when the market
109 turns around they will be ready. Mr. Fiddaman noted right now they need to assess the risks and
110 manage to make the project a reality, the feasibility is positive and the assumptions are
111 reasonable. They will need to deal with on site drainage, and depending on the engineering
112 solution they may need Measure A funds, they will contribute a modest amount for traffic issues
113 but they certainly can't take care of existing issues for all of Grant Street. He stated without the
114 density proposed, Cottage Glen would be dead.
115

116 **Bob Fiddaman** responded to the proposed questions by Staff:

117 1. Is the proposed density appropriate for the site?

118 *Yes. The low end of medium density range is designated by the General Plan, and it is well under*
119 *the maximum R-1 zoning. Palisades and Riverlea subdivisions are very similar densities.*
120 *However this design will look less dense than it is.*
121

122 2. Is the proposed architecture consistent with the character of Calistoga?

123 *Yes - the architecture is consistent and they have retained an outstanding architect and he has*
124 *designed contemporary cottages and bungalows*
125

126 3. Which of the two presented design approaches is more preferable: the clustered layout or the
127 more traditional subdivision?

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 4 of 15

128 *The cluster design is preferable but they are willing to go with an alternate standard neighborhood*
129 *layout.*

130

131 4. If the clustered design approach is preferable, is the Planning Commission comfortable with the
132 development standards and amenities being contemplated?

133 *Endorse flexible standards.*

134

135 5. Should needed deviation from zoning requirements be pursued through a Planned
136 Development designation or by variance?

137 *We are flexible, while they prefer a variance; a Planned Development is simpler and will work.*

138

139 6. Should Amber Way be used as a secondary access to the site or should it be restricted to
140 emergency access only?

141 *It seems it would make more sense to connect to Amber Way to provide better circulation, however*
142 *he would wait for the determination of the engineering report/traffic study. He would encourage*
143 *use of Amber Way during construction for a trial period.*

144

145 7. Should narrower street widths be explored for the internal loop street?

146 *Narrow streets should be explored as they are critical to the cluster site plan. Needs can be met*
147 *with proposed 20' streets that include parking bulb-outs. The new streets need to be public*
148 *because private streets would create an unfair burden on owners.*

149

150 8. Is a City park appropriate / or needed at this location?

151 *He recommended the Planning Commission remain open to the idea of a City Park even though*
152 *small, it would be actively used, and consideration could also be given to a possible dog park here.*
153 *However if the commission were to discourage a public park they would revise the plan.*

154

155 9. Would the Planning Commission prefer to have common /open space areas maintained by a
156 Home Owners Association (HOA) or through a Landscape Assessment District?

157 *The CAH was open on the issue of a Home Owners Association noting there would be limited*
158 *maintenance responsibilities. There would be two community gardens and one community*
159 *building.*

160

161 **Mr. Fiddaman** stated they will continue to reach out to neighbors, and planned to have additional
162 neighbor discussion forums. They can arrange site tours nearby in St. Helena to affordable
163 housing adjacent to million dollar homes. He reported they are committed to being a model for
164 green and sustainable living and further commit to making Cottage Glen a neighborhood Calistoga
165 will be proud of. He concluded stating he was surprised as he did not expect a personal attack,
166 noting it was not a good way to start the meeting. He hoped this could be toned down to establish
167 a dialogue with them. He noted he did not want to fight, but will defend the project.

168

169 **Ross Chapin**, project Architect, provided a brief personal background. He provided an overview
170 noting affordable housing is a critical issue in communities and the key of vitality and livability.
171 This project can help toward solving the housing issue and community issue by getting a number
172 of available units up.

173

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 5 of 15

174 **Mr. Chapin** provided a visual presentation identifying sixteen homes, on an infill parcel of 2.6 acres
175 in the Redmond and Kirkland, Washington market. He reviewed the site plan, significant trees,
176 and local neighborhood streets. Noting walk-ability increases connect-ability. He identified
177 common areas, with open area gardens, common buildings, and garages to the periphery, with
178 walk through gardens to front doors, providing a different web of connect-ability. The houses have
179 one closed side and three open sides, but included preservation of privacy. Mr. Chapin also
180 provided an overview of another project on Whidbey Island, Washington presenting houses
181 ranging from 700 to 1500 sqft.

182
183 **Mr. Chapin** presented the Calistoga project, identified the natural drainage and green areas he
184 had to work with to create clusters. The concept included community buildings, a tool shed and
185 other community elements connecting walk ways to the neighborhood. He provided an overview
186 of the local roadways, a secondary local road and access to parking. He presented a clustered
187 site and a standard site. Mr. Chapin identified the active areas, private back yards, front garages,
188 and entries. He reported currently 2.6 parking spaces per unit, but stated he was working toward
189 three per household and a number of undesignated parking spaces for the final proposal. He drew
190 attention to the issue with narrow streets, but noted the benefits included the tendency to calm
191 traffic, improved pedestrian crossing, and minimized impervious surfaces reducing storm water run
192 off.

193
194 **Chairman Manfredi** called for a five minute recess at 6:42 PM.

195
196 **Chairman Manfredi** called the meeting back to order at 6:50 PM.

197
198 **Planner MacNab** provided a brief project overview starting with an aerial showing the proposed 31
199 lots and noting the zoning allows for 4-10 residential units per acre. This proposed project is
200 approximately 5.3 units per acre. He provided a synopsis on affordable housing and how need is
201 determined, from the Statewide concerns to regional housing needs as determined by ABAG and
202 the State and regional mandates for participation. Mr. MacNab provided a graphic of potential
203 housing sites, naming this site as one of twelve, and only one of two in the appropriate land use
204 designation. He reported the Palisades housing project will provide a jump start to meet minimum
205 housing needs.

206
207 **Planner MacNab** presented the cluster alternative pointing out common open space, and public
208 open space, noting how the design actually reduces the impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.
209 He provided a review of interfacing lots at either side on Michael, Maggie, the Brogan property and
210 Grant Street. Planner MacNab compared the cluster design to a traditional subdivision layout
211 showing a loss of common/green areas and more intensive hardscape area, along with a loss of
212 some green separation. He noted the cluster design would require exceptions to process such as
213 lot standards width, depth, size and coverage and parking within the setback. He reported the
214 density does fit within the existing General Plan designation and Zoning. However the need for
215 development flexibility was apparent, and noted the cluster design was superior to traditional
216 design. Therefore he suggested we explore options for an application for a Planned Development
217 to address exceptions to standards and a variance due to creek constraints. Staff recommended a
218 planned development be pursued for better control of what will happen on the site.

219

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 6 of 15

220 **Planner MacNab** stated he was seeking direction from the Planning Commission on the issue to
221 include a City park. He noted the graphic from the General Plan had identified a park on Mr.
222 Brogan's property, but it had not been realized. Mr. MacNab identified concern with the size of the
223 site, noting that area could be an opportunity for parking and they are willing to explore the options.
224

225 **Planner MacNab** reviewed the required entitlements, which would include a rezone to Planned
226 Development, retaining the R1 base district; a variance, the opportunity for State density bonus
227 options, design review, and tentative map/subdivision map approvals. He reminded receipt of an
228 abundance of communications, with very serious and legitimate concerns. He reminded once
229 again this is a conceptual review and we do not require the technical studies (i.e. drainage, traffic,
230 and tree studies) until a formal application is presented and then there will be significant
231 opportunity to look at those issues. The neighborhood character is the most significant issue that
232 has been raised noting we have an existing neighborhood we need to protect. The project has
233 taken steps to be a good fit, the question is, is it enough? We will need a traffic study and need to
234 address circulations, as well as spill over parking. We need to achieve three parking spaces for
235 each unit. (Note the code only requires two spaces per unit). He referenced drainage stating we
236 know this is a big issue. Public Works will need to follow the drainage study as guidance and the
237 applicant will need to prepare and present his own study. We know the Fire Department won't
238 approve a narrow street that doesn't meet public safety requirements, and environmental studies
239 may be required before entitlement is granted.
240

241 **Chairman Manfredi** opened the floor to the Commission for questions or comments at 7:08 PM.
242

243 **Commissioner Kite** referenced the reported ABAG numbers and the different income levels
244 required, asking why that was changed and what happens if it is not met.
245

246 **Planner MacNab** reported ABAG represented nine counties and they were charged to meet
247 housing needs in the Bay Area, taking into consideration growth, population trends, and a scientific
248 guesstimate. The City is required to prepare a housing element or amend and adopt a new one
249 on how to meet those needs. For those that choose not to address the issue there is little punitive
250 activity, except they will not be eligible to apply for grants if they do not have a certified housing
251 element, so it is vital to make an effort to address the numbers.
252

253 **Commissioner Kite** questioned given the needs is this still required.
254

255 **Director Gallina** stated we will have to have a housing element by June of next year. We will be
256 going through and recertify using the numbers, relook at policies and housing inventory, and then
257 go in and adjust policies. Cities need to be pro active in dealing with the housing issue.
258

259 **Commissioner Kite** asked if it were not designated would the project fit conventionally.
260

261 **Planner MacNab** stated R1 zoning generally is implemented at a lower end of density. Both
262 developments on each side of the project are within the same density with Michael Way a little
263 lower, and Maggie at four units per acre. This proposed project is at 5.3 units per acre which is
264 allowed within the land use designation.
265

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 7 of 15

266 **Bob Fiddaman** noted the RENA numbers do not drive what zoning applies, the General Plan does
267 and that is a direct result of community input. RENA does require we show available sites, we had
268 looked at parcels all over town and this site was identified. This designation was established
269 since 1990.

270

271 **Vice-Chairman Creager** referenced the integration of storm water into the cluster option, he
272 requested Mr. Moss talk about the differences between options.

273

274 **Kevin Moss**, Adobe Associates stated it was very early in the process and there were no specific
275 studies complete. However, general projects with more open space such as the cluster concept
276 give more opportunities for surface waters to be filtered and cleansed. A standard site plan
277 typically does not provide much chance on the surface for detention, or scrubbing water from
278 urban pollutants. There are generally more options with cluster site plans.

279

280 **Vice-Chairman Creager** questioned if areas that are intensively gardened create more of a
281 problem.

282

283 **Kevin Moss** reported gardened areas present more opportunity for direct infiltration, due to no
284 hard surfaces. The more green, i.e. community garden, garden boxes, and gravel ways create
285 opportunities for infiltration.

286

287 **Vice-Chairman Creager** pointed out the cluster approach could create the use of remote and
288 condensed parking structures, and reduces the need for access driveways and space.

289

290 **Ross Chapin** reported they explored remote parking, but did not want to push that. Garages are
291 used for storage and they will impose CC&R's.

292

293 **Vice-Chairman Creager** asked in their experience did they have success with CC&R's.

294

295 **Ross Chapin** reported association with seven projects with CC&R's and he has not heard of
296 issues and they are being enforced. As far as a concern around parking there could be a condition
297 to have the police monitor parking for two years.

298

299 **Vice-Chairman Creager** referenced market rate and affordable housing and asked if Mr. Chapin
300 has done diverse marketing of median and low.

301

302 **Ross Chapin** reported seven market rate projects at the low end approach in diversity, and three
303 pocket affordable developments.

304

305 **Bob Fiddaman** wanted to address the site plan options specific to parking, reporting they looked
306 at lots of options for the parcel, including apartments and townhomes which were not appropriate
307 for the neighborhood. Duplexes could be a possible alternative if designed to look like one house,
308 but would result in zoning issues; a R1 subdivision is more appropriate with every house on its own
309 lot.

310

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 8 of 15

311 **Vice-Chairman Creager** asked if the changes in numbers by ABAG were by region, and asked
312 how set targets could override a local experience.

313
314 **Director Gallina** reported the committee included two representatives from Napa and the City of
315 Napa, and they identified the methodology, and a determination was made that Napa is a rural
316 community, with special circumstances, this is a rural community. Each contributed to that
317 formula.

318
319 **Vice-Chairman Creager** asked if there was a market analysis.

320
321 **Bob Fiddaman** reported they looked at statistics to predict the need, but numbers came down due
322 to extensive lobbying from Napa County to preserve agricultural land. The RENA numbers were
323 lower making it easier to have a housing element that enables us to qualify as eligible for grants.

324
325 **Commissioner Bush** asked for confirmation that 31 units would be essential to make the project
326 work.

327
328 **Bob Fiddaman** stated it could be reduced to 30 (one unit less) but that would raise the land price
329 for each unit and it would wound the project. He reported they would have loved 35 units and they
330 believe they would have fit nicely. So they believe if it were below 31 units they will have to walk
331 away, because in reality the economics won't work.

332
333 **Commissioner Bush** asked about the market rate, moderate and low, 4/6/21 breakdown.

334
335 **Bob Fiddaman** reported incomes below 80 percent, typically would be 100% of the project, we use
336 subsidized money, but we are proposing six at moderate rate equaling 20%, and four at market
337 rate.

338
339 **Paul Coates** questioned can Calistoga afford to finance this project.

340
341 **Director Gallina** reported two projects have gone through and earmarked monies for affordable
342 housing, Vineyard Oaks and Terrano.

343
344 **Bob Fiddaman** suggested this is not the right forum on how to finance, but he anticipates there will
345 be a need for financing from the City at approximately 1.5 or 1.89. He reported today the City has
346 approved a resort and one subdivision, and there are negotiations on Center Court to pay in lieu
347 fees. With Saratoga Manor the City fronted and subsequently obtained \$500,000 from a
348 Community Block grant and paid the City. Given the opportunity he will be prepared to address
349 financing in another forum.

350
351 **Commissioner Coates** was concerned that in difficult times one can get in a pinch. He further
352 advised he was curious and would like to talk to the engineer and Mr. Fiddaman about the
353 comments from Public Works. He had major concerns about open ditches, and sidewalks,
354 possibly to North Oak Street and was concerned about the substantial costs. He still had a huge
355 issue and wanted to know if the funding is truly there. He saw serious pitfalls with placing the tab
356 on the community as a whole.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 9 of 15

357

358

Commissioner Coates asked if they have met with Public Works or is this a possible situation that may still need to be addressed.

359

360

361

Bob Fiddaman stated Public Works identified the 1991 Drainage Plan calls for additional infrastructure, this is not infeasible, but acknowledged off site work and beyond may need Measure A funds. If this Commission is going to ask for a sidewalk down Grant to Oak Street, this would be a deal killer. He noted it is not their responsibility to correct off-site issues that exist today.

362

363

364

365

366

Kurt Becker, 1715 Michael Way, stated he is a resident and a construction professional, and he is not a "NIMBY". Mr. Fiddaman states he wants to address concerns but we would not talk to him. Developers should address problems in advance, and to do so they need to know their budget. He stated he is considered the best in the industry, preparing cost estimates to ensure feasibility. This project is in its infancy and has no prepared feasibility budget, and no consideration for off site improvements. He further provided the following questions and comments:

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

Martin Siegel, 2058 Grant Street, recommended requiring an evacuation plan because it will be needed when the floods come. He stated that CAH has accused us of "not in my backyard", but that is a fabrication as they welcome the opportunity to develop new friendships. He stated the problem is the type of development done by CAH. He stated they are socially engineered compounds, walled in by houses next to each other and the surrounding compound. He stated he rejects a segregated communal lifestyle compound. He reported that planners before had a vision for a residential housing neighborhood and our planners should continue the good work of previous wise planners, with no segregated neighborhood.

Sonny Thielbar, 1608 Harley, stated he was excited about the project, his employment is with vineyards and restaurants and he would like to be part of this neighborhood. The house he lived in has been purchased by a second homeowner that will not be primary residents. He requested we

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 10 of 15

402 make this a community for persons to live and work in. Address the issues, noting the cluster is a
403 great affect. He has looked at the plans and he is excited at what this can do for our community.
404 He stated he has lived on Mora and irrespective of the development, there are already drainage
405 issues that need to be addressed whether this is built or not. This project is important to diversity
406 of the community and it is in step with County and State directives.

407
408 **Rex Albright**, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce stated the Chamber is dedicated to
409 promoting a strong local economy, representing business and individuals. Inadequate housing is a
410 burden on our business in terms of recruitment and longevity. He provided a Resolution from the
411 Chamber asking that favorable consideration be given to this project. He noted traffic and
412 drainage has not been evaluated but requested studies be completed and allow adequate time for
413 the developer to respond to each issue.

414
415 **Tom Balcer** provided photo's to the Commission emphasizing the serious drainage and flooding
416 issues. He reported residing there for nine years and stated the amount of water going through
417 this property is tremendous. He stated the whole property was a flowing river in the storms of
418 2007. He shared concern for placing a project on a swamp, and concern for inappropriate stream
419 setbacks, reporting it is a Class 3 stream. He stated the property is a wetland with water standing
420 3-5 months. He emphasized there were floods even in the last two dry years. He stated to solve
421 the problem they will have to go upstream. In conclusion he stated he is not against housing, but
422 nothing has ever been presented determining the property is even buildable.

423
424 **Al Moore**, Land Use Attorney 279 Front St, Danville, representing concerned neighbors of Fair
425 View Subdivision, Michael Way, Maggie Avenue, and Money Lane North. He stated he represents
426 about twenty-five neighbors, the Brogan, Barnes, and Edds families. He stated the purpose of a
427 conceptual design review hearing is to allow the developer to receive feedback prior to submission
428 of full development plans. However the developer said he is disappointed; we were invited to be
429 here and invited to provide comments. He reviewed how they submitted comments and on the
430 following day received a response letter from the developer referencing an avalanche of comments
431 with a classic "NIMBY" approach. Mr. Moore stated that is what the developer called us and we
432 have to respond. The letter also referenced he was an attorney for an unidentified neighborhood
433 group, suggesting the purpose was meant as a scare tactic and to intimidate. He quoted valid
434 comments from his letter of September 3 stating the Neighborhood Group firmly opposes the
435 proposed project, stating it is clearly incompatible with surrounding neighborhood uses and will
436 have significant and unavoidable impacts on the environment and on the health, safety and welfare
437 of adjacent neighbors. He stated they are seeking a thoughtful process but he was somewhat
438 surprised the developer has stated they cannot pay to mitigate the project, cannot go with any less
439 density, and cannot address the drainage, traffic, or privacy. The developer can't do it and can't
440 afford it. Nevertheless we must hold them to standards to mitigate impacts. The City cannot
441 approve this if the developer says he cannot afford mitigation as needed. Mr. Moore reported he
442 had met with staff when he was hired, and while he does have some concerns, he looks forward to
443 working with them. He concluded stating if the tone of the comments needs to be put in check, it
444 must start with the developer.

445
446 **Dr. Chris Henderson**, 109 West Myrtle St., stated he thinks we need to move past the negative
447 feelings and look at the value of project for the City of Calistoga. The affordable housing element

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 11 of 15

448 is sorely needed, and State mandated criteria, and as a Board member of the CRC and the
449 Chamber of Commerce, a green sustainable project in Calistoga is exciting. The project is slated
450 to be built with green standards and will be a great model for future development. He hoped to
451 integrate the entire community, the park will not be only for this development, it will be for the town
452 of Calistoga. The area is not now very walk-able as it is, and this project will afford us with a
453 greater amount of walk-ability and cohesion. He stated the drainage issues are obvious, and can
454 be resolved.

455
456 **Bev Barnes**, 1710 Michael, stated it is simple, this is not about affordable housing, and it is about
457 density and a stream running through. No one denies affordable housing is needed.

458
459 **Don Montez**, 1418 Fourth Street, reported he sent a letter in favor of the project. He stated this
460 project fits nicely with the General Plan and the flooding and traffic issues will be mitigated with the
461 environmental impact report. He noted the project is reasonable and should be given
462 consideration.

463
464 **Donna Dill** stated it is not the merits or the pitfalls of the project. She noted the City Council
465 funded and directed an inventory of our affordable housing be prepared, and it is still not done.
466 Therefore we should not consider a project this size without knowing our present housing stock,
467 because we don't know there is a need unless a survey is conducted. The only way to get past
468 this is to do an inventory and use the results to guide development.

469
470 **Clara**, 1436 No. Oak, Saratoga Manor, stated eighteen families own their own home in Saratoga
471 Manor, but she didn't want anyone to think that affordable means cheap. What it does mean is it
472 is subsidized to make it affordable. Cottage Glen will provide an opportunity for thirty one more
473 people with moderate and low income to own a home and not have to worry about losing their
474 home. As President of the Saratoga Manor homeowners she wanted to express support for the
475 project.

476
477 **Kurt Larrecou** has reviewed the concept and has heard they have spent a lot of work on it, but he
478 found there was no change from the meeting with him and architect. He shared the following
479 questions and concerns as follows:

- 480 • The presentations viewed this evening were in wooded areas, we are Mediterranean;
- 481 • They have reviewed many proposed developments for the property and it has been found un
482 developable.
- 483 • Can an engineer design it so they don't sink.
- 484 • We have been called a "NIMBY", but it is our due process to contribute information prior to a
485 decision.
- 486 • He stated there are no new issues, but they staked the property and the stakes floated away,
- 487 • Maybe the entire site should be a City park.
- 488 • The sheet run off holds water 30" below grade.
- 489 • Population is based on money, jobs and what the people intend to get back. We have missed
490 the boat by not identifying industrial areas for jobs.
- 491 • This is a pocket neighborhood, inclusionary in tracts and you should not build low income next
492 to a house valued at \$600,000+.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 12 of 15

- 493 • Cottage Glen does not provide the attributes for people to buy a product for value and quality of
494 life.
495 • It is interesting that Bob Fiddaman now has a project and is looking for a hand out of money
496 from the recent Vineyard Oaks project that was endorsed by Bob Fiddaman.
497 • This town has no water and sewer and the poor people think they will have a product. We have
498 been trying to mitigate water and sewer for 25 years.
499

500 **Kelly Brogan**, Money Lane, stated they have lived on Money Lane for 30 years, and the
501 proposed development design will diminish their quality of life. She stated the proposed layout is
502 called a walled effect and will be placed in the middle of the Maggie and Michael million dollar
503 homes. This project says we don't care about you. She stated they have a four lot subdivision
504 they have worked on for many years. They planned and developed their lots to be comparable to
505 those on Michael Way. During hearings they never had one neighborhood express concern about
506 their project. Realtors now say their lots will no longer be prime building sites. She stated it is
507 unfair that they will take such a financial loss due to this project.
508

509 **Tony McBeardsly** stated he has confidence that Bob Fiddaman and the community will be willing
510 to get their arms around the idea, the neighbors have reported flooding and density concerns, and
511 whether or not they have a point they should be heard and recognized. He noted he has
512 confidence mostly because the citizens of Calistoga are rabid about having Calistoga be as good
513 as it can be; they have legitimate points, but they understand we need affordable housing. He
514 reminded for every problem there is a solution and recommended build the project on stilts if you
515 have to, but do it.
516

517 **Joseph Schnieder**, 1311 Gold St., acknowledged housing is difficult and this year is the first year
518 he was able to buy a home. He noted if people work here and don't live here, it is about choice. It
519 is not easy to buy property here, but it does not have to be bought in an affordable way. He
520 referenced the proposed City Park within a riparian area of approximately a 70' x 70' which
521 reduces available space. He said he didn't know how passively or comfortably play could occur
522 within that amount of land. Mr. Schnieder reminded the City has adopted an ordinance to protect
523 trees, and the conditions will have to be addressed as part of the construction element. They need
524 to reduce solid surface, because it inhibits the water flow and deprives the Napa River of recharge
525 value. This property has some of the largest trees in the community and they have not been
526 recognized or addressed at all. Water should be collected for irrigation if feasible and bring
527 engineered concepts for retention bio swales, etc. Biological diversity deserves more respect.
528

529 **Chairman Manfredi** called for a five minute recess at 8:52 PM.
530

531 The meeting reconvened at 9:02 PM, and **Chairman Manfredi** reopened the public hearing portion
532 of the meeting.
533

534 **Dan Beagan**, 1715 Maggie stated if the project goes through, Amber will become a thoroughfare.
535 Anything delivered will go through Amber, the people that live on lots 12 – 31 in the rear of the
536 cluster will likely use Amber for ingress and egress. This will create an unfair burden especially if
537 the road is not widened. He also does not think there is enough parking available, especially for

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 13 of 15

538 holidays with guests, and the overflow will spill into his area. He stated this project shouldn't
539 happen and does not fit. The proposed project does not have a good setup.

540

541 **Chairman Manfredi** closed the public portion of discussion at 9:05 PM. He stated a lot has been
542 put on the table, and after four hours he cannot give what is due to address the issue.

543

544 **Erica Sklar** stated she heard a lot of issues, but wanted to make a few corrections to clear some
545 misunderstandings.

546 • Noted someone said we cannot pay to mitigate the issues. She reported that is not what they
547 meant, what they were trying to say is they cannot pay to fix existing Calistoga issues or things that
548 are not part of or a result of this proposed community, we can help to address anything pertaining
549 to the project; and

550

551 • we can afford this project;

552

553 • they have done a feasibility and have secured a lot of professional assistance; and

554

555 • they have taken a lot of notes and they are listening and truly appreciate the comments.
556 • Regarding the reference to a "commune" development, they are not proposing a social
557 experiment. They are proposing to use construction design to make the neighborhood more
558 livable rather than making it vanilla. The architect explained the thoughtful process to make a
559 community as part of the whole community.

560

561 **Bob Fiddaman** also replied to statements:

562 • He advised the City would not be involved in predevelopment expenses and this will solely be
563 at the risk of CAH.

564 • They have not estimated off site costs as yet because they cannot get an estimate until they
565 have actual plans. A earlier estimate from Adobe Engineering was at \$800,000 but that was
566 one year ago.

567

568 • The \$600,000 is not part of the monies in the fund.

569 • If anyone wants to go to zilol.com it will confirm there is no recorded loss of property value due
570 to close proximity to affordable housing.

571

572 • Reported he is tired of fighting, but he is going to defend;

573

574 • He would like to meet with neighbors to resolve issues.

575

576 **Planner MacNab** the following observations:

577 • there had not been too many questions,

578

579 • mostly comments were provided about the project.

580 • We are aware of the serious drainage issue, potential traffic impacts, the need for
581 environmental resources, and concern if a development of this nature re affordable housing is
582 suitable near Million dollar homes.

583 • He also heard some believed it unfair to persons that have invested in the property near by;

584

585 • the applicant should be given a chance to make a fair case;

586

587 • Communal living is inappropriate and should be rejected.

588

589 • The site is the wrong site; and

590

591 • who will pay for upfront costs.

592

593 • Positive input included there a need for local housing,

594

595 • there need to attract business and employees to area,

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 14 of 15

583

584

Commissioner Kite noted a lot has been stated as fact and comments have been captured for determination as facts.

585

586

- It was noted that affordable housing should be part of all projects; there is an assertion the funding would come from Calistoga, with no other sources; Calistoga will be the bank;

587

588

- Clarify is there a lack of water in this town.

589

- Previous decisions had been based on numbers proposed on the site and could that be used as rationale to deny any other project on this site.

590

591

- The project will lower property values;

592

- Mr. Balcer asserted the waterway is a Class 3 stream, the property is a wetland, and unbuildable;

593

594

- It was implied the Planning Commission will take direction from developer and make a decision based on what they can afford.

595

596

- Is the proposed Park 70 feet x 70 feet?

597

598

Vice-Chairman Creager acknowledged the issues raised are legitimate and that is the reason for the public hearing process. He had hoped it would be more civil because it makes our job a lot harder. He requested the personal issues go away noting "forgiveness is divine". Vice-Chairman Creager recognized there are issues that need further investigation and we will take testimony from the experts. He noted we are looking at a project scoped for the future, it is in the middle of traditional neighborhoods, it is a transition of the future, and there are factual issues as well as conceptual issues. He heard good things, and wanted to make sure they hear items to be investigated as well as hearing the good things too. With reference to the Park he would like to see it retained. He noted he will have a lot more to say when technical studies are provided.

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

Commissioner Bush stated we need to balance the needs of the community. Privacy is an issue and she would like the project design tweaked to create more privacy between neighborhoods. She liked the cluster concept and hoped we can find a way to make it work.

609

610

611

612

Commissioner Coates expressed concerns about density, noting this is more dense than the Homecoming project. He noted more density creates more impacts, and requires more mitigation. He recommended taking time to study the plan and look at Calistoga and compare the other cities and their likeness or differences in the communities that did allow the cluster. Cottage housing is innovative. Highland was established to provide low income but none of it was affordable and followed strict guidelines, costs were not subsidized by tax payers. He shared his concern for a potential funding short fall. He stated the design does not fit in the location, and the drainage issue weighs heavy on his mind.

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

Chairman Manfredi asked a synopsis on how affordable housing works and how homes are deed restricted be provided. He empathized with Mr. Beagan stating parking is a real issue and there is no denying it. He stated a project of this quality needs to address parking and traffic impacts. Chairman Manfredi stated he is a big believer of protecting people's property and shared the concern of Mrs. Brogan. He strongly recommended the developer make a genuine attempt to address privacy with tree's shrubs and noted he did listen when she said they were told to keep their parcels within a comparable scale, but the main concern is privacy. He agreed with Donna Dill that it would be helpful to have an inventory to know what we have and what we need. He

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 2008

Page 15 of 15

629 thanked everyone for calling, writing letters and coming to the meeting and contributing to this
630 discussion.

631

632 **Planner MacNab** pointed out there are some issues we won't be able to respond to without
633 technical studies, and we won't have studies available until there is a formal application. There is
634 a point down the road when this will happen. Staff recommended continuation for further
635 discussion.

636

637 **Commissioner Creager** stated Staff had identified nine questions for the Commission to address
638 and at this time they seemed to be out of time and energy. He believed the Commission had
639 heard enough and needed time to digest this information prior to addressing those questions.

640

641 **Director Gallina** noted the October agenda was slated for discussion on the Urban Design plan in
642 the event it is continued.

643

644 There was motion by **Chairman Manfredi** seconded by **Commissioner Bush** to continue the
645 public hearing for Cottage Glen to the first regular meeting in October (October 8, 2008) **Motion**
646 **carried: 5-0-0-0.**

647

648 **Erica Sklar** asked if there will be additional public input allowed at the next meeting.

649

650 **Chairman Manfredi** responded yes.

651

652 I. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS

653

654 J. DIRECTOR'S COMMENT/PROJECT STATUS

655 **Director Gallina** reminded there would be a Special Planning Commission meeting held on
656 Monday, September 15, 2008, at 5:30 PM, exclusively for review of the Urban Design Plan.

657

658 ADJOURNMENT

659

660 There was motion by **Commissioner Bush**, seconded by **Commissioner Kite**, to adjourn to the
661 meeting to the Planning Commission Special meeting of Monday September 15, 2008 at 5:30 PM.
662 The meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM. **Motion carried: 5-0-0-0.**

663

664 The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, September
665 24, 2008 at 5:30 PM.

666

667

668

669 _____
670 Kathleen Guill,
671 Secretary to the Planning Commission