

**RESOLUTION R2025-XX**

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAPA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DENYING AN APPLICATION FOR A ZONING AMENDMENT, USE PERMIT, AND DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A GLAMPING CAMPGROUND ON THE WEST SIDE OF SILVERADO TRAIL BETWEEN HAGEN ROAD AND STONECREST DRIVE (APN 052-010-011) AND FINDING THE ACTIONS AUTHORIZED BY THIS RESOLUTION TO BE EXEMPT FROM CEQA**

WHEREAS, on October 17, 2022, Parry Murray (the “Applicant”), submitted an application (File No. PL22-0120) seeking a Zoning Ordinance Amendment pursuant to Napa Municipal Code (“NMC”) Chapter 17.66 to establish a glamping campground as a conditionally permitted use and to establish standards for a proposed glamping campground on that certain property bearing Assessor’s Parcel Number 052-010-011, and for a new and different Design Review Permit pursuant to Napa Municipal Code (“NMC”) Chapter 17.62 and a Use Permit pursuant to NMC Chapter 17.60, to authorize construction and operation of a glamping campground with five permanent buildings, up to 100 glamping units, and recreational activity space for property bearing Assessor’s Parcel Number 052-010-011 (hereafter, the “Site”) (collectively, the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (“Draft IS/MND”) was prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Guidelines Section 15074, concluding that after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures the Project would not cause any significant environmental effects. The public comment period was noticed on September 5, 2024, in the Napa Valley Register for a CEQA-mandated 30-day public review and comment period, ending on October 5, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on October 17, 2024, on the Draft IS/MND and has recommended adoption; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on October 17, 2024, on the Project and has recommended approval of the subject application; and

WHEREAS, in consultation with experts retained by the City, staff proposed a substitution of mitigation measures in compliance with CEQA Guidelines 15074.1, which are contained in the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (“Final IS/MND”) , and determined to be equally effective, or more effective in avoiding or reduce the potential impacts “to at least the same degree” as the original measures not creating any new adverse impacts than the original measures in mitigating the identified impact;

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing on February 18, 2025, the City Council considered all information related to this matter, as presented at the public meetings of the

## ATTACHMENT 1

City Council identified herein, including any supporting reports by City Staff, and any information provided during public meetings, and thereafter closed the public hearing and subsequently took no action due to a failed motion; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed meeting on March 18, 2025, the City Council considered all existing information within the record, as presented at the public meetings of the City Council identified herein without reopening the public hearing related to this matter, including any supporting reports by City Staff; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Code of Regulations Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 18, Section 15270, CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Napa, as follows:

1. The City Council hereby finds that the facts set forth in the recitals to this Resolution are true and correct, and establish the factual basis for the City Council's adoption of this Resolution.
2. The City Council hereby finds that the adoption of this Resolution is not subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guideline 15270 as CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.
3. The City Council hereby denies, rejects, and disapproves the application for a Zoning Amendment, and makes the following findings in support of the denial:
  - A. *The proposed amendment is not consistent in principle with the General Plan.*

The proposed Project is inconsistent with the Napa 2040 General Plan as it would introduce a commercial and potentially incompatible use within the Very Low Density Residential designation. Although commercial uses can be allowed with discretionary permits, the proposed Project would introduce a new commercial use similar to a hotel with potential compatibility issues as cited by numerous neighbors in proximity to the site. In particular, residents expressed concerns about the overall long term incompatibility of a hotel type use in proximity to Very Low Residential.

The Project does not adequately align with key policies and goals of the General Plan. For example, the Project fails to demonstrate how it promotes truly flexible land use that adapts to changing economic needs (Policy LUCD 6-4), as it introduces a newly established use that is not clearly compatible with surrounding land uses or long-term community objectives since it introduces a high-intensity lodging use into an area designated for residences

## ATTACHMENT 1

and could alter the established residential neighborhood (Policy LUCD 10-1), without being able to demonstrate how it supplements the existing neighborhood with access to goods or services needed for daily life.

While the Project proposes a nature-based accommodation alternative intended to immerse guests in natural surroundings and preserve the existing mature trees, it does not reinforce Napa's unique sense of place in a manner that balances the needs of residents and visitors (Goal ED-6). Instead, the Project raises concerns from neighbors of the site regarding its compatibility with the existing community character because it prioritizes transient guest experiences over the long term expectations of property owners nearby by introducing a non-residential use into an area designated for Very Low Density Residential. Public testimony included concerns from residents of the surrounding neighborhood regarding the compatibility of a commercial use with the surrounding residential uses.

- B. *The public health, safety and general welfare are not served by the adoption of the proposed amendment.*

While the Project includes measures to ensure compliance with safety regulations, it still raises concerns about its compatibility with surrounding uses and whether the commercial nature of the proposed Project, that is similar to a hotel use, could lead to future public health, safety, or general welfare impacts for the surrounding neighborhood. For example, the Project does not demonstrate that it advances the broader health, safety, and welfare of the community, including the residents who live in close proximity. Residents nearby are concerned about the introduction of up to 100 glamping sites nearby that would feature individual fireplaces that could potentially pose a fire risk, require relocation of airstreams during certain floodplain events that may cause compatibility impacts with the Very Low Residential designation, and that the Project may impede the ability for residents and first responders to evacuate in the event of an emergency.

Additionally, while the amendment includes provisions for aesthetic enhancements, these do not substantiate a broader public welfare justification. Given these considerations, the amendment does not sufficiently serve the public interest.

- C. *If a rezoning to district with a larger minimum lot size is proposed, effectively reducing the planned residential density, the city shall also find that the remaining sites in the housing element are adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584; or if not, that it has identified sufficient additional , adequate and available site with an equal or greater residential density in the jurisdiction so that there is not net loss of residential unit capacity.*

## ATTACHMENT 1

The finding is not applicable because the proposed Project does not involve a rezone and is being denied by the adoption of this resolution.

4. The City Council hereby denies, rejects, and disapproves the application for a Design Review Permit because with the City Council denying the Zoning Amendment, the proposed Project would not be allowed and therefore no Design Review Permit could be issued. Nevertheless, in denying the Design Review Permit, the City Council makes the following findings in support of the denial:

- A. *The project design is not in accord with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan design policies.*

The Project design does not adequately align with the Napa 2040 General Plan and applicable design policies. While it clusters permanent structures to minimize its footprint, the overall design does not sufficiently demonstrate compatibility with the Very Low Density Residential land use designation or ensure the preservation of the area's character. The introduction of a non-residential lodging use in this setting does not fully align with the General Plan's goals for context-sensitive development since it introduces a high-intensity lodging use into an area designated for residences and could alter the established residential neighborhood (Policy LUCD 10-1). Concerns from residents nearby comment on how design of the site fails to demonstrate how it supplements the existing neighborhood while promoting "complete neighborhoods" as it only provides exclusive access to guests to enjoy the open and recreational space.

Additionally, while the Project includes a Class I multi-use path along SR-121, this feature alone does not fully address broader concerns regarding land use compatibility. Although the Project proposes to preserve existing trees and riparian habitat, it does not demonstrate a level of environmental stewardship (NRC 1-8) sufficient to ensure consistency with the General Plan's broader vision for sustainable development.

- B. *The project design is not consistent with applicable Design Review guidelines adopted by the City Council.*

While the Project references Napa's agricultural heritage through contemporary agrarian architecture, the absence of specific non-residential design policies does not inherently establish consistency with the City's adopted Design Review guidelines. The proposed materials and forms, while evocative of traditional barns and outbuildings, do not sufficiently demonstrate compatibility with the surrounding residential character or adherence to established design principles.

## ATTACHMENT 1

Additionally, the Project's site layout and building orientation, while designed to take advantage of natural features, do not clearly align with the City's broader design guidelines for ensuring cohesive development. Without specific policies supporting the introduction of this lodging use within the existing context, the required finding cannot be made.

- C. *The design review permit is not in accord with provisions of this title and will be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity of the development site, or to the public health, safety or general welfare.*

While the project's low massing and clustered design are intended to minimize impacts, the proposed use introduces a non-residential lodging element that is inconsistent with the surrounding residential character and land use designation since it introduces a high-intensity lodging use into an area designated for residences and could alter the established residential neighborhood (Policy LUCD 10-1).

Additionally, while the development meets flood safety requirements, concerns remain regarding its long-term compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and its potential to create new demands on local infrastructure, public services, and emergency response systems. Residents nearby are concerned about how the introduction of up to 100 glamping sites that would feature individual fireplaces and that the Project may impede the ability for residents and first responders to evacuate in the event of an emergency. These factors, combined with the introduction of a non-residential use, may pose risks to the broader public welfare and the neighborhood's character. As a result, the required finding cannot be made.

5. The City Council hereby denies, rejects, and disapproves the application for a Use Permit because with the City Council denying the Zoning Amendment, the proposed Project would not be allowed and therefore no Use Permit could be issued. Nevertheless, in denying the Use Permit, the City Council makes the following findings in support of the denial:
- A. *The proposed use is not in accord with the General Plan, applicable specific plans, the objectives of the zoning ordinance and the purposes of the district and overlay district in which the site is located.*

The proposed use is inconsistent with the General Plan, the objectives of the zoning ordinance, and the purposes of the district and overlay district in which the site is located. Although the Project introduces a new use to a historically underutilized site, it does not align with the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) designation, as the introduction of a non-residential lodging use does not conform to the long-term vision for the area. The proposed use does not reflect the intent of the zoning district, which is focused on maintaining residential character.

## ATTACHMENT 1

While the Project does provide some benefits, such as generating transient occupancy tax revenue and enhancing transportation infrastructure, these do not sufficiently address concerns related to land use compatibility. The proposed use does not fit well within the broader context of residential development, and the project does not fully demonstrate that it aligns with the General Plan's goals for balanced development that preserves the character of residential neighborhoods. Concerns from residents nearby comment on how design of the site fails to demonstrate how it supplements the existing neighborhood while promoting "complete neighborhoods" as it only provides exclusive access to guests to enjoy the open and recreational space (Policy LUCD 10-1).

As such, the required finding cannot be made, and the proposed use is not consistent with the General Plan, zoning ordinance, or the intent of the district and overlay district in which the site is located.

- B. *The proposed use, together with the conditions applicable thereto, will be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity, or to the general welfare of the city.*

The proposed use, along with the applicable conditions, may be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare, and could be materially injurious to nearby properties and improvements. While the Project would meet flood safety requirements and comply with noise and lighting standards, the introduction of a non-residential lodging use in a residential area creates potential long-term challenges related to neighborhood compatibility. Residents were concerned how the Project could meet stringent flood requirements on an ongoing basis, operate quickly to remove the glamping units in the event of an emergency, and evacuate guests, without impeding response times for emergency responders and residents of the area, since CA 121/Silverado Trail has been closed semi-regularly for emergencies. The Project does not adequately demonstrate that it will integrate smoothly with the surrounding residential community, and the non-residential nature of the use may alter the character of the area, affecting the overall welfare of the city and its residents.

As a result, the required finding cannot be made.

- C. *The proposed use does not comply with each of the applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance.*

The proposed ordinance amendment introduces a new use (glamping campground) that is not fully compatible with the provisions of the zoning ordinance. While the amendment establishes specific standards for the proposed use, the introduction of a non-residential lodging use within a

# ATTACHMENT 1

residential zoning district does not fully align with the intended character of the area as outlined in the zoning ordinance. Although the project may meet certain technical standards regarding building placement and flood safety, it does not adequately address the broader compatibility with the zoning district's goals and residential character.

As a result, the proposed use does not comply with all applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance, and the required finding cannot be made.

- D. *The proposed use complies with any other applicable findings required under other chapters of this title for the specific use.*

There are no other applicable findings required under other chapters of this title for the proposed use.

6. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Napa at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of March 2025, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tiffany Carranza  
City Clerk

Approved as to form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher Diaz  
Interim City Attorney