

City of Calistoga

Staff Report

TO: CHAIRMAN MANFREDI & MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: CHARLENE GALLINA, PLANNING & BUILDING DIRECTOR

MEETING DATE: NOVEMBER 10, 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 August 26, 2009.***)

7
8 **HISTORY/BACKGROUND:**

9
10 On August 26, 2009, the Planning Commission held a second public hearing on
11 the Revised Draft Urban Design Plan (UDP) that had been released on May 20,
12 2009 to confirm Commission direction provided to date on recommended
13 changes to the Revised Draft UDP. In addition, staff presented for Commission
14 discussion and direction a list of items that had not yet been addressed (these
15 were additional points raised at the June 24th meeting and in letters received
16 afterwards). Furthermore, staff provided a status update on the work effort of the
17 UDP Ad-Hoc Committee Meetings with the Merchant family. As reported,
18 additional time was needed to complete Committee discussion and formulate a
19 recommendation for Commission consideration. Therefore, issues directly
20 affecting the Merchant properties were deferred for a month pending completion
21 of work by the UDP Ad-Hoc Committee. The Meeting Minutes and an
22 abbreviated Staff Report for August 26, 2009 have been attached to this report
23 for Commission review and consideration. (Attachments 5 & 6)

24
25 **DISCUSSION:**

26
27 UDP Ad-Hoc Committee Meetings with the Merchant Family: The work effort of
28 the Committee occurred over three meetings – August 3, August 18, and October
29 13, 2009. It should be noted that the task at hand with the Committee and
30 Merchant family was not to embark on a specific evaluation of a development
31 proposal, nor to conduct negotiations around a development proposal, nor

32 develop a precise development plan for the property, but instead to provide
33 broad direction for language to be incorporated into the UDP in order to provide
34 clarity, definition and refinement for future amendments to relevant elements of
35 the General Plan and to provide clear direction and expectations to the property
36 owners and the public regarding the vision for the redevelopment of this key area
37 of Calistoga.

38
39 On October 13, 2009, staff presented the UDP Ad-Hoc Committee final
40 recommendations that were developed with participation from the Merchant
41 family. The final language recommended by the Ad-Hoc Committee places the
42 Merchant (not including the Indian Springs Resort property), Paoletti and Fox
43 properties in its entirety within the Gliderport Character Area. As presented,
44 applicable sections within the Gliderport Character Area have been revised to
45 remove, in most cases, directive, mandatory, or prescriptive language by
46 eliminating mandatory language, as well as, elements which were speculative or
47 overly precise (e.g., no need to plan for development of the Fox and Paoletti
48 except to consider access and circulation needs). As recommended, uses to be
49 considered in the redevelopment the Gliderport Character Area may include
50 retail/commercial uses, a full service resort and spa, residential uses and
51 community and visitor servicing uses. In addition, language was incorporated
52 stating that consideration be made in providing shared parking facilities. (Refer
53 to Attachments 1 & 2 – Chapter 2 Character Areas: Downtown & Gliderport
54 Character Areas)

55
56 Overall, the Committee and the Merchant family concluded that the proposed
57 language changes as recommended addresses the primary concerns of the
58 Merchant family (avoid mandatory creativity limiting prescriptive language) and
59 responds to the goals-objectives of the Committee.

60
61 Commission Recommendations for Changes to the Draft UDP: In response to
62 public comments provided during the public hearing testimony and letters
63 received to date, the Commission on August 26, 2009 provided final direction to
64 staff on recommended changes for further revision of Draft UDP. As presented
65 in Attachments 1 & 2 of this report, the Revised Draft Urban Design Plan, dated
66 November 2009 reflects Planning Commission direction provided from the
67 meetings of June 24 and August 26, 2009 after receiving substantial public input
68 on the Revised Draft UDP, dated May 20, 2009.

69
70 Once again, a clean version of the Revised Draft UDP without photographs has
71 been attached for Commission discussion and recommendation to the City
72 Council. In addition, staff has also provided a document highlighting “tracked
73 changes” to identify proposed new text and text to be deleted to reflect the public
74 input received and the Planning Commission’s direction. It should be noted
75 however, that revisions to maps have been hand drawn, since these maps will be

76 completed pending the processing of this Plan through the public hearing
77 process.

78

79 Outlined below is a summary of all the key changes that have occurred to the
80 Revised Draft UDP, since its original release in July 2008. Key changes to the
81 Revised Draft UDP, dated November 2009 include:

82

83 • Executive Summary & Introduction - Incorporated an executive summary
84 explaining the UDP process to date; provided more information on what was
85 included in each chapter.

86 • New Revisions:

87 ○ Incorporated additional information related to public hearings conducted to
88 date.

89 ○ Deleted reference related to Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375, since
90 the City has embarked on the development of a Local Climate Action Plan
91 that will specifically address state mandates on Global Warming.
92 However, it should be noted that recommendations provided in the UDP
93 are consistent thus far with proposed policy direction of this effort.

94

95 • Chapter 1 – Design Orientation

96 ○ No revisions proposed.

97

98 • Chapter 2 – Character Areas

99 ○ Reformatted discussion to provide clarity on the character area vision and
100 proposed policy guidance recommendations.

101 ○ Reformatted background information and policy directives to clearly
102 identify the essence and/or desired objectives of the Character Area into
103 the following headings: Boundaries, Existing Conditions, Objectives,
104 Development Character, Land Use, Connectivity, and Architecture.

105 ○ Character Area 1: Gateways

106 ■ Incorporated language that an evaluation of all feasible alternatives
107 (signalization, intersection realignment, roundabout and other
108 alternatives) for intersection improvements would be conducted to
109 address deficiencies and objectives not a focus on roundabouts as
110 the preferred solution.

111 ■ New Revisions:

112 • Silverado Gateway - revised connectivity language to require
113 the evaluation of all feasible alternatives for intersection
114 improvements.

115 • Petrified Forest - re-incorporated reference to Highland
116 Court at State Highway 128.

117 • Foothill/Lincoln - incorporated additional language on
118 pedestrian safety control.

119 • Incorporated wayfinding signage recommendations at all
120 Gateways.

- 121 ○ Character Area 2: Corridors
- 122 ▪ Foothill Corridor – deleted language regarding the need to
- 123 encourage higher density in-fill residential uses.
- 124 ▪ Deleted the Northern Crossing (Foothill/State Highway 128 &
- 125 Grant) recommendation.
- 126 ▪ New Revisions:
- 127 • Highway 29 Corridor – deleted references on encouraging
- 128 the development of a resort as an alternative to a residential
- 129 subdivision of the Diamond Hills Subdivision, as well as
- 130 street level properties.
- 131 • Highway 29 Corridor (Connectivity) - clarified the process for
- 132 providing public access to the Napa River in conjunction with
- 133 General Plan direction.
- 134 ○ Character Area 3: Downtown
- 135 ▪ Retracted language that discouraged local serving businesses
- 136 along Lincoln Avenue.
- 137 ▪ Adjusted Historic District boundaries to include the Roman Spa Hot
- 138 Springs Resort, the Calistoga Spa Hot Spring Resort, and the
- 139 former Valley Business Forms properties.
- 140 ▪ New Revisions:
- 141 • Incorporated recommendations of the UDP Ad-Hoc
- 142 Committee – transferred Merchant properties fronting
- 143 Lincoln Avenue to the Gliderport Character Area.
- 144 • Clarified land use recommendations for privately owned
- 145 parking lots on Gerrard Street.
- 146 • Clarified land use and connectivity recommendations for
- 147 CalMart.
- 148 • Clarified land use and connectivity recommendations for the
- 149 Doctor Wilkinson’s Hot Springs Resort; deleted requirement
- 150 for designating parking for public use and accessing such
- 151 parking from Fair Way.
- 152 • Corrected street names.
- 153 ○ Character Area 4: Gliderport
- 154 ▪ Established a new character area for the former Gliderport; this
- 155 area includes the Merchant family lands commonly referred to as
- 156 the former Gliderport and adjacent parcels of Fox and Paoletti.
- 157 ▪ New Revisions:
- 158 • Incorporated recommendations of the UDP Ad-Hoc
- 159 Committee which resulted in a completed rewrite of this
- 160 Character Area to address concerns of the Merchant Family
- 161 with respect to avoiding mandatory creatively limiting
- 162 prescriptive language. Recommend uses include
- 163 retail/commercial uses, a full service resort and spa,
- 164 residential uses and community and visitor servicing uses.

- 165 Consideration should also be made to provide shared
166 parking.
- 167 • Connectivity - recommends amendment to the 2007
168 Transportation Plan to eliminate the Class 1 bicycle path
169 reflected across the Merchant family properties.
- 170 ○ Character Area 5: Resort
- 171 ■ Retracted the size of this Character Area to address public
172 concerns regarding the potential amount of resort development.
- 173 ■ Recognizes Calistoga Beverage Company as a fully compliant use
174 pursuant to its current land use entitlements and provides design
175 guidance for minimal expansion on the development portion of their
176 site.
- 177 ■ New Revisions:
- 178 • Reinstated limited land uses to reduce the broad range of
179 land uses permitted within the Community Commercial
180 General Plan Land Use designation in order to address
181 concerns of “leap-frogging” commercial uses away from the
182 Downtown core. Recommends high density residential,
183 visitor accommodations, and commercial uses ancillary to
184 primary uses to be the preferred land uses in this area. This
185 recommendation includes the long narrow parcel (APN 011-
186 050-044) between Calistoga Village Inn & Spa and Calistoga
187 Beverage Company owned by Jag Patel in order for their
188 property to be developed to its full potential.
- 189 • Connectivity - recommends amendment to the 2007
190 Transportation Plan to eliminate the Class 1 bicycle path
191 reflected across the Indian Springs Resort as requested at
192 the UDP Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting.
- 193 ○ Character Area 6: Lower Washington
- 194 ■ Incorporates language that exceptions may be granted on a case
195 by case to the minimum requirement of two uses per parcel.
- 196 ■ New Revisions:
- 197 • Clarified connectivity recommendations with regard to the
198 extension of Washington Street to Dunaweal Lane.
- 199 • Clarified the process for providing public access to the Napa
200 River in conjunction with General Plan direction.
- 201
- 202 • Chapter 3 – Circulation Systems
- 203 ○ Deletes the Northern Crossing (Foothill/State Highway 128 & Grant)
204 recommendation.
- 205 ○ Corrects the east-west notations on the connection between Washington
206 & Silverado cross section.
- 207 ○ Clarifies that the City should initiate studies of all feasible alternatives
208 (signalization, realignment, a roundabout and other alternatives) for
209 intersection improvements to address deficiencies and objectives not a

- 210 focus on roundabouts as the preferred solution. With respect to this
211 process, language was included to clarify that full public input and review
212 will be conducted before a desired road design or intersection
213 improvement can be settled upon.
- 214 ○ Extension of Washington Street to Dunaweal Lane – This section was
215 revised to identify that the proposed alignment must be appropriate in
216 scale and suitable for the rural/urban transitional setting and that such
217 alignment must not encroach upon County agricultural lands.
 - 218 ○ New Revisions:
 - 219 ■ Deletes reference related to Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375,
220 since the City has embarked on adoption of a Local Climate Action
221 plan that will specifically address state mandates on Global
222 Warming.
 - 223 ■ Acknowledges that other valley crossing will be explored when
224 taking steps to relocate State Highway 29 from Lincoln Avenue.
 - 225 ■ New Street #1 – Extension of Washington to Dunaweal Lane -
226 provides more clarification on intent. Requires a feasibility study to
227 be conducted which will include substantial public input.
 - 228 ■ New Street #2 - Corrects references to the Merchant Family
229 properties with regards to changes recommended by the Ad-Hoc
230 Committee on the Gliderport Character Area.
 - 231 ■ New Street #3 – Deletes reference to providing access to the
232 Gliderport Character Area, since street is not directly adjacent to
233 this area.
 - 234 ■ Parking – Deletes Shared Facility 1 – Merchant Family Properties
235 section to reflect recommendations of the Ad-Hoc Committee on
236 the Gliderport Character Area.
 - 237 ■ Re-numbers recommended parking facilities.
 - 238 ■ Deletes references to parking garages.
- 239
- 240 ● Please note that general typographical and minor corrections may still need to
241 be completed pending the processing of this Plan through the public hearing
242 process.

243

244 General Plan Conformity: In response to Commission and public comments,
245 staff presented on October 13, 2008 a summary of topic areas identifying those
246 areas and ideas which would, if adopted, require future General Plan
247 amendments. In response to the Revised Draft UDP, staff has attached for
248 Commission review an updated summary of those topic areas. (Attachment 3)
249 Once again, it should be noted that these amendments will take different forms.
250 Some may simply be additional language added to elements of the current
251 General Plan, such as new goals or objectives or policies. Other actions will
252 include modification of the General Plan Land Use Map to reflect modification of
253 boundaries or other map amendments to implement policy direction as needed.
254 Still, other actions will include the development of new land use designations (as

255 recommended by the Character Areas of the UDP) and the requisite
256 accompanying land use descriptions, goals, objectives, and policies. Again, as
257 these come forward to the Planning Commission for discussion and
258 recommendation, specific environmental review and noticed public hearings will
259 be a part of the process.

260

261 Additional Written Public Comments: Attachment 4 represents written public
262 comments that have been received to date, since the public hearing held on
263 August 26, 2009.

264

265 Environmental Review: During previous public testimony, it has been suggested
266 that the Draft UDP requires environmental review through the preparation of an
267 Initial Study. The City Attorney and staff maintain that such environmental review
268 is not necessary given the nature of the Urban Design Plan. As presented, the
269 Draft UDP is intended to serve as a report summarizing recommendations for
270 change and amendment of the General Plan and regulatory codes. As such, the
271 Plan itself is not binding nor is it a project under the terms of the California
272 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any subsequent action will require
273 preparation of environmental documentation and public review pursuant to the
274 provisions of CEQA. Therefore, staff has determined that the Draft Urban Design
275 Plan, as revised and dated November 2009 is a project exempt from CEQA
276 pursuant to Section 15183 Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning
277 and Section 15262 Feasibility and Planning Studies of the CEQA Guidelines.

278

279 Next Steps: Upon completion of Planning Commission deliberation and Council
280 recommendation on the Revised Draft UDP, it is staff's intent to forward a final
281 Word document draft with tracked changes to the City Council for their review
282 and discussion. Upon completion of the public hearing process and final action
283 by the City Council, staff proposes to complete final production of the document
284 (e.g., incorporate photos back into the document, final editing, etc.). Immediately
285 afterwards, staff proposes to commence work on developing an implementation
286 program setting forth a recommended schedule for incorporating policy direction
287 into the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and other regulatory documents, as well
288 as, establishing a priority schedule with timelines for commencing work on public
289 initiated infrastructure projects as identified in the UDP. It should be noted that
290 this draft implementation program will be presented to the Planning Commission
291 for review and recommendation to the City Council. During processing of this
292 implementation of this program, public comment will be solicited.

293

294 **RECOMMENDATION:**

295

296 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss the Revised Draft
297 Urban Design Plan, dated November 2009, solicit public comments, and offer a
298 recommendation for action to the City Council.

299

300

SUGGESTED MOTION:

301

302

I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the Revised Draft Urban Design Plan, dated November 2009 (or as amended based upon Commission direction).

304

305

306

ATTACHMENTS:

307

1. Revised Draft Urban Design Plan, dated November 10, 2009 (Clean Version)

308

309

2. Revised Draft Urban Design Plan, dated November 10, 2009 (Tracked Changes)

310

311

3. Updated Listing of Potential Future General Plan/Zoning Map and Text Amendments

312

313

4. Public Comments

314

5. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of August 26, 2009

315

6. Abbreviated Staff Report of August 26, 2009

316

317

[Note: A complete copy of the Planning Commission Staff Reports of June 24 and August 26, 2009 has been provided on the City's Website at www.ci.calistoga.ca.us as a linked to the November 10, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.]

318

319

320