



Staff Reports

File #: 1155-2017, **Version:** 1

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council

From: Rick Tooker, Community Development Director

Prepared By: Michael Allen, Associate Planner

TITLE:

Napa Oaks II Project, Proposed Development of 51 Single Family Homes on an 80.63-Acre Site Located at 3095 and 3027 Old Sonoma Road and 211 Casswall Street

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Adopt a resolution denying an application to Amend the General Plan Designation for the Property at 3095 Old Sonoma Road from "Resource Area" (RA-123) to "Single-Family Residential" (SFR-121) (APN 043-040-008 & 025); based on a recommendation from the Planning Commission which would result in a denial of the proposed "Napa Oaks II Project" Development.

Alternatively, it is within Council's discretion to take actions to:

- (1) Adopt a resolution certifying the Environmental Impact Report for the Napa Oaks II Project (3095 and 3027 Old Sonoma Road, 211 Casswall Street), and adopting a mitigation and monitoring program;
- (2) Adopt a resolution amending the General Plan designation for two parcels totaling 78-acres located at 3095 Old Sonoma Road from "Resource Area" (RA-123) to "Single Family Residential" (SFR-121) (APN 043-040-008 & 025);
- (3) Approve the first reading and introduction of an ordinance amending the Zoning Map Established Under Napa Municipal Code Section 17.04.050, rezoning two parcels totaling 78-acres located at 3095 Old Sonoma Road from "Agricultural Resource" (AR) to "Single Family Residential" (RS-7); and determining that the action authorized by this ordinance were adequately analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report for the Napa Oaks II Project; and
- (4) Adopt a resolution approving a Use Permit, Design Review Permit and Tentative Subdivision Map for the Napa Oaks II Project, a subdivision of an 80.63-acre project site into 51 single family lots with six open space parcels, located at 3095 and 3027 Old Sonoma Road and 211 Casswall Street (APNS 043-040-008, 010, 013 & 025).

DISCUSSION:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant requests a General Plan Amendment, Rezoning and a Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide an 80.63-acre project site at 3095 and 3027 Old Sonoma Road and 211 Casswall Street into 51 single family lots including six open space parcels containing walking trails and a 0.5-acre park. Access to the subdivision will be via a new private street off the south side of Old Sonoma Road with a new roundabout intersection at Lilienthal Avenue. A secondary emergency access is

proposed further west on Old Sonoma Road. The proposed streets, sidewalks, park and trails within the subdivision would be privately owned and maintained but publicly accessible through a public access easement. The subdivision proposes lot sizes that range from 0.29 acres to 0.79 acres with an average lot size of approximately 0.46 acres. Approximately 49 acres of the site would remain undeveloped and be preserved as open space under a deed restriction.

The project approvals requested as a part of this application include:

1. **Certification of Environmental Documents/CEQA Actions:** This development proposal and the actions listed were subject to preparation and circulation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (forwarded separately) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City Council must certify the Napa Oaks II Project Final EIR and adopt a resolution including findings prior to approving the General Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and/or project entitlements. Denial of a project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and does not require certification of the project's Environmental Impact Report.
2. **General Plan Amendment (GPA):** The proposed GPA would change a majority of the project site (78 acres) from RA-123, Resource Area with an allowable density of 1 unit per 20 acres to SFR-121, Single Family Residential with an allowable density of 0 to 3 units per acre. A 2.63 acre portion of the project site is currently designated SFR-121, Single Family Residential and does not require an amendment.
3. **Rezone:** Consistent with the requested GPA, the proposed Rezone would change the majority of the project site (78 acres) from AR, Agricultural Resource to RS-7, Single Family Residential District. A 2.63 acre portion of the project site is currently zoned RS-10, Single Family Residential which does not need to be rezoned. The proposed rezoning would have no effect on the existing :HS, Hillside Overlay Zoning District which will continue to remain.
4. **Use Permit:** Would authorize an increased density within the Hillside (HS) overlay which currently allows only one dwelling per existing parcel, and would provide for additional density through use permit approval. A use permit is also requested to authorize the use of flag lot development standards.
5. **Design Review Permit:** Would authorize the building designs, landscaping, retaining walls and subdivision map layout including streets, sidewalks, trails, and park.
6. **Tentative Subdivision Map:** Would subdivide the property into 51 residential lots, common parcels including five open space parcels and a park parcel, and a common parcel for private streets.

The Planning Commission staff report includes a discussion regarding the Applicant's proposal for a Planned Development (PD) Overlay. The purpose of the proposed PD Overlay District (NMC 17.42) was to provide a mechanism to allow for variations in development regulations such as setbacks, yards, height limitations, street standards, parking, landscaping, open space and lot area. However, the application does not seek any variations from the proposed district regulations and the only reason for proposing a PD Overlay was to provide a mechanism for preservation of the 49 acres of open space. It has been determined that an open space easement, which would be required as a condition of approval, is a more appropriate mechanism to ensure preservation of the 49 acres of open space. Therefore, the Planned Development Overlay has been removed from the requested

entitlements before the City Council.

NEW ALQUIST PRIOLO EARTHQUAKE FAULT MAP

The Project was considered by the Planning Commission in December 2017 and had been scheduled for a February City Council meeting. However, on January 24, 2018, the Applicant requested that the item be removed from the agenda after the State released new Alquist Priolo (AP) Fault Maps in mid-January that affected the project site. These new maps placed a fault zone over the project site whereas the previous maps did not.

Originally, the Applicant had prepared an extensive fault evaluation in conjunction with the City's preparation of the project's EIR. Because the site is now in an AP fault zone, the Applicant was required to prepare a supplemental fault investigation which expanded the coverage of the fault investigation conducted in 2014 to include all proposed lots that are within the newly designated fault zone.

The supplemental evaluation demonstrated that the fault on the eastern/central portion of the site had been fully and adequately defined in the initial evaluation and there would be no additional fault setbacks necessary to respond to the newly-designated fault zone. While homes are not proposed in those areas, discontinuous cracks identified on the fault setback map have been determined not to be part of the fault but have been identified as a building exclusion zone for habitable structures to formalize prohibition of homes on these locations. An additional condition has been added requiring a building exclusion zone for habitable structures over areas designated as "zones of distributed cracking" west of Lots 14, 15, 16 and the "Riedell shears infill" north of Lot 49 to be recorded on the Final Map.

GENERAL PLAN

GENERAL PLAN HISTORY

Prior to 1998, the 78-acre portion of the project site was designated Estate Residential (ED) which provided for low density single family residential uses at a density range of 0-3 units per acre. In December of 1998, the City Council adopted a comprehensive General Plan update and the site's land use designation was changed to the current Resource Area (RA) designation. The Estate Residential designation was discontinued as the 1998 General Plan update introduced the current residential designations: Single Family Residential (SFR), Single Family Infill (SFI), Traditional Residential Infill (TRI) and Multi-Family Infill (MFR).

CURRENT GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

The project site has two General Plan designations. The majority of the site (78 acres) is located within the Resource Area (RA-123) designation, and a 2.63-acre portion of the site located in the northeastern corner is designated Single Family Residential, (SFR-121). To allow for the construction of the proposed single family subdivision, the applicant requests a General Plan Amendment of the 78-acre portion of the site so that the entire 80.63-acre project site is designated SFR-121, Single Family Residential. The proposed amendment would make the land use designation consistent with the applicant's proposed use of the site.

The site's current Resource Area (RA) designation is generally applied to sensitive lands inside the Rural Urban Limit (RUL) that require special standards due to viewshed, resource, habitat, geotechnical or other considerations that further the conservation and resource protection goals of the General Plan. Limited, very low-density residential use (up to 1 home per existing parcel) is permitted, with discretionary review of site development details. Other low intensity uses, such as rural residential (to a maximum of 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres with approval of a Use Permit) or agriculture, may be considered at the discretion of the City on a case by case basis. All uses are assessed to determine if they will impact or change the underlying character or feature that is intended for preservation by the RA designation.

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

The Single Family Residential (SFR) land use category is described in the General Plan as applying to areas intended to develop or redevelop into a detached single family unit pattern with building types and styles generally conforming to: 1) a typical subdivision layout with generally uniform lots on gridiron or curvilinear streets; or 2) the estate residential pattern with larger irregular shaped lots and curvilinear streets responding to natural constraints. The portion of the site located in Density POD SFR-121 provides for detached single-family homes at densities from zero to three (0-3) units per acre. The proposed development would have an overall density of 0.63 units per acre, consistent with the density range (0 - 3 units/acre) of the SFR-121 General Plan designation. Because the subject property has a Zoning designation of :HS, Hillside Overlay, the steepness of the slopes on the site determines the theoretical maximum density of 117 units. This density calculation is explained in greater detail in the Hillside Overlay District section of this report.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

In order to approve a General Plan Amendment, the applicant must demonstrate that the Amendment is in the public interest and that there is internal consistency with the policies and principles of the General Plan.

The proposed amendment could be found in the public interest as the project would provide additional housing stock to the City which has a limited inventory of available housing and an extremely low vacancy rate for rental properties. Although the project proposes homes that are not anticipated to be entry level homes, increasing the inventory of housing stock could make market rate homes more available as established homeowners "upgrade" from their market rate homes to one of the higher-end homes in this development. Another component of the project that may be found in the public interest is the provision of public access to an expansive hillside property that had previously been privately owned and inaccessible to the public. The privately maintained park and walking trails would be available to the public via a public access easement. The development would also preserve in perpetuity approximately 50 acres of open space including 17 acres of Oak woodlands.

The project could be found consistent with several policies and principles of the General Plan, including policies that encourage the creative and efficient use of vacant land along with providing an increased mix of various types of housing throughout the City to meet the community's housing needs. As outlined in detail in the Planning Commission staff report (Attachment 6), the project would constitute a small percentage (less than 1%) of the 7,840 housing units projected for the City over the plan period, through 2020. The project could be found consistent with City policies for efficient

development of land within the RUL. The project design would concentrate the density of development within the center portion of the site, while avoiding natural resources and hazards in the area (i.e., the riparian areas, trees and fault traces). The proposed development by design and density would be consistent with General Plan policies encouraging buffering and feathering development adjacent to the RUL.

ZONING

The project site is located within two zoning districts, with a majority of the site zoned AR, Agricultural Resource District which is applied to lands within the RUL designated “Resource Area” or “Greenbelt” by the Napa General Plan. This designation is applied to sensitive lands within the RUL that require special standards due to viewshed, resource, habitat, geotechnical or other considerations that further the resource protection goals of the General Plan. The AR District permits one detached single-family dwelling unit per lot. Any proposed development, including agriculture, is subject to a Use Permit and densities of up to one unit per 20 acres may be considered. Development standards in the AR district include a maximum height of 2.5 stories or 30 feet and a minimum lot size of 20 acres.

The 2.63-acre portion of the site in the northeast corner of the site is zoned RS-10, Single Family Residential which provides for residential development with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. No changes to the existing Zoning Designation are proposed in this area.

Consistent with the proposed General Plan Amendment, the applicant is requesting a Zoning Amendment for the portion of property designated AR, Agricultural Resource to the RS-7, Single Family Residential Zoning District. The RS district implements the single-family residential category of the General Plan and allows a single family detached unit pattern including custom home subdivisions on hillsides or constrained sites, and tract subdivisions with uniform platting patterns, setbacks and building types. This district provides opportunities for low density detached single family homes and planned developments. The RS-7 Zoning District provides for residential development with a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet.

The proposed subdivision includes lot sizes that range from 12,712 square feet (0.29 acres) to 34,809 square feet (0.79 acres). All the proposed lots in the subdivision are consistent with and exceed the minimum lot size requirement for the RS-7 Zoning designation. For additional detail regarding the project’s compliance with the RS-7 development standards, see the attached Planning Commission report (Attachment 6).

HILLSIDE OVERLAY DISTRICT

The project site is located within the HS, Hillside Overlay Zoning District. The purpose of the Hillside Overlay is to implement the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan concerning hillside and ridgeline development, development hazards, resource conservation and open space lands. These regulations are intended to preserve the predominant views both from, and of, the hillside areas and to retain the natural appearance that these hillside areas impart to the City and its environs. The Hillside Overlay (HS) requirements are imposed on development to minimize and control scarring and cut-and-fill development impacts on hillsides, minimize water runoff and soil erosion, and promote the preservation and retention of significant features of a site such as native vegetation, terrain or rock formations.

Under the HS designation, one unit per lot is allowed and any additional units are subject to approval of a Use Permit and must demonstrate consistency with the hillside development criteria. The steepness of the slopes on the site determines the theoretical density that might be possible to consider for a subdivision. The allowed number of lots is determined through a slope density analysis using the following criteria:

- Any portion of the lot or parcel having a slope of less than 15 percent shall be assigned a density not to exceed the underlying General Plan land use classification (in this case, up to 3 units per acre under the requested General Plan Amendment to SFR-121);
- Any portion of the lot or parcel having a slope of 15 percent to 30 percent shall be assigned a density not to exceed one (1) dwelling unit for each acre; and
- Any portion of the lot or parcel having a slope greater than 30 percent shall be assigned no density.

The project contains 30.48 acres of slopes that range between 0 and 15%, 25.66 acres of the site range between 15 and 30% slope, and the remaining 24.48 acres exceeds 30% slope. The results of the slope density analysis on the subject hillside property provides a theoretical maximum of 117 units. The actual location of the units would be determined by other site constraints and the objectives of the Hillside Design Guidelines. The slope density formula does not imply a density “by right” because all other factors of development in the HS district must be evaluated in order to determine the appropriate density and development configuration for a site.

The applicant has designed a total of 51 residential lots on the 80-acre site although the theoretical maximum number of lots is much higher (117 units). The total number of proposed units is based on several factors, including the street connections, tree removal, building visibility, fault trace location, and the steepness of the slope. A majority of the site (49.93 acres) will be preserved as open space or community park and remain undeveloped. In areas where steeper slopes exist, stepped housing foundations will be utilized to limit slope-related impacts. See additional discussion regarding Hillside Development Guidelines, Alternate Hillside Development Standards and Use Permit for increased density in the Planning Commission report (Attachment 6).

SUBDIVISION DESIGN REVIEW

The 51-lot subdivision has been designed to take advantage of grading that was performed in the past by a previous owner. The proposed road system follows the natural terrain and aligns with previous grading. The house pads make use of the flatter areas between and around the four prominent knolls and are clustered around the roadway system. These features facilitate the preservation of more than half the site which would remain undisturbed in an open space easement. The subdivision is laid out to minimize cuts and fills consistent with the Hillside Overlay principles. Although the proposed subdivision street design appears to have room to accommodate sidewalks on both sides of the streets, with a few exceptions where the street narrows due to existing topography, it has been designed without sidewalks for the most part. However, the Tentative Map has been conditioned to provide sidewalks on both sides of the streets, where feasible. For more discussion on the Design Review of the subdivision’s design and the architecture of the proposed homes, see the Planning Commission report (Attachment 6).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

After receiving an application for the original 53 Lot subdivision, the City determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be the appropriate environmental review path for this project. The EIR, containing both the Draft EIR and Final EIR, is an informational document intended to disclose to the City of Napa and the public the environmental consequences of approving and implementing the Napa Oaks II Subdivision project.

On July 20, 2012, a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report pursuant to CEQA for the project was posted with the Office of Planning and Research (OPR; State Clearing House No. 2012082093) and mailed to all responsible and affected agencies. On July 31, 2012, a Scoping Meeting was noticed and held at the City of Napa City Hall, and was attended by several individuals and several comments were received at the meeting. On March 25, 2016, staff filed a notice of Completion of the Draft EIR with the OPR, and the Draft EIR was circulated from March 25, 2016 to June 10, 2016 for a period of not less than 45 days as required by CEQA. The public review period elicited 59 written comments from agencies, groups and interested individuals. On November 17, 2017, the Final EIR, which was prepared by the City's environmental consultant, Lamphier-Gregory, and which incorporated comments received, responses to those comments, and changes to the Draft EIR, was published and circulated to commenting agencies and responding persons.

The Final EIR has been routed to the City Council separately and is available on the City's web site. The public comments address in the Final EIR contain a broad range of topics, but generally include concerns regarding the following issues:

- Changes to the current conditions of the site
- Agricultural Buffer
- Tree Removal
- Development of a site with an earthquake fault
- Soil slips
- Downslope drainage
- Safety of stormwater basin
- Project related traffic and cumulative traffic
- Traffic patterns / cut-through traffic
- Emergency vehicle access
- Safety of main vehicle access

For a complete list of these issues and specific responses to each comment, please see the Final EIR. For additional analysis of the Final EIR contents see the Planning Commission staff report (Attachment 6).

CEQA requires that, prior to the approval of a project, the decision-makers certify that the EIR has been prepared and circulated in accordance with CEQA. CEQA also requires that, if an EIR has identified potential significant environmental impacts from the project, the lead agency must make certain findings relating to those potential impacts. Of relevance to this project, if the City certifies the EIR and approves the project, the City must find that the changes or alterations to the project (in the form of the identified mitigation measures) have been required and would avoid or substantially lessen the potential significant impacts, such that as modified, the proposed project would not result

in any significant environmental effects. Staff has prepared a Resolution for adoption by the City Council for certification of the EIR, including the necessary findings of fact that the project with mitigation measures identified in the EIR would have no significant impacts to the environment. The EIR was distributed to the City Council for their review on January 8, 2018.

EFFECT OF REVISED ALQUIST PRIOLO MAP ON THE EIR

The Draft EIR identified fault traces across the site, which were characterized through extensive fault evaluations including trenching at the site. That the site was not within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zone ("designated fault zone") was noted in the Draft EIR, but this information was not used to screen out the site from fault evaluation or otherwise treat environmental analysis of the site any different than a site that was in a designated fault zone would have been treated. In other words, the Draft EIR treated the known fault area substantially the same as a designated fault zone would have been treated. Development within a designated fault zone requires fault evaluation to determine required setbacks. That fault evaluation work had been previously performed and included in the Draft EIR. However, the newly-designated fault zone was a little larger than the area analyzed in the Draft EIR and the site was included in an additional fault zone along the eastern portion of the site. A supplemental fault evaluation was performed to expand the coverage of the fault evaluation to the entire newly-designated fault zones.

The supplemental evaluation demonstrated that the fault on the eastern/central portion of the site had been fully and adequately defined in the previous study and there would be no additional fault setbacks necessary to respond to the newly-designated fault zone. While homes had not been proposed in those areas, discontinuous cracks identified on the fault setback map have been determined not to be part of the fault but have been identified as a building exclusion zone for habitable structures to formalize prohibition of homes on those discontinuous cracks. As noted above, the updated fault zone mapping included a portion of the site in an additional designated fault zone along the eastern portion of the site. While no fault traces had been previously found through exploration on the eastern portion of the site, the supplemental fault zone analysis included additional exploration to demonstrate that the area where buildings are proposed within this eastern fault zone do not require additional setback. While the proposed development remains the same as that presented in the EIR, a fault setback line has been established on site plans to substantiate that structures could not be built farther east of that line without additional study.

Therefore, the official designation of a part of the site as being within designated fault zones would not be considered "significant new information" under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, because it would not result in new impacts or increase the severity of identified impacts. Even though portions of the site are now in officially-designated fault zones and fault setbacks and building exclusion zones have been substantiated outside of areas proposed for structures, the presence of faulting at the site was known during preparation of the EIR, and the potential for environmental impacts related to faults are fully covered under the EIR. Thus, no recirculation of the EIR or other supplemental CEQA analysis is required to address the newly-designated fault zones.

PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW

On December 7, 2017, the Planning Commission considered the proposed project (see Attachment 6, Minutes Excerpts). At that meeting, the Commission heard a summary of the project and Environmental Impact Report from Staff including a presentation by the Applicant. The Commission

then opened the public hearing and heard from forty-five (45) members of the public. The primary issues raised by the speakers included concerns about increased traffic, drainage, project grading, and view shed impacts, and the appropriateness of the General Plan and Zoning amendment request.

The Commission asked the Applicant to respond to the comments received during the public testimony. The Applicant's legal counsel, Kevin Teague, introduced the Applicant's responses. Mr. Teague began by comparing the Napa Oaks II site to other sites with the Resource Area (RA) designation, and specifically to the previously approved Stanly Ranch Resort project which amended 95 acres of land with a General Plan designation of Resource Area (RA) and zoning designation of Agricultural Resource (AR) to the Tourist Commercial (TC) GP designation and a Master Plan zoning designation.

The Applicant's engineer discussed grading and drainage (hydrology) and explained that if the project is approved and constructed, the amount of water draining off the site post-project will improve existing conditions through management of the stormwater.

The Applicant's geologist discussed the geologic considerations of the project site including how the proposed setbacks from the earthquake fault were determined and how the proposed homes are located in stable areas of the project site. The Applicant team finalized their responses by identifying the project's consistency with the Housing Element's goals and Napa's need for additional housing.

The Commission asked City staff, with legal analysis from the City's special counsel, Dan Doporto, to respond to a late communication from a law firm which suggested that recirculation of the project's Environmental Impact Report is required due to the addition of a new alternative "Alternative E" and the proposed traffic roundabout on Old Sonoma Road. City staff provided documentation to support the conclusion that the information provided in the late communication did not trigger the requirement for recirculation of the EIR (Attachment 6). The Commission asked about the capabilities of the detention basin. Tim Wood, Public Works Senior Civil Engineer, confirmed that the detention basin has been designed in accordance with industry standards and should be sufficient.

In response to questions about the fire safety of the project and how potential impacts to the Casswall neighborhood would be mitigated, Larry Pasero from the Fire Prevention Division indicated the project would mitigate existing fire hazards onsite and that the project's Wildland Fire Protection Plan provides mechanisms to ensure safety for future residents and the surrounding area.

Mr. Wood responded to the Commission's question about the safety of the proposed roundabout by providing information from the Caltrans manual regarding the benefits and safety of a roundabout. Dalene Whitlock, the Applicant's Traffic Engineer, responded to concerns about how vehicles traveling down the hill on Old Sonoma Road at higher rates of speed would be addressed by the roundabout. She indicated that with adequate signage and design features ensuring that drivers would see the roundabout from a distance, the roundabout would operate safely.

Staff was asked to explain the criteria of the Hillside Overlay and how the project was analyzed for compliance with building height regulations. Staff noted that building height is regulated in both the Zoning Code and the Hillside Design Guidelines. In the RS-7 Zoning District, the height limit is 30 feet but it can be increased to 35 feet with design review approval. The Hillside Overlay, which is more stringent, recommends a maximum building height of 24 feet from natural grade at any point on

the lot. The proposed project includes homes that exceed the height limits set forth in these standards. As discussed in the staff report, staff analyzed the location and design of each home and determined that the proposed clustering of the homes in areas of minimal slope would reduce the amount of grading consistent with criteria for increased building height in the Hillside Overlay. Similarly, the analysis found that the taller homes are in locations that would not be visible from off-site.

As the public hearing had reached nearly five hours, the Commission moved to close the public comment period and continue the public hearing to the December 21, 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

At the December 21, 2017 meeting, the Planning Commission began their deliberations (see Attachment 6, Minutes Excerpts). Comments ranged from the stated belief that the addition of housing promotes the public interest of the City to an assertion that the adopted Housing Element already identifies sufficient housing sites to adequately meet all levels of housing needs, including above-moderate housing. Some of the common issues raised were concerns about the appropriateness of the home designs given the topography of the property and concerns about the design and location of the detention basin which would be located down in the Casswall neighborhood. There were concerns about the safety of the proposed roundabout. The potential improvements to the City's water system were identified as a potential public benefit.

The Commission discussed various ways to consider changing the General Plan designation of the site if the Project was not approved at this time. They concluded that the site's General Plan designation could be evaluated as part of the forthcoming comprehensive General Plan Update, through development of a Specific Plan, or through development of a more detailed Planned Development Zoning overlay that could address community concerns. The Commission concluded it could not support the General Plan Amendment based on the current project design.

Commissioners Huether and Painter moved and seconded to forward a recommendation to the City Council to deny the General Plan Amendment for Napa Oaks II PL11-0024 with a recommendation that the site's General Plan designation be considered during the 2018 General Plan Update. At the conclusion of the hearing the Planning Commission voted 3-2 (Kelley, Huether, Painter; Ayes, Murray and Myers; noes) to forward a recommendation to the City Council to deny the project.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS:

No direct financial impact to the General Fund have been identified with this application.

CEQA:

If the Council intends to take action to approve any of the requested entitlements for this Project, including the General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, or associated permits, City staff recommends that City Council certify that the Environmental Impact Report [Napa Oaks II Project, PL11-0024, November 2017, State Clearing House No. 2012082093] has been completed in accordance with CEQA; the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR prior to approving the project described in the Recommended Action; and the EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgement and analysis.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

ATCH 1 - Draft resolution denying an application to amend the General Plan Designation for the

property at 3095 Old Sonoma Road from Resource Area (RA-123) to Single Family Residential (SFR-121) based on a recommendation from the Planning Commission which would result in a denial of the proposed Napa Oaks II project development

ATCH 2 - Draft resolution certifying the Environmental Impact Report for the Napa Oaks II Project (3095 and 3027 Old Sonoma Road and 211 Casswall Street) and adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

EX A and EX B - Link to the Draft EIR and Final EIR

ATCH 3 - Draft resolution amending the General Plan Designation for two parcels totaling 78-acres located at 3095 Old Sonoma Road from Resource Area (RA-123) to Single Family Residential (SFR-121) (APN 043-040-008 & 025)

ATCH 4: Draft ordinance amending the zoning map established under Napa Municipal Code Section 17.04.050, rezoning two parcels totaling 78-acres located at 3095 Old Sonoma Road from Agricultural Resource (AR) to Single Family Residential (RS-7) and determining that the actions authorized by this ordinance were adequately analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report for the Napa Oaks II Project

ATCH 5 - Draft resolution approving a Use Permit, Design Review Permit and Tentative Subdivision Map for the Napa Oaks II Project, a subdivision of an 80.60-acre project site into 51 single family lots with six open space parcels, located at 3095 and 3027 Old Sonoma Road and 211 Casswall Street (APNs: 043-040-008, -010, -013 & -025)

ATCH 6 - Planning Commission staff reports dated December 7, 2017 and December 21, 2017 (attachments removed to avoid duplication) with correspondences received for Planning Commission meetings and minutes excerpts

ATCH 7 - Project description and project plans

NOTIFICATION:

A courtesy notice advertising the availability of the Final EIR was mailed to all property owners within a 500-foot radius of the subject property, and to others who have requested notification, on November 15, 2017. A courtesy notice of availability of the Final EIR was also published in the Napa Valley Register on November 17, 2017, and notice of the scheduled public hearing was provided on June 6, 2018, by US Postal Service to all property owners within a 500-foot radius of the subject property. Notice of the public hearing was also published in the Napa Valley Register on June 8, 2018 and provided to people previously requesting notice on the matter at the same time notice was provided to the newspaper for publication. The Applicant was also provided a copy of this report and the associated attachments in advance of the public hearing on the project.

Prior to the Planning Commission meetings, the Applicant held a neighborhood meeting at Harvest Middle School on November 28, 2017. The meeting was attended by 75+ Napa residents.