



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Agenda Date: 8/20/2008

Agenda Placement: 10B

Napa County Planning Commission Board Agenda Letter

TO: Napa County Planning Commission
FROM: John McDowell for Hillary Gitelman - Director
Conservation, Development & Planning
REPORT BY: Hillary Gitelman, Director - 253-4805
SUBJECT: Growth Summit Discussion

RECOMMENDATION

GROWTH SUMMIT DISCUSSION

Presentation and discussion regarding results of the June 13, 2008 Growth Summit.

Staff Recommendation: No action is requested at this time.

Staff Contact: Hillary Gitelman 253-4805

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 13, 2008, Napa County Planning Commissioners and staff participated in a so called "summit" regarding growth issues in Napa County. The summit was organized by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) and attended by representatives of the County and all incorporated cities/town within the county.

Subsequent to the summit, the Planning Commission requested that an item be placed on their agenda to allow for a discussion of the summit, the issues it highlighted, and ideas for the future.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Informational presentation and discussion only; no action is proposed.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The June 13, 2008 growth summit involved presentations by the planning director of each jurisdiction, opportunities for questions and answers, and a group exercise/discussion focusing on principles developed by the Napa County League of Governments (NCLOG) via a collaborative effort in 2003-2004. Copies of the power point presentations are available for review on NCTPA's website at www.nctpa.net, and a copy of the NCLOG principles is attached.

Today's agenda item is provided to give Commissioners an opportunity to discuss their experiences at the growth summit, issues that were highlighted by the presentations and discussions, and next steps. In aid of this discussion, staff has compiled the following brief list of comments received from meeting participants at the conclusion of the days events:

1. Great turnout for a weekday! Informed citizens are hungry for problem-solving and leadership.
2. This "summit" could have done more than pose the questions. The morning session just got us started, and the afternoon was not very helpful.
3. We better keep talking and get together again (on a Saturday?) well before the next scheduled "summit" in November.
4. Yountville, St. Helena, and Calistoga have it figured out. They understand their constraints, they have good plans, and control their growth. Someday this may get them in trouble with HCD.
5. Napans see all that vacant land inside the City of St. Helena and wonder why they don't provide more housing.
6. The County fairgrounds is a big blank space in the middle of Calistoga's general plan map. Perhaps the County should invite the City to plan for its future after their urban design plan (with plans for the glider port site) is completed.
7. American Canyon plans to add substantial employment in order to achieve a "jobs-housing balance" within the City even as the Airport Industrial Area builds out to the north.
8. The City of Napa plans to grow from 75,000 to 90,000 residents by 2026 or so. Their strategy involves adding new homes within existing neighborhoods, at the edges of the City, and in downtown.
9. Traffic is on everyone's mind, and there could be support for a County-wide impact fee which obligates all new development (new non-residential square footage and new market-rate dwelling units) to pay an impact fee for use in funding alternative modes of transportation.
10. The historic development pattern along Highway 29 between Vallejo and Airport Boulevard has negatively affected views of American Canyon and the County's principal gateway. Maybe the business community would help fund and organize a planning/design process jumping off from the South Corridor study that NCTPA completed last year. It would mean bringing the City of American Canyon and the County together, and focusing attention on both the aesthetics and the functionality of the corridor. This should be someone's priority.
11. It's easy to understand why American Canyon leaders feel misunderstood by the rest of the County, given some of the comments and questions we heard from the public. The County can/should help resolve these feelings somehow. Also, how can the City say they get no County services??? This is just plain wrong.
12. It seems like building a new residential neighborhood at Napa Pipe could be supported by people who live north of Soscol Ridge if it takes the pressure off of existing neighborhoods in Napa and up-valley housing sites in the County. The traffic impacts would have to be mitigated too...
13. The next "summit" needs to move towards solutions. It should define the minimum amount of growth that

is acceptable, and distribute that growth to the most appropriate locations without reference to jurisdictional boundaries. When there is community consensus on the minimum amount and location of growth, the politicians will have to make it happen, even if it means shifting boundaries, sharing revenue, etc.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- A . NCLOG Principles
- B . MIG Growth Summit Summary

Napa County Planning Commission: Approve

Reviewed By: John McDowell