

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT
FEBRUARY 11, 2009
ITEMS G & H**

ITEM G. TOUR OF INSPECTION

PA 2008-04, CDR 2008-04 – Chairman Manfredi noted that this item had been continued from the Planning Commission meeting of January 28, 2009.

Shortly after 3:00 p.m. the Planning Commission left the Community Center to inspect the project site for the proposed Bounsall & Wright Winery and Event Center to be located at 414 Foothill Blvd. (APNs 011-260-045 through 011-260-076) within the “I” Light Industrial Zoning District.

The purpose of this inspection was to view the physical characteristics of the site only. No discussion took place on the tour of inspection. The following people were in attendance on this tour of inspection: Planning Commission Chair Jeff Manfredi, Commissioner Nick Kite, Planning and Building Director Charlene Gallina, Jeff Bounsall, Bill Bounsall, Kathy Bowser, Jean Kapolchok, Urban Designer, Kari Abreu, Windy Johnson, Barbara Moler, and Michelle Wing of the Calistoga Tribune.

The Regular Planning Commission Meeting resumed at 5:35 p.m. in the Calistoga Community Center, 1307 Washington Street, City of Calistoga, CA, as noted above at the beginning of these minutes.

H. NEW BUSINESS

1. PA 2008-04, CDR 2008-04. Conceptual Design Review for the proposed Bounsall & Wright Winery and Event Center on a 7-acre site to be developed in three phases. The project proposes to feature two wineries, a tasting room with a delicatessen and outside picnic areas, two retail buildings, winery office space, and a special event area with an adjacent reception building for a site total of 80,289 square feet. The project site is located at 414 Foothill Boulevard (APNs 011-260-045 through 011-260-076) within the “I” Light Industrial Zoning District. *(This item was continued from the Planning Commission Meeting of January 28, 2009.)*

Chairman Manfredi asked **Director Gallina** to summarize the project.

Director Gallina did a brief introduction of the item and clarified the intent of the conceptual design process. She noted that after the Commission reviews the conceptual plan and comments from the public, the Project would be presented to the City Council for consideration of a Memorandum of

47 Understanding (MOU) for the processing of a Development Agreement and
48 the submittal of formal development application. If the MOU is executed, this
49 project would possibly involve working with a subcommittee of the Council for
50 negotiating terms of a Development Agreement. Director Gallina then turned
51 the presentation over to the applicant for a presentation on the project, before
52 staff gave an assessment on the project.
53

54 **Jeff Bounsall, 414 Foothill Blvd.**, spoke on behalf of the Bounsall family. He
55 started by giving a brief history of his family (several generations) and their
56 contributions to the City of Calistoga. He then noted that they have tried to
57 develop their plan with the idea of preserving the character and history of
58 Calistoga. He stated that the plan has been developing over 15 years and
59 includes: two wineries, two retail buildings, a tasting room with a deli and
60 outside picnic area and garden, fruit stand, winery office space, and a special
61 event area with an adjacent reception building. Chairman Manfredi then
62 asked for clarification of the project. Mr. Bounsall responded by explaining
63 that there would be four separate parcels on the property and they are
64 proposing to merge them in order to complete the project as a whole, rather
65 than separate projects. He also noted that the Bounsall family believes that
66 their plan is a “less intense” use of the land than what it is zoned for and could
67 potentially have on it such as an inn or spa, and by purposely not doing one of
68 these other kinds of businesses; they would not be competing with the
69 businesses in downtown Calistoga. This is important to them because they
70 want to do something that draws people to Calistoga and other local
71 businesses. They want to support and compliment other local businesses, and
72 stated additional benefits to the community as a whole (jobs, etc.) He
73 concluded by stating that this proposed project is not for him or this
74 generation, but for future generations and the legacy of his family. “We have a
75 substantial investment in the community’s vitality and future.”
76

77 **Jean Kopolchok, Urban Designer** then gave a power point presentation on
78 the planning aspects of the project. She noted that there are 31 separate
79 parcels on the property and that the zoning for it is industrial and light
80 industrial. She reviewed the guidelines from the General Plan for this property
81 which is that it will be designed to “convey agricultural qualities”. She also
82 noted that this property is located at one of the gateways to Calistoga and
83 reviewed the guidelines for this aspect of the project.
84

85 **Mary Sites, Project Architect** then gave a presentation of the overall design
86 concept for the project site and each proposed building.
87

88 **Director Gallina** then pointed out that the applicant would be completing the
89 project in three phases, and noted that the proposed winery was in keeping

90 (appropriate) with the zoning guidelines for the property's location. She stated
91 that one of the remaining issues seems to be the "intensity" and size of the
92 winery, and that is what she is asking the Planning Commission to focus on in
93 their discussion and comments. She then gave an overview of remaining
94 issues with this project that need to be addressed which includes: appropriate
95 height of buildings, parking, traffic, access for emergency vehicles, affordable
96 housing requirements, etc. She also provided an overview of the list of
97 wineries provided in the staff report in which the Commission could use to
98 conduct a review on the proposed project.
99

100 **Chairman Manfredi** then opened the floor to the public and the applicant for
101 any comments or questions before the Commissioners commented.
102

103 **Jeff Bounsall** stated that Adobe Engineering, the engineering firm on this
104 project has reviewed the Caltrans Right-of-Way and egress, and stated that
105 there would be enough room for emergency access only. He also commented
106 on the list of wineries that Director Gallina had prepared and presented, and
107 noted that the list includes wineries outside of Calistoga and asked the
108 Commission to focus on the Calistoga wineries only. He noted that there are
109 only 3 local wineries in the City of Calistoga.
110

111 **Kari Hammond Abram, 1720 Reynard Lane**, stated that she was speaking
112 on behalf of her mother, Elizabeth Hammond, who lives on the south side of
113 the Bounsall property. She distributed a copy of the letter written by her
114 mother to the members of the Planning Commission. She noted that there is
115 an ongoing dispute regarding the property boundary line. She then read the
116 letter for the record and a copy is attached to these minutes. After reading the
117 letter she added the following points of concern: 1) in the Staff Report under
118 Requests, the acreage amount is 6.68 acres not 7; 2) the height of one of the
119 proposed buildings is 50.6 feet which would completely block the view of the
120 Palisades and Mt. St. Helena, which can now be seen from Ms. Hammond's
121 property. 3) she noted that there has never been a business on this parcel
122 except for one man who dehydrated walnuts, and had only one small tractor;
123 4) possible soil contamination from storage tanks which has not been
124 addressed; and 5) a concern regarding a possible one million gallons of
125 wastewater from the production of the proposed wineries that has not been
126 addressed.
127

128 **Michael Brooks, Land Surveyor, business located at 6525 Washington**
129 **Street, Yountville** spoke on behalf of his client Elizabeth Hammond. He
130 noted that there is still a boundary dispute that is unresolved, which boils down
131 to a difference of $\frac{1}{4}$ of an acre. This difference in what the survey prepared by
132 the surveyor for the Bounsall's (Howard Bruner) and his survey show could

133 impact the size of the proposed structures because they are based on
134 percentages of the total gross area. He also noted that with regard to the
135 floodway line, in September 2008, FEMA (Federal Emergency Management
136 Agency) issued a new floodway map, which shows a different shape and
137 location of the floodway for the Bounsall and Hammond properties. This could
138 also impact the size of the proposed structures and the amount of buildable
139 area. Additionally, as it is shown now on the Bounsall's architectural
140 rendering, the proposed event center (building G) is located in the floodway.
141 The last point of concern he raised is with regard to the issuance of the
142 Certificates of Compliance. In reading the certificates, he noted that the
143 property is described in lots and blocks but there is no mention of the streets
144 between the blocks. He also noted that it appears to him that the property has
145 not been conveyed in lots and blocks prior to the issuance of the Certificates
146 of Compliance. He then questions if the City of Calistoga still owns these
147 "streets" or if they have been "vacated". This would also have an impact on
148 the proposed project.

149

150 **Chairman Manfredi** stated that he wanted to remind everyone at the meeting
151 that the purpose of tonight's meeting was for the purpose of design review and
152 would like any other speakers to please stick to design issues. However, he
153 appreciates the points that Mr. Brooks and others have brought forward and
154 stated that the Commission will review them.

155

156 **Jeff Bounsall** said he appreciates the comments made by the Hammonds
157 and spoke in response to Mr. Brooks's comments regarding the floodway. He
158 stated that in 1987 he was a part of the study that was conducted on the
159 floodway from the city limits to Elm Street in Calistoga. A study was done in
160 1988 which updated floodway data, and then there was another study done by
161 FEMA in 1992, which was based on data from 1929. In order to get accurate
162 information, Mr. Bounsall believes that the data from these two studies need to
163 be combined because they use different terminology. This work has been
164 completed by the original engineer and will be submitted to the City. He noted
165 that the Bounsall's surveyor has taken the information from this new document
166 and marked the floodway to the inch. He believes that this should "put this
167 issue to bed." He also noted that with regard to the issue of the "streets" on
168 the Bounsall property, they have not been dedicated and are owned by his
169 mother Marion Bounsall. He also mentioned that several other studies have
170 been completed.

171

172 **Norma Toffenelli, 10001 Dunaweal Lane**, thanked staff for their extra efforts
173 in preparing data pertaining to this project. She first noted that according to
174 the staff report, after carefully reviewing the City's General Plan, "staff does
175 have concerns with this development proposal with respect to the proposed

176 scale and intensity of the two wineries coupled with proposed intensity of the
177 retail component, as well as the special events to occur on the project site,
178 especially if all these activities occur at the same time that the two wineries
179 are at their peak operation.” She further referred to the letter by the State
180 Department of Fish and Game (that was attached to the staff report of January
181 28, 2009) in which their concerns are outlined with regard to the possible
182 impacts on sensitive resources in particular the Napa River and water
183 resources, storage, and infrastructure for irrigation. She noted that if
184 production at the wineries goes to the maximum of 40,000 cases each, the
185 amount of water needed would be a million and a half gallons of water for
186 each winery. She further noted that based on a 2008 report done by Local
187 Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) on Calistoga’s ability to serve the
188 water needs of the population, the amount of flow and demand on the sewer
189 system during the wet winter months would be when the wineries use the
190 most water, and the added amount of waste water would far exceed the
191 permitted limits of capacity of Calistoga’s sewer system. She added that the
192 bearer of the burden of impact for an overtaxed sewer system is the citizens
193 who live outside the City limits (of which she is one). She then referred to the
194 comments in the staff report of January 28th from the Public Works Director
195 regarding the possible need to “condemn” certain properties to expand the
196 sewer capacity and wonders what properties would be involved. She believes
197 this is a critical issue in considering this proposed project.

198
199 **Director Gallina** pointed out that with regard to the comments in the staff
200 report from Public Works, some of these are “standard conditions that may not
201 relate to the project”.

202
203 **Ron Tadai, Napa County Farm Bureau, 811 Jefferson Street, Napa.** Said
204 that he was speaking tonight because the Farm Bureau believes that the City
205 would be best served if they adopted winery development standards for all
206 potential new wineries that are consistent with the provisions that the County
207 has adopted in what is known as the “Winery Definition Ordinance.” The Farm
208 Bureau urges the City to adopt these standards for all new wineries within the
209 Bounsall property as well as any new wineries within the City limits. There are
210 two main provisions of the Ordinance that the Bureau believes come in to
211 play. One is that 75% of the grapes to be used in the wine production be
212 sourced from Napa Valley vineyards. This is so that the appellation and
213 economy of Napa Valley be preserved. The second provision relates to wine
214 touring and tasting of new wineries and that it be “ancillary to wine making”,
215 which would tend to cut down on conflicts with neighboring properties. He
216 mentioned that the City of Napa had worked closely with the Farm Bureau to
217 incorporate the Winery Definition Ordinance into their Municipal Code, and
218 they would extend the same service to Calistoga. They support Calistoga for

219 an opportunity to permit wine production facilities within the City limits, and to
220 showcase Napa's premium wine products. They will look forward to working
221 with staff, the applicant, the Planning Commission, and the City Council on
222 developing sound and sensible guidelines.

223
224 **Kristin Casey, 1132 Denise Drive, Calistoga** stated that she had sent a
225 letter outlining her concerns to the Commission and the local newspaper. She
226 stressed that she believes the project is too big, especially given the emphasis
227 in the revised General Plan on the importance of preserving the "ruralness and
228 smallness " of the entry corridor areas. She went on to read a section on page
229 LU 46 – Goal LU2, Policy 2 of the Land Use Element of the General Plan that
230 talks about overlay designation regulations that states: "all new developments
231 on sites with overlay designations shall follow the overlay designation
232 regulations in section D of this Land Use Element to insure that their
233 development is in harmony with the surrounding environment." She asked
234 that the Planning Commission take this into consideration as they review this
235 project.

236
237 **Aaron Harkin, 1019 Myrtle Street, Calistoga**, noted that "in concept the
238 proposed project is a worthwhile endeavor", and urged the Commission to
239 urge the developer to "continue working with the community and the neighbors
240 to tweak the intensity issues but overall move forward with what he believes
241 will be an economically viable project that will enhance the entry corridor to the
242 town."

243
244 **Chairman Manfredi**, seeing no one else coming forward to speak, called for a
245 10 minute break before resuming with the Commissioners' discussion.

246
247 After the break, **Chairman Manfredi** then asked the Commissioners if they
248 had any questions of staff or the applicant.

249
250 **Director Gallina** stated that before discussion started she wanted to note into
251 the record that a letter of communication from **Mr. Paul Smith** had been
252 received and distributed to the Commissioners.

253
254 **Commissioner Kite** asked for clarification about the total site area if it
255 included going out into the center of the Napa River.

256
257 **Director Gallina** confirmed that yes, the total site area did include going out
258 into the center of the river.

259
260 **Commissioner Kite** then asked about whether residential replacement was a
261 requirement of this project.

262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303

Director Gallina stated that in her comments to the applicant, she had informed them that whatever housing was lost, would need to be replaced, which they do propose to have a three bedroom unit to replace the housing. She added that there is also another unit on the site that will need to be looked at as well as meeting the City's affordable housing requirement resulting from the employees that would be utilized at this site.

Commissioner Kite asked if the replacement housing, as well as any additional affordable housing is required to be on site.

Director Gallina stated that it does not have to be on the site, it could be provided somewhere else.

Commissioner Kite then asked the applicant "why two wineries?"

Jeff Bounsall responded that after a very thorough review of looking at other potential uses such as an inn or a wine warehouse, which would be permitted under the General Plan, they decided that they did not want to compete with the downtown merchants by establishing another inn, and that the plan they came up with incorporated the uniqueness of the site and seemed to be the best use of the land and merging the parcels that would have the least amount of impact.

Commissioner Kite further asked if the reason had to do with economics.

Jeff Bounsall said yes, it was an issue of economics, which also included the reason for the design of the buildings and facilities and the related expenses.

Katherine Bowser, 1619 Washington Street, stated that the applicants did go back and forth about proposing a winery or another bed and breakfast and they decided that they did not want to compete with the other bed and breakfast's in town. She continued by commenting that the back of the site would be open space with only temporary structures such as a gazebo or a tent going up by request only. She added that this would be an alternative site for celebrations held at the Napa County Fairgrounds, which might generate more revenue for the City as opposed to it going to the County, if in fact that is where the fees from the Fairgrounds go.

Vice-Chairman Creager asked for clarification on the interplay between the PD Overlay designation and the zoning designation and which has precedent?

304 **Director Gallina** responded that: “the General Plan takes precedent over the
305 industrial zoning of the property because of the time in which the General Plan
306 was updated versus the zoning, and so the PD provides us that guidance for
307 what type of uses should go on the property as well as looking at policies that
308 we have because this property is located within the entry corridor, and the
309 General Plan gives us that guidance.”
310

311 **Commissioner Bush** noted that she “thought that the architect stated that
312 you (the applicant) were not going to use one of the buildings (building B) that
313 is designated retail for retail” and asked if they had some other idea for it?
314

315 **Jean Kalpolchok** responded that building B would have a residential unit on
316 top and the bottom would be used for storage of gardening equipment, a
317 commercial kitchen, and a changing area and would not include the small
318 retail area that they had originally been included in the design.
319

320 **Commissioner Bush** asked for clarification of the type of retail items that
321 would be sold in the retail building and whether they would be “agriculture or
322 winery related”?
323

324 **Jean Kalpolchok** replied that it would be “winery related to the extent that in
325 wineries with wine tasting you have dishes and cheeses and breads.” She
326 then commented that “the General Plan Land Use for this property remains
327 industrial; it is not simply the zoning.”
328

329 **Commissioner Coates** then stated “based on that statement that it is light
330 industrial, and we were talking about the Certificates of Compliance (COCs),
331 and if this project (and proposed land use) does not take place, how do these
332 come into play? It is in conflict with the General Plan and Director Gallina just
333 stated that the General Plan takes precedent pretty much over everything and
334 now we are talking about the light industrial approach to it and yet we have 29
335 or 31 lots which was based on the probability of it being way back when,
336 residential? So, where does that leave that parcel with those COCs?”
337

338 **Director Gallina** responded that she has had several discussions about this
339 with the applicant, and “if they were not to do this proposal and wanted to
340 come in with an industrial proposal of a warehouse or something else other
341 than what is stated in the General Plan, we would have to say it is inconsistent
342 with the General Plan even though there is an industrial designation from a
343 General Plan standpoint, the policies in the General Plan give us a more
344 specific direction on other type of land uses.” She further stated that she does
345 not know why “when we did the General Plan update that if we did have these
346 policies in here why we just didn’t go in and amend the land use diagram to

347 say it's a PD overlay or something else? – but that's my reading of the
348 General Plan and we've tried to be consistent on that, but even though its got
349 the industrial zoning, as long as a proposal comes in here and it's consistent
350 with the policy of the PD then we would be in favor of the project as opposed
351 to if something came in contrary to that policy direction; and I'm looking to the
352 Planning Commission too for that concurrence on that interpretation especially
353 for those that were here during that time frame.”
354

355 **Chairman Manfredi** stated that he had made a list of the issues that were
356 brought up and asked if the Commissioners wanted to start their discussion
357 that way. He noted that the first area of concern is the height of some of the
358 proposed buildings and asked Commissioners to comment on this.
359

360 **Commissioner Kite** opened his comments by stating that he appreciated that
361 the applicants have worked long and hard on this proposal and appreciated
362 that they are trying to produce something that will be a legacy for their family
363 and he likes the general concept, “so in the comments that come, please don't
364 take it as calling your baby ugly; we're trying just to address aspects of the
365 design, but appreciate all the effort you have put into it.”
366

367 **Jeff Bounsall** stated that he wanted to clarify the Certificate of Compliance
368 issue again. He stated that he disagreed with Planning staff and that “if we
369 continue down this path, I don't see it being a good fruition; we have single
370 parcels, separately described, they are legal, they can't take away building
371 rights on each single lot, we're not after that , we haven't asked for that, if we
372 wanted to merge a couple of parcels, we can do that and then comply with the
373 zoning, but I don't have to work with my brother or sister – this is a legal
374 question that is very difficult for any of you to answer, so I would urge you to –
375 I don't know how we continue on with this Charlene, but obviously we have
376 had a difference of opinion regarding our parcels that we own that are
377 separately described and what you are saying is we're going to take them
378 away from you. That can't happen in the United States and California. I didn't
379 want to go down this tract with you guys. I wanted to go through the project,
380 wanted to go through the concept review; just want you to have in your mind
381 that if want to talk to someone who is a professional that understands law
382 regarding that – it's called the taking of land, taking of property rights, so, with
383 that, I didn't want to take you away from looking a the site, looking at the
384 concepts, so if we want to speak further on this – thank you.”
385

386 **Commissioner Kite** responded by saying that “none of us are trying to
387 consider that, the only reason it has come up is because there's been kind of
388 an implied, if we don't do this look what could happen.”
389

390 **Jeff Bounsall** stated that “that is correct, bottom line.”

391

392 **Chairman Manfredi** brought the discussion back to building heights, and
393 asked Commissioner Kite to comment on this.

394

395 **Commissioner Kite** stated that he feels that the building heights are high and
396 they are not compatible with other buildings in the entry corridor with the tallest
397 buildings being closest to the road and no scaling back with going from lowest
398 to highest.

399

400 **Commissioner Bush** stated that she likes the architecture very much, but
401 agrees that the heights are just a little too high. She thinks the landscaping is
402 wonderful and really likes the idea of an event center.

403

404 **Chairman Manfredi** stated that his initial overall issue with the proposal is that
405 it lacks cohesiveness and he doesn’t understand the 2 wineries and all of the
406 other different uses all together and generally thinks it does not really have an
407 identity or an understandable rhyme and reason. He is also concerned about
408 the impact if a lot of people showed up at the same time for the different uses
409 of the site. He also feels that the bulk of the buildings are too high and too big.
410 He would much prefer to see something at the entrance to town which is along
411 the lines of what Kristin Casey spoke to; more of a sense of entering a town
412 that is low key and has a mixture of types of buildings, with some smaller and
413 some larger. He suggested that the applicant look at and work on the heights
414 of the buildings.

415

416 **Vice-Chair Creager** commented: “I think you can’t separate the height from
417 the intensity of development; I appreciate the use of the buildings as the
418 architect noted to accommodate some of the machinery, which would interfere
419 with some of the multiple use stuff, so that is what I mean by there is a lot of
420 interrelatedness to these individual issues and so I think the height with the
421 intensity of development is too much, that the scaling on the site relative to the
422 surrounding landscape – so if we change one part of the element I understand
423 it’s going to affect others and I think we will touch on that.”

424

425 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested that they touch on it now because they do go
426 hand-in-hand.

427

428 **Commissioner Coats** commented that: “I’m going to go back to problems we
429 are having with the conceptual design approach. It’s a great idea, what’s
430 happening here is that you end up with reports from different agencies that
431 provide information for us to look at without a clear view of what the true intent
432 is – a good example is Fish and Game.” He then read the following quote

433 from the report: "Proposed project does not provide a sufficient buffer along
434 the Napa River to prevent impact to sensitive resources." He went on to say
435 that it does not mean it can't be mitigated, "but if it can't, you can just about
436 throw out half of those buildings, so the whole concept goes down the tubes.
437 So I guess where I'm coming from is – and I get frustrated with this is because
438 back in my day, was that you had these reports in hand when you came
439 forward, we didn't have the design concept approach, which is a good
440 approach because it does help the applicant and the City to understand
441 things, but there are sometimes there are these big hurdles that they have to
442 cross over and if you don't have some minimal assurance that they can
443 accomplish those we all sat up here for nothing. And then we go back to
444 density – so if you have to set back 100 feet from the river, these poor folks
445 are out, and I don't have the answer; water is another huge issue that has a
446 direct impact on whether you do 2 wineries, how much water can the City
447 handle? We don't have an answer and they don't have an answer so how can
448 we sit here as a board and make a good decision?" He went on to say that he
449 loves the architectural design, but agrees with the Commission on the density
450 issue, though he likes where the applicant is going with the project. He closed
451 his comments by stating: "there are two big issues that have such an impact
452 on this how can we honestly and truly come up with a consensus that the
453 applicant can go with?... these are questions I don't know how to answer
454 short of having some kind of minimal research done on it to see if indeed they
455 are mitigatable and that the project is going to go forward as presented or in
456 some form like that."

457
458 **Chairman Manfredi** commented that during the site visit he did mention that
459 in his opinion having read all the reports, it was a 100 foot setback from the
460 river and "you guys said no it was 30."

461
462 **Commissioner Coates** stated: "But that's my whole point, we're talking about
463 structures, and so based on a typical State agency throwing so much at you
464 and what you can and can't do, and then,... and I would direct this to our
465 Planning Director – I guess it has to be mitigated to the satisfaction of Fish
466 and Game in this particular issue and then does it override our (the City's)
467 required minimum of a 30 foot, setback?"

468
469 **Mary Sites**, stated that she has worked on projects in the past where they
470 were within a setback and in working with Fish and Game, they have
471 considered "if the land was already in use and is being changed from plowed
472 earth (which is something that is really bad around the river) to something that
473 is permanent landscaping, they don't generally have, they're actually kind of
474 glad that it happened. So we have to review this with them more thoroughly."
475

476 **Commissioner Coates** reiterated that this is where he has a problem with the
477 process and big issues.
478

479 **Director Gallina** noted that with other projects, such as the Pool Project,
480 sometimes it is necessary to meet with Fish and Game on the site so that they
481 can be walked through a project and then come to a better understanding and
482 perhaps is able to negotiate the required amount of setback.
483

484 There was a little bit of discussion between **Commissioner Coates** and
485 **Chairman Manfredi** on the setback issue, and then **Chairman Manfredi**
486 stated that: "I think we should recognize that there are setbacks and we are
487 just not sure what they are which will ultimately impact the design." He then
488 suggested that the Commission focus on what they think of what the applicant
489 is proposing physically on the site and the use, and that "all of the other issues
490 that have been raised are very important, but will be dealt with one way or the
491 other and proved to be either insurmountable or require a real change and a
492 real redesign."
493

494 **Vice-Chair Creager** noted that their understanding is consistency with the
495 General Plan, and believes that there is real value there at this stage.
496

497 **Chairman Manfredi** then responded: "yes, and that goes to the fact that I
498 think the project is too intense for stated goals of the General Plan overall for
499 this City and in particular for a gateway." He then asked the Commission how
500 they felt about the idea that was brought up by the Farm Bureau about
501 establishing some guidelines and also the issue of replacement housing.
502

503 **Commissioner Kite** responded by mentioning the density of some of the
504 wineries included in Director Gallina's data on other local wineries, as a way of
505 comparing them to the proposed project.
506

507 **Vice-Chair Creager** responded that he wanted to go back to the height issue
508 as it relates to intensity, and noted that barn buildings can be high, and so in
509 terms of consistency with the surrounding area, if the intensity were down, he
510 would not have as much of a problem with the height if it is being used to store
511 equipment and shielding surrounding areas from noise, as opposed to other
512 repercussions from having machinery running, but with the intensity, the
513 height is too much – too much mass.
514

515 **Commissioner Kite** added that "the relationship of the building to the site also
516 works into that equation in terms of where it is most frequently viewed from
517 and if it is right up close to a road edge and sixty feet that is one thing, if it's at
518 the back of a site, it just has a different visual feel."

519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561

Director Gallina then asked the Commission to “weigh in on the design of the driveway access, the parking, its proximity to the front of the site, whereas the entry corridor policies talk about moving parking areas to the rear of the site; whether you are comfortable with the layout or want to see something different because if you’re not, then that really plays into a redesign of the site so that’s an important element to this site layout.”

Vice-Chair Creager stated that no measurements were taken and that this was a similar problem that came up with the Solage project and their use of berms, and noted that the Commission did work with Solage to allow them to have parking near the road, but he feels that did not work out as well as he had hoped. “The feeling is that there is a big parking lot in front of a lot of buildings.” Therefore, in his opinion he is skeptical that the same thing would not occur again with this project.

Director Gallina noted that parking close to the road was also allowed for the Highlands Church project.

Vice-Chair Creager noted that he had opposed the parking for the Highlands Church project and still believes it was not a good decision to let it go forward.

Mary Sites responded by saying that in this project, the road is about 7 feet higher than where the cars will be sitting, which will actually help to hide the visibility of the cars, especially with shrubbery in front of it.

Commissioner Kite agreed that the height will help, but he still feels that some sort of a brum will be necessary to help screen the cars.

Mary Sites further responded by explaining that the parking is not designed as a big lot like in a mall, but rather like perpendicular street parking that is seen in Calistoga.

Chairman Manfredi stated that he wished the Commission could be more concrete and helpful at this stage of the project, but he believes that the consensus is that the intensity of the project has to be reduced, and that there is too much going on within the site, which leaves him with a feeling of not really having an identity.

Commissioner Coates then excused himself from the meeting to attend to a family matter.

Chairman Manfredi then opened the floor to further comments or questions.

562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577

Jean Kolpolchok stated that perhaps she had not explained the project as well as she could have in tying all the parts together, but essentially she sees two uses for the project; one being special event use and the other being the deli/retail tasting room division as servicing the 2 wineries. She also commented that they appreciate all of the Commissioners' comments and will "take them to heart and go from here."

Commissioner Kite summarized his feelings about the project by stating that he believes there are a lot of positive aspects to the project, such as the architecture and the concept in general.

Chairman Manfredi commented that he agrees with Commission Kite, but still believes the scale of the project doesn't work. He then moved on to the next item on the agenda.