

**REGULAR MEETING
ST. HELENA PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2003**

The Agenda for the Tuesday, August 19, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting was posted at City Hall, 1480 Main Street on August 15, 2003 at 12:00 P.M.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. CALL TO ORDER - Called the meeting of August 19, 2003, to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Oldford, Novak, Katz, Chairman York
Absent: Commissioner Philippakis
Staff: Carol Poole, Planning Director
Sally Brightcloud, Associate Planner
Myke Praul, Public Works Director, City Engineer
Patricia Lambert, Administrative Assistant

3. MINUTES APPROVAL:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN YORK, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 5, 2003 AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONER KATZ, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS NOVAK, OLDFORD
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

4. PUBLIC FORUM: NONE

5. COMMUNICATIONS & PETITIONS: NONE

Chairman York noted that additional information had been provided with regard to Item 13.1 (Review of Building Permits)

6. RECOMMENDED CONSENT CALENDAR: (9.1, 13.1)

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR AS PRINTED. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 5, 2003, PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA AS PRINTED. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

8. CONTINUED ITEMS: None

9. DESIGN REVIEW/SIGN PERMIT/ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATION:

9.1 2003-40 SP: SIGN PERMIT
LOCATION: 1399 RAILROAD AVENUE
APPLICANT: GOLDEN GATE SIGN COMPANY

Request for identification signs located in the Central Business District. (APN 009-212-002)

CEQA STATUS: Exempt
REQUIRED ACTION: Approve/deny Sign Permit

This item was approved under the Consent Calendar.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO DETERMINE THAT THIS PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO SECTION 15311, CLASS 11, WHICH EXEMPTS ON-PREMISE SIGNS. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO APPROVE A SIGN PERMIT FOR CITIBANK CONSISTENT WITH EXHIBITS A, B, AND C, DATED 8/19/03 AND THE STIPULATION THAT THEY NOT BE INTERNALLY

ILLUMINATED. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS - PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS: None

11. PUBLIC HEARINGS - RECOMMENDATIONS TO CITY COUNCIL: None

11.1 2003-18 DEIR: REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR CITY OF ST. HELENA COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT
LOCATION: PROPERTIES ALONG THE NAPA RIVER
PROPONENT: CITY OF ST. HELENA

This public hearing provides the public with the opportunity to comment on a revised and recirculated DEIR pertaining to a city-initiated feasibility study to determine the most appropriate method of providing 100-year protection from flooding to residents and properties along the Napa River. The proposed project alternatives include the relocation and flood proofing of homes within the flood plain and may include the terracing of river overflow areas to accommodate winter storm flows. All alternatives include the flood proofing of the City's wastewater treatment facilities along the river at the southern end of the city limits. The revised Draft Environmental Impact Report provides variations of the original alternatives for the project. The Proposed Project would have significant unavoidable project-level impacts on aesthetics, cultural resources, and transportation. The Proposed Project would result in cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation. (Continued from June 17, 2003).

CEQA STATUS: Revised DEIR
REQUIRED ACTION: Open and close public hearing, recommend certification to City Council.

The Planning Director introduced Dave Dickson, consultant to the City for this project.

Mr. Dickson explained that written and oral comments would be taken on the revised draft E.I.R until September 15. Staff will then respond to the comments and the Planning Commission will hold another Public Hearing before forwarding this project for consideration by the City Council.

He reviewed the enhanced minimum plan pointing out that in addition to the proposed plan there are three alternatives to be considered. There are 14 elements to the enhanced minimum plan all of which were reviewed by Mr. Dickson.

Commissioner Oldford asked for clarification with regard to the revised scope of the study as it pertains to the area between Pratt Avenue and the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Mr. Dickson responded that the hydraulic study area remains the same.

The Public Works Director pointed out that Napa County would be considering how to mitigate flood hazards for the area between Pratt Avenue and Deer Park Road in its feasibility study.

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:30 p.m.

Pat Dell, 25 San Juan Court, presented her comments orally and submit them in written form. She acknowledged that the revised document was more concise and thorough and pointed out some exceptions to the language used in the document. She added that there might be residents of St. Helena that do not realize the benefits of implementing the flood protection and urged the City to disseminate information to affected homeowners as soon as possible. Ms. Dell also raised some concern for the security and safety of the residents of Vineyard Valley as it pertains to the height of the proposed floodwall and the public access path on the river side of this wall. She added that additional remarks on this matter would be included in additional written remarks. With regard to comments made by the Friends of the Napa River, she felt that none of the details such as the location of the homes, the need for or location of a Detention Pond and the location of floodwalls can be determined until all of the involved parties, including Vineyard Valley and owners, have an opportunity to add their input. In closing, she stated that Vineyard Valley feels that open space would be ideal for a nature park for the education of both children and adults. The concept would benefit the entire City and promote an appreciation of the environment amongst our impressionable young people and retain open space.

Wally Juchert, 555 Crystal Springs Road, did not feel that the proposed project would insure access to the St. Helena Hospital at Deer Park Road. This project does not adequately address flooding at Deer Park Road. If the water is not lowered at Deer Park Road there will not be access to the hospital. He pointed out that Crystal Springs Road also floods because the City does not have the mechanism to let the water out of the reservoir.

Sampson Bowers, 912 College Avenue, referred to a statement on page 218 of the revised document that states that funds will be reserved for projects around the City, and asked how much money is going to be set aside and how these funds will be used. He encouraged involving the Tree Committee in this project and working with the County to determine if they are agreeable to the procedures described in the document and how this

project will tie into the County's flood project. Mr. Bowers also urged the City to protect the environment of the endangered species by protecting their habitat, inclusion of Sulphur Creek into the project, and adding the wetlands as a part of this project. He pointed out that it was the Living River Principle to preserve or enhance the Napa River and Sulphur Creek.

Bernard Krevet, 68 Pope Street, representing Friends of the Napa River, noted that he had submitted interim comments and will prepare additional comments before the deadline. He also raised the issue of water being diverted into Vineyard Valley during construction of this project.

There being no further discussion, the following motion was made:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO SEPTEMBER 2, 2003.
MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

12. NAPA COUNTY REFERRALS: None

13. SCHEDULED MATTERS:

13.1 Review of Building Permits

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, TO CONFIRM THE DETERMINATION BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT THAT THE FOLLOWING BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN REVIEW REGULATIONS, AND ARE RECOMMENDED AS EXEMPT FROM DESIGN REVIEW.

- 1. MADRONA AVENUE. SPOTTSWOODE WINERY - TRELLIS, PLANTERS AND TERRACE.
- 2. 1367 MAIN STREET. WOODHOUSE CHOCOLATE - REPLACE DOORS

IT WAS FURTHER MOVED TO CONFIRM THAT THE FOLLOWING BUILDING PERMITS WERE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AND ARE NOT SUBJECT TO DESIGN REVIEW OR OTHER TYPES OF REVIEW BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

- 1. 807 Charter oak Colesworthy shed 8/15/03
- 2. 1230 Allyn Leonhardt Pool 8/15/03

3.	1855 Main St.	Blackburn	Solar system	8/15/03
4.	1219 Main St.	Grgich	Tenant improvements	8/15/03
5.	859 Pratt	Newton	Carport	8/15/03
6.	1715 Stockton St.	Wagner	Interior remodel, bath etc.	8/15/03
7.	499 Crane	Scruggs	Water tank	8/15/03
8.	1758 Stockton	McInerney	new residence	8/15/03

MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS OLDFORD, KATZ, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
 NOES: NONE
 ABSTAIN: NONE
 ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

14. STAFF REPORTS:

14.1. Review and comment on revised agenda format.

THE COMMISSION AGREED THAT A REVISED AGENDA FORMAT SHOULD BE USED IN THE FUTURE.

15. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS:

Commissioner Oldford asked what was known with regard to the effectiveness of the water agreements that have been imposed on previous projects. He felt that this information was important to determine the benefits of imposing water agreements and if they are helpful in maximizing the City's water use.

16. AGENDA FORECAST:

September 2, 2003

The tentative agenda was reviewed.

17. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m. to a Planning Commission meeting scheduled 7:00 p.m. on September 16, 2003 in the Council Chambers of the Carnegie Building, 1360 Oak Avenue, St. Helena, California.

Carol Poole
 Planning Director

Prepared by: Patricia Lambert
 Administrative Assistant

**REGULAR MEETING
ST. HELENA PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2003**

The Agenda for the Tuesday, September 2, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting was posted at City Hall, 1480 Main Street on August 29, 2003 at 12:00 P.M.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. CALL TO ORDER - Called the meeting of September 2, 2003, to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Oldford, Novak, Katz, Chairman York
Absent: Commissioner Philippakis
Staff: Carol Poole, Planning Director
Sally Brightcloud, Associate Planner
Myke Praul, Public Works Director, City Engineer
Dave Dickson, Consultant
Patricia Lambert, Administrative Assistant

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOVAK, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 19, 2003 AS PRINTED.
MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONER KATZ, NOVAK, OLDFORD, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

4. PUBLIC FORUM: None

5. COMMUNICATIONS & PETITIONS: None

6. RECOMMENDED CONSENT CALENDAR: (9.1)

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR AS PRINTED. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2003, PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA AS PRINTED. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

8. CONTINUED ITEMS:

8.1. 2003-18 DEIR: REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR CITY OF ST. HELENA
COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT
LOCATION: RESIDENTS AND PROPERTIES ALONG THE NAPA RIVER
PROPONENT: CITY OF ST. HELENA

This public hearing provides the public with the opportunity to comment on a revised and recirculated DEIR pertaining to a city-initiated feasibility study to determine the most appropriate method of providing 100-year protection from flooding to residents and properties along the Napa River. The proposed project alternatives include the relocation and flood proofing of homes within the flood plain and may include the terracing of river overflow areas to accommodate winter storm flows. All alternatives include the flood proofing of the City's wastewater treatment facilities along the river at the southern end of the city limits. The revised Draft Environmental Impact Report provides variations of the original alternatives for the project. The Proposed Project would have significant unavoidable project-level impacts on aesthetics, cultural resources, and transportation. The Proposed Project would result in cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation. (Continued from 08/19/03).

CEQA STATUS: Revised DEIR
REQUIRED ACTION: Open and close public hearing, direct staff to supervise preparation of Final E.I.R.

The Planning Director reviewed the staff report. She asked that the Commission include the following in their discussion this evening.

1. The adequacy of the draft E.I.R.

2. Identification, clarifications, or additional information needed which should be incorporated in the final E.I.R as a condition of certification.

At the conclusion of their discussion, the Commission should then direct the Planning Director to initiate and supervise preparation of a final E.I.R that incorporates these revisions and responds to all significant environmental points raised during the public review period.

Dave Dickson, Consultant to the City, noted that Rick Rhinehart, from MBK, and Wayne Picus, from CDM, were present. Mr. Dickson stated that he was not prepared to respond to comments but if there were questions of an engineering matter this would be a good time to voice those.

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:10

There being no comments the Public Hearing was closed at 7:11.

Commissioner Oldford noted that there was a statement in the mitigation measures that suggests that when Adams Street is extended to Silverado Trail, the traffic impact at Adams and Main Streets will result in a Level of Service F because of the additional traffic that is diverted to Main Street. Another mitigation refers to a traffic signal at Silverado Trail that would reduce the impact from F to D. He asked if these two traffic impact areas are part of the flood project in as much as Adams Street is proposed as a connector street to Silverado Trail. He also asked how can the City insure that these impacts will be addressed.

Carol Poole pointed out that all of the mitigation measures would be included in the final E.I.R.

Commissioner Oldford noted that if the project is phased the measures that are connected to the improvements will then become a part of the future project.

Dave Dickson responded that the Adams Street extension is a program level analysis in this document. More environmental assessment will come back before this phase is actually implemented.

There being no further discussion, the following motion was made:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOVAK, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND DIRECT THE PLANNING DIRECTOR TO INITIATE AND SUPERVISE PREPARATION OF A FINAL E.I.R. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, NOVAK, OLDFORD, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: NONE

8.2 2003-36 DRA: DESIGN REVIEW AMENDMENT
VAR: VARIANCE AMENDMENT
LOCATION: 1413 SPRING STREET
APPLICANT: BLAINE LEMMON FOR GRACE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Request to amend a previously approved Design Review and Variance to parking. Building/site plan amendments include modifications to the foundation, addition of a second floor balcony and stairwell, waiver of condition to construct four on-site parking space, modifications to the roofline, and modifications to pedestrian site entry design for a previously approved expansion and renovation of the church located in the PQP: Public Quasi-Public district. (Continued from 08/05/03)

CEQA STATUS: Determine that the previously approved Negative Declaration remains adequate.
REQUIRED ACTION: Determine conformity with the General Plan, approve, or deny Design Review and Variance.

Chairman York recused himself from discussion due to a conflict of interest.

The Planning Director reviewed the staff report. She explained that this item was continued to this meeting to give the Tree Committee an opportunity to review the impacts of the proposed Design Review modifications on the existing oak tree. The Tree Committee reviewed the entire proposal but primarily focused on the expansion of the foundation and the construction of the balcony and the stairwell. The Tree Committee has recommended that the stairwell and the balcony not be included. They feel that the expansion will negatively impact the oak tree because of the proximity of the building to the tree. If the Council should approve the proposed Design Review the Tree Committee is recommending that a cash bond of \$40,000, to be in effect for 10 years, be obtained from Grace Church. The purpose is to secure the cost of replacement of the tree should the oak tree die. In addition they are also requesting that an arborist provide semi-annual assessment of the health of the tree.

With regard to parking, staff has determined that the church is outside of the parking impact area. Consequently there is no mechanism to pay an in-lieu fee. What they can do is provide the parking on site, which is what the Variance approved in the year 2000 required or they can provide parking with 300 feet of the site. If the parking is going to be 300 feet from the site it has to be available

in perpetuity. The Catholic Church has excess parking spaces and is agreeable to entering into an agreement with the church to provide four parking spaces in perpetuity. If the Commission agrees, this agreement would then meet the parking requirements of the church. The church will still be required to provide two handicapped accessible spaces in front of the church, and the proposed parking lot along the Spring Street would be eliminated.

Commissioner Oldford suggested that, if the balcony was approved, the bond requirement could be modified. The Tree Committee was recommending a bond of \$40,000.

The Planning Director responded that the Commission could make a modified recommendation to the Council.

Blaine Lemmon, architect for the project, reviewed the proposed changes to the previously approved design. He pointed out that there had been changes to the original design to be more complimentary to the wall design and the most prominent portion of the historic chapel.

Joe Borden, arborist for the church, felt that proposed balcony would have negligible impact on the tree. The only impact on the tree is where the piers go into the soil. By using an air knife, all of the roots can be located before any drilling is done. He noted that because of the proposed design of the balcony, the holes for the piers could be shifted as much as two feet in any direction. He felt that the new design would create a new area in which new roots could grow. With regard to the issue of reflective heat from the concrete, he had been advised that that there would not be any damage because of reflective heat since the building was always in the shade. He also did not see any need for further pruning of the tree.

Commissioner Oldford asked if the high water table would have a tendency to draw the roots downward and if this was why there was little concern with regard to encountering large roots.

Mr. Borden responded that because of the type of soil in the Napa Valley, there is very little oxygen below two or three feet and roots require oxygen to grow. In 95% of the cases in the Napa Valley the roots are right on the surface.

Commissioner Oldford asked if any 6 inch roots had been located at this point.

Mr. Borden stated that they had not. He noted that the air knife was a very efficient tool to use to determine the location of the larger roots.

Commissioner Oldford noted that it seemed as though the large branches of the trees are on the west side of the tree. He asked if when the building comes down

on the south side, that was impeding the growth of the branches, would the root growth fill in and add to the strength of the tree.

Mr. Borden responded that this additional growth would not add to the strength of the tree. He explained that what is holding the tree now are roots that are, generally, within 10 feet of the trunk on the tree. He added that as soon as the slab is removed, and mulching is begun, an environment would be created within which roots could grow.

Commissioner Oldford asked if it were correct that the new roots will not anchor the tree but will provide more area for nutrient uptake.

Mr. Borden responded that this was correct.

Commissioner Oldford asked Mr. Borden if the replacement tree that was suggested by the Tree Committee has the possibility to survive and grow.

Mr. Borden was certain that it would.

Peter Newton, 2555 Madrona Avenue, stated that the church has no bonding capacity to meet the Tree Committee's recommendation of a \$40,000 bond. He assured the Commission that if the tree should die the church would replace the tree in the manner that was described by Mr. Borden. He noted that the bond was very burdensome because it is the equivalent of having to put up that amount of cash for ten years. He could not imagine asking the church to support a bond for 10 years. He felt that the promise that the tree will be replaced should be taken in good faith. No one had a more vested interest in preserving the tree.

Commissioner Oldford noted that he had met with Mr. Newton before the meeting. He asked Mr. Newton if the church would agree to a semi-annual inspection of the tree.

Mr. Newton responded that the church would agree to the inspections. With regard to the proposed balcony, Mr. Newton emphasized the importance of the balcony was to have more seating. He pointed out that there would be no way to add a balcony at a later date.

Mr. Oldford asked how the tree would be protected during the construction of the balcony.

Mr. Lemmon answered that when working on the floating patio portion, scaffolding will be used and the City arborist will make periodic inspections. He pointed out that in the upper area the tree branches could be avoided during construction.

Commissioner Oldford asked how the bark of the tree would be protected.

Mr. Lemmon responded that the scaffolding is very rigid but there may be areas where the trunk may need to be padded to protect the tree from equipment.

Sampson Bowers, 912 College Avenue, voiced concern that branches will be cut off the tree. He urged the church to protect the branches. He felt that during the construction of the patio the tree is going to be well taken care of. He stated that he was convinced that this is a good project.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:05.

Commissioner Oldford stated that he was in favor of the balcony but was also in support of protecting the tree. He added that he agreed with Mr. Newton that it would be impossible for the church to agree to the bond.

Commissioner Katz suggested that this matter be continued so that Commissioner Philippakis could participate in the decision process. He felt comfortable accepting the word of the church with regard to replacing the tree if necessary.

Commissioner Novak agreed that Commissioner Philippakis had been very involved in previous discussion and should be a part of the final action.

There being no further testimony, the following motion was made:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOVAK, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS MATTER TO SEPTEMBER 16, 2003 WITH MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRAFT DOCUMENT TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

1. A TREE PROTECTION PLAN PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION.
2. AN AGREEMENT FOR SEMI-ANNUAL INSPECTIONS OF THE TREE IN LIEU OF \$40,000 BOND AS REQUESTED BY THE TREE COMMITTEE.
3. ACCEPT PARKING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND APPLICANT.

MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS OLDFORD, NOVAK, KATZ
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: CHAIRMAN YORK
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

Chairman York returned to the dais.

9. DESIGN REVIEW/SIGN PERMIT/ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATION:

9.1 2003-49 SP: SIGN PERMIT
LOCATION: 1422 MAIN STREET
APPLICANT: THOMAS ALLEN/JAUNT

Request for a secondary frontage sign in the Central Business district. (APN 009-211-005)

CEQA STATUS: Exempt
REQUIRED ACTION: Approve or deny Sign Permit

This matter was approved under the Consent Calendar.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO DETERMINE THAT THIS PROJECT IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA PURSUANT TO SECTION 15311, CLASS 11, WHICH EXEMPTS ON-PREMISE SIGNS. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OLDFORD, TO APPROVE A SIGN PERMIT FOR A SIGN ON THE SECONDARY FRONTAGE AT 1422 MAIN STREET, CONSISTENT WITH EXHIBIT A, AND ACKNOWLEDGE ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL FOR SIGNAGE ON THE AWNING.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, OLDFORD, NOVAK, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS - PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS: None

11. PUBLIC HEARINGS - RECOMMENDATIONS TO CITY COUNCIL: None

12. NAPA COUNTY REFERRALS: None

13. SCHEDULED MATTERS:

Review of Building Permits - None

- 13.2 Review of 2003 Capital Improvement Plan for recommendation to the City Council pertaining to consistency with the 1993 General Plan.

Sally Brightcloud, Associate Planner, explained that the City Council had reviewed a draft list of projects during two recent study sessions and had authorized staff to proceed with preparation of a final document to be presented to the Planning Commission for General Plan consistency determination and recommendation. Section 65401 of the California Government Code requires review and recommendation of a capital improvement program by the Planning Commission for General Plan consistency.

There are two action required this evening. The first is to make an environmental determination to establish the Capital Improvement Program/General Plan consistency determination is exempt from CEQA per Section 15061 (b) (3) under the General Rule provision, utilized when it can be safely asserted that there will not be significant environmental effects. The second is to determine the consistency of each project listed in the Capital Improvement Program with the 1993 General Plan.

Ms. Brightcloud proceeded with a power point presentation.

Commissioner Katz asked what was being purchased for \$50,000 to study the Adams Street property.

Ms. Brightcloud responded that it was her understanding that \$50,000 would provide a conceptual plan for property development.

Commissioner Katz questioned the cost of a plan for \$50,000 and providing flood protection for the Corporation Yard for \$725,000.

The Planning Director explained that the \$50,000 was for preliminary planning for the first year.

The Associate Planner pointed out that there was a summary section in the proposed CIP that looked at the costs and the variety of projects in a number of different ways. In this way it can be seen how much time and cost is associated with the projects over the next six years.

Commissioner Katz asked if the proposed public parking lot in the Central Business District could be considered growth inducing.

The Planning Director did not consider the parking lot to be growth inducing.

Commissioner Oldford felt that several of the projects could raise the same question as far as utilities and various improvements. Obviously we are saying no growth in this town, or very slow growth, and if you have an improvement encouraging growth what does that mean to the consistency of the General Plan?

The Planning Director pointed out that many of these projects are called out in the General Plan so you can't say that they are inconsistent because they are growth inducing. These projects were anticipated and so were included.

Commissioner Oldford clarified that he questioned extending improvements to the perimeter of our development areas. He asked if this would not encourage growth beyond the Urban Limit Line. He noted that there had been previous discussions in the past with regards to putting in improvements that may encourage annexation. In fact, that is what Meadowood is talking about now.

The Planning Director referred to one of the policies of the General Plan that states that urban services such as sewer, water, and storm drainage will only be extended to development within the urban service area. If undo hardship can be demonstrated within the City limits these services can be extended. It is when you go beyond the City limits that it would be inconsistent with the General Plan. During preparation of the memo provided this evening, it was determined that there was only one project that is outside of the Urban Limit Line and thus inconsistent with the General Plan. There are others, but they are all replacement projects such as new water lines.

Commissioner Oldford agreed that the utilities are in need of upgrading. The City has been trying to do that for some time. He asked if a new treatment plant at the lower reservoir was a part of the Master Water Plan.

Myke Praul, Public Works Director/City Engineer, responded that it was. He added that one of the reasons it becomes more feasible is if we utilize the lower reservoir for storage of the recycled water. Therefore we run it through the water plant and put it directly into the potable systems without mixing it with irrigation water.

Commissioner Oldford referenced the following projects listed in the Capital Improvement Plan

1. Page 44 (WA5)(Replace the water main from west side of bridge to Meadowood Lane) and page 45 (WA7) (Construct 260' of 8" main to replace obsolete steel main)

Commissioner Oldford asked if both of these projects couldn't be considered growth inducing.

The City Engineer responded that WA5 and WA7 are replacement projects of existing water mains brought up to current standards for fire service.

2. Page 53 (WA 24) Recycled Water Storage, Treatment and Distribution.

Commissioner Oldford asked if the treatment of the water was part of this project.

The Public Works Director responded that it was. It is part of the system upgrade and expansion to tertiary treatment that will be integral to the Water Master Plan referred to on page 54 and 57 of the Capital Improvement Plan.

3. Page 54 (WA 25) Install package water treatment plant to treat water diverted from York Creek and local watershed.

Commissioner Oldford questioned why this was listed in the CIP. He did not believe that this had been listed in any previous CIP as a water source.

The City Engineer responded that the water was being treated directly from the creek not the reservoir and therefore may be more feasible than previously proposed. The Water Master Plan will address the feasibility of this project.

4. Page 57 (WA31) Provide for system upgrade per Water Master Plan recommendations.

Commissioner Oldford asked about the nature of the upgrade.

The City Engineer responded that this would be addressed in the Water Master Plan.

5. Page 64 ((WW6) Construct 2000 feet of eight-inch sewer main to serve forty units and future development north of Sulphur Springs Avenue.

Commissioner Oldford asked for clarification as to how far the sewer main was going to be extended.

The City Engineer responded that it would go to South Crane Ave.

6. Page 65 (WW8) Construct 8,000 feet of new twelve inch main to Deer Park Road.

Commissioner Oldford felt that there might not be enough use to justify a 12" main. He suggested that an 8" main would be sufficient. He felt that a 12" might be growth inducing,

8. Page 66 (WW9) Construct 3,000 feet of new twelve inch main to Meadowood Lane.

Commissioner Oldford questioned why the main was being extended outside of the Urban Limit Line.

Staff agreed that this item should be found inconsistent with the General Plan.

9. Page 74 (ST5) An additional signal is needed at the south end of Main Street. The best location and configuration will be determined by the Hwy. 29 Specific Plan.

Commissioner Oldford asked for clarification.

Staff explained that the General Plan shows the reconfiguration of Mills Lane and a signal at Main/Mills/Grayson, but that other alternatives are being analyzed.

10. Page 75 (ST8) Install acceleration/deceleration lanes at east side of Main Street.

Commissioner Oldford pointed out that this project was tied into the Cal Trans project and additional right-of-way was required before this project can be started.

There being not further discussion, the following motion was made:

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOVAK, TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA AS PROVIDED BY SECTION 15061 (B) (3) OF THE GUIDELINES. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, NOVAK, OLDFORD, CHAIRMAN YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KATZ, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOVAK, TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL A DETERMINATION OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE 1993 GENERAL PLAN WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE WASTEWATER PROJECT CONSTRUCTION OF 3,000 FEET OF NEW 12 INCH MAIN TO

MEADOWOOD LANE. MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING ROLL
CALL VOTE:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS KATZ, NOVAK, OLDFORD, CHAIRMAN
YORK
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER PHILIPPAKIS

14. REPORTS BY STAFF AND PLANNING COMMISSION:

15. AGENDA FORECAST:

September 16, 2003

The tentative agenda was reviewed.

- 16. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. to a Planning Commission meeting scheduled 7:00 p.m. on September 16, 2003 in the Council Chambers of the Carnegie Building, 1360 Oak Avenue, St. Helena, California.

Carol Poole
Planning Director

Prepared by: Patricia Lambert
Administrative Assistant