

From: [Jeff Mitchem](#)
To: [Jeff Mitchem](#)
Cc: [Lauren Clark](#)
Subject: April 12, 2023 PUBLIC HEARING ITEM 2: 2449 Foothill Blvd Gateway Plaza (APN 011-360-003) Design Review DR 2022-2
Date: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 2:42:30 PM
Importance: High

Dear Planning Commissioners,
Please review the following public comment and staff responses and consider in formulating your decision on this matter.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM 2: 2449 Foothill Blvd Gateway Plaza (APN 011-360-003) Design Review DR 2022-2

PUBLIC COMMENT: Lucretia Marcus (via email below)

STAFF RESPONSE:

- 1) Probably the most problematic is the traffic flow. This intersection was deemed seriously impacted in 2010. With the additional homes built north of this intersection after the UDP was approved, with the increased traffic from Lake and Sonoma Counties, this problem has become exponentially worse. Even the addition of the Stop Lights has not helped. Indeed, sometimes it seems to have made it worse.

STAFF RESPONSE: *The applicant will be required to improve the intersection to increase capacity and safety pursuant to the approved master plan. Improvement measures include intersection widening, dedicated right-turn lane from Foothill Blvd. to Petrified Forest Rd, a two-way left turn lane on Petrified Forest Road, enhanced pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, wider shoulder, and related drainage features.*

- 2) The additional traffic generated by this project will only add to the problem. Especially, the access/egress points Remember there is a busy Arco station with access/egress points directly opposite those proposed with this project. It's difficult enough just navigating both the PFR/Fthll intersections and the traffic entering/exiting the Arco. Add to that yet another driveway onto PFR and that's asking for gridlock.

STAFF RESPONSE: *The project is proposing a two-way left turn lane on Petrified Forest Road that will improve access to Arco's driveway as well as the driveway to the new development. The project's Transportation Impact Study indicates trips generated by the project would not result in queues extending into a visually restricted area under any volumes evaluated and due to the additional capacity provided by the right-turn lane that would be constructed as part of the project, queues would decrease in some cases.*

- 3) According to the UDP, parking should be BEHIND the buildings and screened from street view. I'm not convinced that 59 parking spaces isn't overkill and definitely not need. There is a huge parking lot across Foothill and another large lot surrounding the Arco. A visitor's first view of Calistoga is an ocean of asphalt!! That old song comes to mind: we'll pave Paradise to put up a parking lot. This certainly is NOT conveying a "sense of arrival" (UDP, page 51)

STAFF RESPONSE: *The Urban Design Plan (2010) was the basis for a General Plan*

Amendment in 2012 (Mobility Element – dedicated L/R turns; Land Use Element – entry corridor/gateway; Community Identity Element – Petrified Forest Gateway.) Though the buildings are not proposed to directly front the sidewalks, the project plans indicate significant landscape improvements to the entire frontage in order to screen parking and convey a sense of “forest canopy” and framing views of the Palisades as an entry sequence experience. Placing the buildings at the rear of the site serves to best buffer the abutting residential and church from street and parking lot lighting, as well as associated traffic noise and visual activity. Considering these factors on-balance, Staff supports the proposed project layout and design as meeting the purpose and intent of the Petrified Forest Gateway designation.

- 4) Finally, please remember that there are homes across PFR from the proposed project and also behind the proposed project. Therefore, low level lighting at night to not interfere with the well-being of existing residents must be considered.

STAFF RESONSE: *Placing the buildings at the rear of the site serves to best buffer the abutting residential and church from street and parking lot lighting. Additionally, all proposed lighting is required to be dark-sky compliant prior to issuance of any building permit for the proposed development.*



Jeff Mitchem

Planning & Building Director
City of Calistoga
1232 Washington Street
Calistoga, CA 94515
O: 707.942.2830
C: 971.400.1840
jmitchem@ci.calistoga.ca.us

From: bellemarc@comcast.net <bellemarc@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 8:07 PM

To: Planning & Building <Planning&Building@ci.calistoga.ca.us>

Cc: publiccomment@ci.calistoga.ca.us.

Subject: PUBLIC HEARING ITEM 2: 2449 Foothill Blvd Gateway Plaza (APN 011-360-003) Design Review DR 2022-2

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Lucretia Marcus, address: 933 Petrified Forest Rd. I am slightly west of the Arco station, across from the proposed Gateway project.

In reviewing and comparing the Proposed Project to the Urban Design Plan adopted by the City of Calistoga in 2010, more of the project than not seems to favorably compare.

However,

There are glaring issues here.

1. Probably the most problematic is the traffic flow. This intersection was deemed seriously impacted in 2010. With the additional homes built north of this intersection after the UDP was approved, with the increased traffic from Lake and Sonoma Counties, this problem has become exponentially worse. Even the addition of the Stop Lights has not helped. Indeed, sometimes it seems to have made it worse.
2. The additional traffic generated by this project will only add to the problem. Especially, the access/egress points. Remember there is a busy Arco station with access/egress points directly opposite those proposed with this project.
It's difficult enough just navigating both the PFR/Fthll intersections and the traffic entering/exiting the Arco. Add to that yet another driveway onto PFR and that's asking for gridlock.
3. According to the UDP, parking should be BEHIND the buildings and screened from street view. I'm not convinced that 59 parking spaces isn't overkill and definitely not need. There is a huge parking lot across Foothill and another large lot surrounding the Arco. A visitor's first view of Calistoga is an ocean of asphalt!! That old song comes to mind: we'll pave Paradise to put up a parking lot. This certainly is NOT conveying a "sense of arrival" (UDP, page 51)
4. Finally, please remember that there are homes across PFR from the proposed project and also behind the proposed project. Therefore, low level lighting at night to not interfere with the well being of existing residents must be considered.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lucretia Marcus