

City of Calistoga

Staff Report

TO: CHAIRMAN MANFREDI & MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: CHARLENE GALLINA, PLANNING & BUILDING DIRECTOR

MEETING DATE: AUGUST 26, 2009

SUBJECT: REVISED DRAFT URBAN DESIGN PLAN

1
2 **REQUEST:**

3
4 To resume discussion and deliberation on the Draft Urban Design Plan, as
5 revised and develop a recommendation to the City Council. (***This item was***
6 ***continued from the Planning Commission Meeting of June 24, 2009.***)

7
8 **HISTORY/BACKGROUND:**

9
10 On June 24, 2009, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the
11 Revised Draft Urban Design Plan (UDP) that had been released on May 20,
12 2009. As presented, the Revised Draft Urban Design Plan consisted of a
13 document without photographs highlighting “tracked changes” to identify
14 proposed new text and text to be deleted to reflect the substantial public input
15 received and the Planning Commission’s direction from September 15, 2008 and
16 October 13, 2008 public hearings. In addition, several maps had also been
17 updated to reflect proposed changes to Character Area boundaries and to
18 correct typographical errors identified though the public meeting process to date.
19 For a complete description of changes directed by the Planning Commission,
20 please refer to the Planning Commission Staff Report of June 24, 2009.
21 (Attachment 3)

22
23 After receiving public comment and Commission discussion, the Planning
24 Commission continued action on this item to August 24, 2009 and directed staff
25 to make additional changes to the UDP and to provide a listing of the public
26 comments raised at the June 24th public hearing. Furthermore, in response to
27 public testimony provided by Mr. John Merchant, property owner of the Merchant
28 family lands and the former Gliderport area, the Commission further directed staff
29 to request the City Council to form an Ad-Hoc Committee consisting of: 2
30 members from the Planning Commission and 2 members from the City Council
31 along with staff. The Commission appointed Commissioners Paul Coates and

32 Nicholas Kite to serve on this Ad-Hoc Committee. The Commission expressed a
33 desire to create an Ad-Hoc Committee for the purpose of meeting with the
34 Merchant family and City staff to discuss and provide specific direction for the
35 development of elements and suggestions to be contained in the UDP with
36 respect to the Merchant family lands located within the proposed Downtown –
37 Historic District and Gliderport Character Areas.

38
39 On August 7, 2009, the City Council considered the Commission's request and
40 adopted City Council Resolution No. 2009-055 to establish an Ad-Hoc
41 Committee and confirm the Mayor's appointment of Vice Mayor Michael
42 Dunsford and Councilmember Gary Kraus to serve on an Ad-Hoc Committee as
43 well as the appointment of 2 members from the Planning Commission
44 (Commissioner Paul Coates and Commissioner Nicholas Kite) the City Manager
45 and the Planning & Building Director.

46

47 **DISCUSSION:**

48

49 Ad-Hoc Committee Meetings with the Merchant Family: Within the past month,
50 the Ad-Hoc Committee met on August 3, 2009 and August 18, 2009. On August
51 3rd, the Committee spent time listening to specific concerns and comments from
52 the Merchant family with the Draft UDP, as well as, their desired vision for the
53 development of their properties. In response to the Merchant family concerns
54 and public comments, the Committee agreed that portions of the Draft UDP
55 should be revised to provide more clear and less prescriptive language in order
56 to better describe the vision for the redevelopment of the property, and to provide
57 the greatest amount of flexibility in project design and development to the
58 property owner/future developer to achieve this vision. A first draft of this
59 language was presented at the Committee's meeting of August 18, 2009. After
60 continued discussion, consensus was reached by the Committee and the Family
61 that more revisions were necessary to clearly articulate, the desired vision for the
62 properties, to provide more clarity on range of desired land uses and basic
63 circulation needs to be included in the UDP, as well as, clearly identify within the
64 document the process for which the Family may seek project entitlement from the
65 City. Given this direction, the Committee anticipated at least one or two
66 meetings will be required to complete this task in order to reach consensus with
67 the Merchant Family on a recommendation for the Commission to consider. It is
68 further anticipated that the work of the Committee should be completed within
69 one month.

70

71 To meet this objective, staff with Committee concurrence is requesting that the
72 Commission, at this Meeting, only focus discussion on UDP issues other than
73 those that directly affects the Merchant properties.

74

75 Commission Recommendations for Changes to the Draft UDP: In response to
76 public comments included in the Planning Commission Staff Report of June 24,

77 2009, and provided during public hearing testimony, the Commission
78 commenced discussion on the Revised UDP, as well as, conducted straw votes
79 to determine consensus on issues that should remain or be removed from the
80 Revised Draft UDP in order to formulate a final recommendation to the City
81 Council. Minutes for the June 24th meeting has been attached to this report for
82 Commission review and consideration (Refer to Attachment 2). The items
83 identify below represent issues discussed and the Commission's straw vote
84 taken on these issues.

- 85
- 86 1. Whether or not the processing of a UDP should be tossed out (or ceased)
87 at this point in response to public comments. The Commission straw vote
88 was 3-1-1 to continue Draft UDP processing.
89
 - 90 2. Northern Crossing – Suggestion that the Northern Crossing should be
91 reinserted into the Draft UDP. The Commission unanimously agreed to
92 leave it out.
93
 - 94 3. Resort Character Area – After hearing public comment from
95 representatives of the O'Connell, Hemberger and Calistoga Beverage
96 Company properties that staff's recommendation to restrict these parcels
97 to residential uses only could be considered a taking, the Commission
98 unanimously agreed that within this Character Area, the O'Connell,
99 Hemberger and Calistoga Beverage Company properties should revert
100 back to the Community Commercial Land Use designation.

101

102 At this time, staff is requesting clarification from the Commission regarding
103 this direction and whether or not the Commission remains comfortable in
104 reverting back these properties to the Community Commercial General
105 Plan Land Use designation. Given that the range of permitted land uses
106 allowed within Community Commercial designation are very broad, the
107 Commission, perhaps, may want to reconsider something in-between
108 such as a range of land uses. For example, such uses could be limited to
109 visitor accommodations, ancillary commercial uses to visitor
110 accommodations, as well as, high density residential. It is staff's opinion
111 that limiting commercial activity within this Character Area will address
112 concerns of potential "leap-frogging" of commercial uses away from the
113 Downtown core.

- 114
- 115 4. Roundabouts - The Commission unanimously agreed that language in the
116 Silverado Gateway Character Area with respect to referencing that the
117 apparent best design for intersection realignment is a roundabout, the
118 Commission unanimously voted that the language under the Connectivity
119 section be revised consistent with other Gateway Character Areas thereby
120 noting that a study should be initiated to evaluate all feasible alternatives

121 including signalization, intersection realignment, a roundabout and other
122 alternatives to address deficiencies and objectives.

123

124 5. Washington Street Extension to Dunaweal Avenue – Recognizing that this
125 extension is provided for in the City’s General Plan, the Commission
126 unanimously voted to keep in the UDP and directed that the language
127 referencing that this extension should be given high priority be deleted
128 from the text. In addition, the Commission further discussed that it would
129 be beneficial to use the existing bike path for emergency access only. It
130 was further discussed and agreed upon that the connection between
131 Washington Street and Silverado Trail was more sensible and a preferable
132 alternative of the two.

133

134 6. Wayfinding Signage - The Commission unanimously agreed that this issue
135 was very important and recommended it should be more emphasized in
136 the UDP.

137

138 7. Lincoln/Foothill Gateway – The Commissioner unanimously agreed that
139 pedestrian safety and traffic control measures were needed within this
140 Character Area and that more emphasis should be placed on this issue
141 under the Connectivity section of the UDP.

142

143 List of Outstanding Issues remaining to be addressed: At the public hearing held
144 on June 24th, the Commission directed staff to prepare a list of those items the
145 Commission has not yet addressed that were raised by the public. Staff has
146 reviewed the meeting minutes, letters submitted during the public hearing, as
147 well as, additional comments submitted after June 24, 2009, and has provided
148 below a summary list of issues that the Commission may want to focus their
149 discussion. (Attachments 1 & 2)

150

151 • A request that the Planning Commission should provide for additional time to
152 solicit more public comment and input from affected parties and/or
153 stakeholders before providing a recommendation to the City Council. (Doug
154 Cook)

155

156 • A suggestion that the UDP needs to provide for more economic diversity and
157 not solely focus on resort industry activities in order to contribute to a
158 balanced community and create work opportunities for its citizens. (Doug
159 Cook)

160

161 • It should be noted that staff will be meeting with Doug Cook on Monday,
162 August 24, 2009 to review all his comments made on the UDP. In response
163 to this meeting, staff will be transmitting any outstanding issues for further
164 consideration by the Commission prior to the meeting.

165

- 166 • A suggestion that Dunaweal Lane is not the best choice for a regional traffic
167 bypass and that the better option is to route the State Highway 29 across
168 Deer Park Road and up Silverado Trail. (Carl Sherrill)
169
- 170 • A suggestion that the Draft UDP provide more specificity with regards to
171 future public infrastructure needs, financial responsibilities of property owners,
172 public/private funding mechanisms and/or estimated anticipated costs for
173 UDP recommendations, as well as, shared public parking options. With
174 regards to parking, suggests that the Commission direct the document to
175 create a fully effective parking plan for commercial and public parking.
176 (Michael Quast)
177
- 178 • A suggestion that the UDP not provide guidance on the Diamond Hills Estates
179 site. (Kristin Casey)
180
- 181 • A suggestion that rather than denigrate the farm equipment dealership, the
182 UDP should include language that celebrates Calistoga's rural and eclectic
183 nature within the Resort Character Area under Land Use section. (Kristin
184 Casey)
185
- 186 • A suggestion that the UDP should not include language that the City should
187 be designating/reserving land for future relocation of municipal facilities at the
188 end of Washington Street within the Lower Washington Character Area.
189 (Kristin Casey)
190
- 191 • A request by the property owner that the long narrow parcel (APN 011-050-
192 044) between Calistoga Village Inn & Spa and Calistoga Beverage Company
193 remain unchanged or equal to that of Calistoga Beverage Company with
194 regards to being reverted back to Community Commercial in order for their
195 property to be developed to its full potential. (Jag Patel)
196
- 197 • A request that language be deleted within the Downtown Character Area –
198 Land Use and Connectivity sections that encourages redevelopment of their
199 property to provide public access to redeveloped parking facilities, as well as,
200 design their project to have access to public parking from Fair Way (Carolynn
201 Wilkinson)
202

203 It should be noted here that not everyone's issues have been captured within this
204 list. In going through the letters, staff has noted typographical and/or minor
205 corrections which require more clarification that will need to be completed
206 pending the processing of this Plan through the public hearing process. Staff
207 would further point out that immediately after final action of the UDP, staff
208 proposes to commence work on developing an implementation program setting
209 forth a recommended schedule for incorporating policy direction into the General
210 Plan, Zoning Ordinance and other regulatory documents, as well as, establishing

211 a priority schedule with timelines for commencing work on public initiated
212 infrastructure projects as identified in the UDP. It should be further noted that
213 this draft implementation program will be presented to the Planning Commission
214 for review and recommendation to the City Council. During processing of this
215 implementation of this program, public comment will be solicited.

216

217 Additional Written Public Comments: Attachment 1 represents written public
218 comments that have been received to date, since the public hearing held on June
219 24, 2009. Please note that those public written or verbal comments received in
220 conjunction with UDP Ad-Hoc Committee Meetings have not been included as
221 part of these comments. Such comments will be included in the staff report
222 prepared for the next public hearing held on this item along with final
223 recommendations of the Committee.

224

225 **RECOMMENDATION:**

226

227 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission continue discussion on the
228 Revised Draft Urban Design Plan, dated May 2009, solicit public comment, and
229 continue this item to September 23, 2009 (or a designated Special Meeting date).
230 Based upon Commission discussion and recommendations of the Ad-Hoc
231 Committee, staff proposes to bring forth revised UDP language for Commission
232 discussion and recommendation to the City Council at the next meeting.

233

234 **SUGGESTED MOTION:**

235

236 I move that the Planning Commission continue this item to Wednesday,
237 September 23, 2009 (or a designated Special Meeting date).

238

239 **ATTACHMENTS:**

240

- 241 1. Public Comments
- 242 2. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of June 24, 2009
- 243 3. Abbreviated Staff Report of June 24, 2009

244

245 [Note: A complete copy of the Planning Commission Staff Report of June 24,
246 2009 has been provided on the City's Website at www.ci.calistoga.ca.us as a
247 linked to the August 26, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.]