

Land Use Plan – GPAC Comments

Ghisletta Properties

- The key issue is that this should be a “Complete” neighborhood with a mix of housing types, parkland, neighborhood-serving small businesses (small groceries, coffee shops, banking outlets, and the like). (CS)
- Focus should be on integrated pedestrian and bicycle access to reduce vehicular trips. There may also be space and desirability to have internal walking paths and landscaped areas that meander through the area. (CS)
- A City park needs to be incorporated into the area, most likely adjacent to Snow School. Easy access to the park and to Snow School from all directions should be provided. (CS)
- The current General Plan shows the arc-shaped strip along Golden Gate Drive as Corporate Park with a 0.25 FAR. In the proposed GP, is there a need for additional Corporate Park areas? Should this area be a mix of Corporate Park and higher density Mixed Use? (CS)
- The Traditional Residential strip along Foster Road needs to be somewhat wider, perhaps 225 to 250 feet, to fully accommodate a transitional area to the higher densities to the east. Ensuring view access to the eastern hills, etc, from the existing neighborhood on the west side of Foster Road will be important and will drive height limits in this strip. (CS)
- I agree with the Residential Mixed-Use designation with 16-40 units per acre and 1.0 FAR total for the entirety of the properties other than the strip along Foster Road. A height limit of three stories is probably appropriate except for the area nearer Golden Gate Drive where four stories would be appropriate. (CS)
- There probably will be need for some additional access to Highway 29 from Golden Gate Drive(overpass/interchange?) to keep intersection workability reasonable at Imola and Stanly Lane. (CS)
- As I live off Foster Road, I probably should recuse myself from this discussion. For what it is worth, I oppose the Low Density Residential designation along Foster Road. It abuts the historic Horseman’s Association, is a favorite walking destination for the entire neighborhood, and is a lovely green space to be retained. I have no problem with the proposed designations for the Golden Gate Drive portion of the proposed plan. (DM)
- Full disclosure: I live quite close to this property so it is in my backyard and I know development is somewhat opposed by the neighborhood. Nevertheless, I think that the designation is right for the property, feathering the density away from Foster Road and over to Golden Gate Drive. Elevations should be included in that feathering as well. I think if a strip of land can be set aside and designated as green belt that could become a walking path (perhaps screened from the development) I think that it would probably pass muster with the neighborhood. A decent sidewalk or walking path on the Golden Gate side would also be a selling point. Traffic may be an issue, so ideally the access/egress of the higher density units would be on Golden Gate, and perhaps the lower density units on Foster Road. I like the mixed use idea on Golden Gate, but think it

would be most utilized as convenience type businesses: coffee shop, sandwich shop, convenience store etc. (JG)

- I like the idea of medium to high density residential on the Ghisletta/Horsemen's properties, with the higher density being proposed for the eastern portion alongside Golden Gate Drive. (HS)

Big Ranch Road

- I agree with the Medium Density residential designation as shown on the exhibit. I suggest, as well, that other vacant/underutilized parcels on the west side of Big Ranch Road from Trancas Street to the RUL on the north should have this same designation. This would include the parcel on the southwest corner of Big Ranch Road and Garfield Lane whose owner has addressed the GPAC in the past. (CS)
- This seems to be a wise and non-disruptive proposed designation (medium density residential). I say this partly because I believe one of the owners of one of the parcels came before GPAC a few meetings back and seemed to be in favor of this. It also has similar density abutting this section. (DM)
- I also know this area well, from my time with the school district. I think the routing of Trower is appropriate, would provide traffic calming, and serve both VHS and the neighborhood well. I believe that the designation is right for the area and that it provides a good opportunity for multifamily housing and workforce housing, well located near the high school. (JG)

Napa Oaks

- this area, in my opinion, should have an Agriculture designation. (CS)
- I do not see how this Proposed Designation can go forward. It is obviously strenuously opposed by the surrounding community. The arguments about fire and other safety issues are persuasive. Most importantly, it does nothing to advance our housing priorities while distracting from our green space priority. (DM)
- Also in my neighborhood—I would benefit if it was developed as housing—but I think enough is enough on that. I hope the GPAC doesn't need to put anymore time into this. In fact we really don't need more high end housing in the next twenty years, if ever, and don't need to be putting time and resources into that project. I've walked it—it's a beautiful piece of land and would make a great park. (JG)

Timberhill-West Browns Valley

- this area is more complex than Napa Oaks. Before rational land use planning can be done in this area, the City's real estate professional should be tasked with researching the various open space easements and land use restrictions that are currently in place, as outlined by a number of speakers at the February 24th GPAC meeting. This would require his working with a title company to determine how much land is truly available for further development. Further, as I personally observed when walking the entire

area, there is a great deal of land instability, which would need to be thoroughly addressed. Once these issues have been addressed, it might be appropriate to give the remaining lands a low-density residential designation. However, no such designation should be ascribed until that research is completed. (CS)

- I am not familiar with this area. The Proposed Designation would seem to suffer from the same deficiencies and arguments against Napa Oaks. (DM)
- I became familiar with this property when I walked it a couple months ago right after our meeting. My feelings are the same as I wrote for Napa Oaks—it would make a great park. (JG)

Stanly Ranch

- the designations for Agriculture and Greenbelt appear to be reversed; the area along the river should have the Greenbelt designation. The other areas are in vineyard production and should be in Ag. (CS)
- It seems to me the Proposed Designation here is already what is happening. However, I would like to see if there is a way to further divide or weight the Proposed Designation so that the Greenbelt and Agriculture portion is more heavily weighted than the Hospitality Commercial. The construction going on right now for the new hotel seems to be enough hospitality Commercial for the size of the area. (DM)
- I'm also quite familiar with this property. I think the proposed designation is appropriate. (JG)

Old Sonoma Road (HHS Site)

- I am just confirming that the designation for this County-owned parcel is Residential Mixed Use with a density range of 16-40 units per acre with a 1.0 maximum FAR. (CS)
- I think that the residential mixed use is appropriate and hope we can find more places where more affordable projects can be located. We need a substantial amount of lower cost housing built into the GP. (JG)

Trancas Corridor

- I generally support the elements here, especially if executed in conjunction with the pedestrian oriented and bicycle focused plan. Emphasizing a business /professionally oriented focus make sense near the hospital, but we do need to de-emphasize the current auto focus. In that light, I think we should find a way to eliminate Diablo as an artery that moves directly through Bel-Air Plaza. This creates terrible traffic problems and hazards as through motorists mix with shoppers. (JG)

Jefferson Corridor

- I strongly urge the narrowing of traffic lanes to ten feet (10'), from downtown all the way to at least Trancas Street along with wider bicycle lanes. (CS)

- I like the design plan and appreciate the effort to make it more bike and pedestrian friendly. Vienna Austria has created designated bicycle spaces within the urban core, and it would be an incredible coup for Napa to create something similar so that a cyclist (or pedestrian) could ride to the more critical business and shopping areas safely and comfortably. I would say the same for Soscol and Imola. I like the concept of the urban wall if it can be created along Jefferson. I also hope that more lower cost/denser or mixed use housing can be located in the current CalTrans yard as well as the City corp yard on Lincoln. (JG)

Lincoln & Soscol Area

- I like this plan as well, particularly with the focus on mixed use and pedestrian cycle access. As mentioned above, let's zone the City corp yard for multi-family and find a better site for the corporation activities. (JG)
- I support the vision of HD Residential along the River in the Lincoln/Soscol Focus Area (as shown on that page of Attachment 1), to the extent that there are no remaining Flood plain restrictions. However in the lower right hand corner of that schematic, I would propose a serious increase in the intensity of use at/near the intersection of First Street and Silverado Trail, currently appearing to be "light industrial" to the south of the long-entitled "Ritz" hotel property (what about that, by the way?) (HS)

Soscol

- There are hundreds of families living in the Braydon and Stoddard West, who don't have a direct access to downtown or the college. Let's make sure that our planning calls for connecting the residences to the bike trail. Think of how many auto trips we can eliminate if we give them easy access, perhaps extending Sousa Lane. I think this area is a necessary resource in the City to provide access to the kinds of shops and businesses currently there. This place seems sensitive to how these can be better incorporated into a city that aspires to be climate and health friendly. (JG)
- The Soscol Corridor Focus Area – already the location of some recent and ongoing high density residential development – still retains opportunities for more, as shown in the diagram. For example the vacant parcel at the northeast corner of Soscol and Shetler (I believe) - once targeted for a Long's Drugs/CVS store – seems like a good site and also does appear to be in the area that has been proposed for HD Residential. Two questions on that diagram – what is the current plan for the long-discussed connection between the Gasser Property and a) NV College (through extension of Gasser Drive and b) the connection of the end of Silverado Trail with the Gasser property across Soscol? (HS)

General Comments

- We need to think about how downtown can be made more accessible to transportation other than cars—restrict auto access? Move parking lots to the perimeter? Create wine train stops? Designate more intensive residential (not like the Register Square project) that would appeal to workers versus out of towners: e.g.: Safeway, Old Cinedome area...? (JG)
- Make Imola more bike and pedestrian friendly and ensure safe routes not only to schools but also to the vine trail. Right now, the only safe way to get to the trail with kids is to ride through Napa, versus down Imola which is currently quite treacherous. Pedestrian and bike friendly corridor along Imola could also help to energize the Riverpark shopping Center, which has made some positive strides in its commercial mix. (JG)
- These comments reflect my personal impressions from the presentation, but I also realize that those impressions may change when I have the benefit of the thinking of my GPAC colleagues, which our cancelled meeting would have provided. Please find a way to send everyone's responses to all members so we can begin to shape our thinking together. It may represent a lot of reading, but it's a commitment I would be happy to make. (JG)
- Listening to the Webinar on preservation has triggered some thoughts I meant to include but overlooked. Namely that we increase heights in mixed-use developments throughout the city. It only makes sense that we be willing to increase to at least 4 or 5 stories, particularly in settings (example: all existing strip malls which coincidentally are also more accessible to public transportation) where it makes sense to have mixed-use applications. I'm comfortable with higher elevations throughout the community where appropriate, especially given our ag preserve and the desperate need for affordable/workforce housing. I would also like to see us generally moving away from single family homes in favor of multi-family, again to satisfy our need for more workforce housing. (JG)
- I support the increase in residential and mixed use (incl. residential on upper floors) intensity along the main travel corridors of Jefferson, Lincoln, Soscol, Imola and – to some extent – Trancas Streets. However, I think Jefferson could support a bit more high density residential than what is shown on Attachment 1 (Jefferson) and believe that the Mixed Use intensity could be increased along Trancas, as indicated on that page of Attachment 1. (HS)
- I support the idea of by-right development, when meeting specific density and affordability criteria for residential development. (HS)
- I have already weighed in with my concerns about asking the public their opinion of 10+ story buildings (rather than the heights of about half that size that we discussed and have envisioned). One further comment on that front – it seems a bit incongruous to ask

the GPAC to respond to the Preferred Land Use Plan that implies heights of 6 floors or less, even in HD designated areas – while the public is being asked to comment on much taller buildings. (HS)

- Traditional Residential: This is very similar to the current GP in which offices, B&B's, and similar uses are Conditionally Permitted. I believe that they should continue to be Conditionally Permitted rather than just being Allowed Uses. I agree with the need to economically sustain historic resources but I also want to make sure that we don't significantly impact the character of our vital historic neighborhoods and their residents. (CS)
- Public/ Public Serving Properties: Once the City and its consultant have crafted a complete list of publicly owned/ public serving properties within the RUL, then the GPAC and the community should have a discussion regarding these sites. In my opinion, many of them (City Corporation Yard, Caltrans Corporation Yard, Justin Siena High School site, etc) should have an underlying Mixed Use or Medium/High Density GP designation. In this way, when reuse of a site becomes clearer, decisions will have already been made about their future use. (CS)
- Mixed Use/Industrial: In the draft Land Use descriptions, there are many uses listed as examples. In all of these (Mixed Use, Business Park, and Light Industrial), wineries should also be among the listed permitted uses. Let's be specific and not leave the issue vague. (CS)
- •Public Serving: There is description within "Public Serving" that outlines that, "The maximum FAR for all uses is 1.0, with no specific FAR limitation for City-owner public-service and safety uses." If the purpose of this section is to exempt the City from the FAR rules in the Downtown or other areas, that is unreasonable. The City should abide by the same limitations that it imposes on other, privately owned properties. (CS)
- •Single-Family Designations / By Right Duplexes and Triplexes: This should be discussed by the GPAC. Other cities, Minneapolis for example, have now modified land use plans to allow, by right, the development of duplexes and triplexes in single-family designated areas. We have a number of older neighborhoods (50+ and older) where some homes on larger parcels may deteriorate. We should discuss what we might allow and with what underlying standards (minimum parcel size per unit, maximum lot coverage, etc). (CS)
- Downtown and its periphery: These areas need substantially more discussion, especially related to residential development. The community survey as well as the Planning Commission and City Council have expressed strong interest in much higher densities and heights in the Downtown area. Clearly, there is work that is needed about parking issues, heights, form-based design, and the like. The discussion at the end of the February 24th GPAC meeting was just the beginning of more complete and robust review and conversation about these important issues. (CS)

- Other Infill Areas: During our February 24th GPAC discussions, I suggested density designations on two or three specific parcels (north side of Pueblo near Main and Beard; north of Lincoln, west of the River, etc). It seemed that many other GPAC members agreed with my suggestions. I strongly encourage you and the consulting team to make these designation changes on the Draft Land Use Plan prior to the Draft's issuance to the public. If the community, Planning Commission, and/or City Council prefer to keep the lower densities, I am fine with those decisions. The dilemma in leaving them at the lower range in the Draft is that it is substantially harder to raise those densities later than it is to reduce them. Neighbors can easily make the argument that, "...Professional planners suggested these lower densities; why is the Planning Commission / City Council trying to raise them?" (CS)
- I understand your suggestion that an attached report from me or the GPAC might accompany the Draft Land Use Plan to outline these issues. However, as you will certainly know from your own professional experience, such an attachment rarely carries much weight. (CS)
- "Ritz" Site at First Street and Silverado Trail: This is currently shown as "Hospitality Commercial". Given that the site, approved for hotel use for decades, remains vacant, I suggest that it have an alternate designation added, either "High Density Residential" or "Residential Mixed Use". (CS)