



DRAFT DOWNTOWN NAPA SPECIFIC PLAN

**PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED on the DRAFT DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN
SINCE SEPTEMBER 9, 2011 RELEASE**

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
CIRCULATION:		
Support for traffic calming.	Bulbouts and special crosswalks are called out in the Specific Plan.	5.4 A, 5.4 B.
Recommend elimination of forced right turn at Third and Randolph.	Engineering will address specific roadway changes at the time the street reconfiguration moves forward.	Chapter 8
Consider adding a more “complete” street on Third Street between Main and Randolph Streets with improved bicycle/pedestrian access, passenger loading, turn lanes, connections through landscaping.	Engineering will address specific roadway changes at the time the street reconfiguration moves forward.	5.4 A., Chapter 8
Integrate more language regarding access and connections to Oxbow Bypass	Language added to address importance of connections	6.6
Encourage walking and biking experiences.	Plan includes concepts for slowing traffic, restoring the grid, addressing bike and pedestrian connections and a proposed bike plan	6.3, 6.6
TWO – WAY CIRCULATION:		
Support for two-way traffic in Downtown.	Proposed in the Specific Plan.	6.3

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
If two-way is not possible, support for reversal of the couplet.	Alternative of reversal of the couplet may be addressed if significant issues arise with the proposed reconfiguration to two-way circulation.	6.3
Opposed to two-way traffic on First and Second Streets – more parking availability, slower traffic, safety. The problem is retail vacancies, not traffic direction.	Economic analysis performed in preparation of the Specific Plan identified the one-way streets as an issue in attracting retailers. Safety and traffic speed will be addressed in the reconfiguration process.	6.3
Not supportive of one-way streets becoming two-way. The one-way streets accomplish good traffic flow and avoid gridlock. Referenced Whidbey Island, which now is converting streets to one-way for this very reason. Drivers trying to navigate our streets can rely on Google maps, signs, etc; doesn't feel it is the tax payer's responsibility to solve the merchants' problem.	Plan supports two-way circulation.	6.3
Comment that decisions regarding two-way in downtown cannot be made without considering effects on west of Jefferson.	The Specific Plan can only address circulation within the plan area. Traffic west of Jefferson is being analyzed on a separate track.	West of Jefferson study
COOMBS PLAZA CIRCULATION		
Support for restoration of the street grid wherever feasible – Coombs and Randolph.	The Specific Plan calls for restoration of Coombs Street to through traffic. It does not call for Randolph to be restored due to the amount of reconfiguring of buildings that it would entail.	6.3, Figure 6.4
Remove Coombs Street two-way circulation in the long term.	<i>Two way circulation in the long term would allow for traffic to access the Pearl Street garage as well as move back and forth between Pearl and First Streets more easily.</i>	6.3, Figure 6.4
For Coombs Plaza, suggest plan for 2-way and as projects come forward, the City should get dedication of right of way.	This is proposed in the Specific Plan.	6.3, Figure 6.4
In Coombs Plaza area, city should not allow additional development without requiring two-way circulation.	When a significant project is proposed for the area, the issue of restoring two-way circulation will be addressed.	4.8, Figure 4.5

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
Coombs Street Plaza proposal needs to be more detailed.	Implementation of traffic through Coombs Street will involve more detailed design.	6.3
If Coombs Street becomes one-way it should be a couplet with Franklin Street. Coombs = northbound. Franklin = southbound.	Change will be addressed in final Specific Plan.	6.3
Coombs Street Plaza diagram needs to be revised to reflect right-hand alignment with left side reserved for future lane.	Change will be addressed in final Specific Plan.	Figure 6.4
Oppose Coombs Street being one-way even short-term. If we are removing one-way streets we should not create new ones.	Plan reflects one-way circulation in the short term.	6.3
Consider impacts on loading areas for Kohl's and Merrill Building.	Impacts and logistics of loading in the areas of Kohl's and Merrills will have to be considered in any reconfiguration of Coombs Street.	6.3
WEST OF JEFFERSON CIRCULATION (OUTSIDE PLAN AREA)		
Encourage traffic redirected away from 2 nd Street, 3 rd Street and California Blvd. west of Jefferson St.	All west of Jefferson comments will be addressed in the West of Jefferson traffic study currently underway.	West of Jefferson Traffic Study
Recommend Hwy 29 off ramp at Old Sonoma Road.	Hwy 29 off ramp at Old Sonoma Road would not be allowed by CalTrans due to proximity to the First Street off ramp.	West of Jefferson Traffic Study
Recommend two-way circulation from California Blvd. to Main Street.	Within the Plan Area, two-way circulation is proposed in the Specific Plan. All west of Jefferson comments will be addressed in the West of Jefferson traffic study currently underway.	West of Jefferson Traffic Study
Consider re-striping west of Jefferson like East Avenue, with a wider area for bikes.	All west of Jefferson comments will be addressed in the West of Jefferson traffic study currently underway.	West of Jefferson Traffic Study
PARKING AND LOADING:		
Support for parking structures Downtown if attractive, safe and compatible with historic buildings.	Design Guidelines for parking structures are included in the Specific Plan supports attractive, safe structures that are sensitive	5.5 A.

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
	to surrounding historic buildings.	
Plan for electrical vehicle plug-ins and more bike racks.	Guidelines for parking structures include guidance on this.	5.5 A.
Recommend incorporating Fourth Street between Randolph and Coombs into a surface parking lot.	If the County wishes to work toward abandonment of the Fourth Street right of way, this could be considered at the time the County has a plan in place for this area.	Project initiated
Passenger and delivery vehicle loading in front of public buildings should be noted.	This would be considered as part of the reconfiguration of the street direction to ensure access for passenger and delivery vehicle loading.	Chapter 8
If the jail is relocated, a secure bus parking and loading facility adjacent to the Superior Court will be necessary.	The Specific Plan does not preclude such a facility.	Chapter 8
BICYCLING:		
Support dedicated bicycle routes.	The Specific Plan provides for dedicated bicycle routes.	6.6
Show East Avenue as an existing <u>Class III</u> route.	East Avenue is outside of the Plan Area.	Figure 6.6
Show the Class I path through the Opera House Plaza north of First and over the creek as <u>EXISTING</u> .	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Figure 6.6
Show First Street between Vernon and Juarez as <u>EXISTING</u>	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Figure 6.6
Randean Way is now known as River Terrace Drive. It should be shown as a <u>Class II</u> route for consistency with the draft Bicycle Plan.	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Figure 6.6
Identify Third Street as a proposed Class II route <u>west to Jefferson</u> .	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Figure 6.6
Technical errors that should be corrected on page 160: Modify Paragraph 2: "East of the Napa River, the bicycle facilities on First and Third streets connect to a series of Class II bike facilities along Silverado Trail, East Avenue , <u>Soscol Avenue</u> and Coombsville Road. A parallel Class III route meanders <u>runs east-west</u> through Downtown mainly on Clay and Street to	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	6.6

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
Pearl streets, terminating into the Coombs Street north-south route..."		
Last two bullets p.160 – replace current description which contains errors with “Provide Class II bike lanes along Coombs Street from Division Street to Pearl Street through the Napa Town Center, assuming Coombs Street is reopened through the Town Center. (If for some reason the proposed street extension is not reopened, the Plan calls for a Class I path through the Town Center).”	Change will be addressed in final Specific Plan.	6.6
Bicycle parking protocol to identify locations would be desirable.	The City Bike Commission and City/County Bike plan addresses this issue.	Bike Commission
Third or Fourth Streets as Class II	Third Street is planned as a Class II.	Figure 6.6
Ensure that bike lanes are incorporated on Third Street concurrent with conversion to two-way circulation.	Third Street is planned as a Class II.	Figure 6.6
Will bike lane markings (sharrows) be allowed?	Roadway markings for Bike Routes will be determined by the City Bike Plan.	Bike Commission
Would like bicycles accommodated on First Street.	Roadway width appears to be too narrow to accommodate a dedicated bike lane. Engineering of the reconfiguration will address how bicycles may be accommodated on First Street.	Figure 6.6, Figure 6.3
Class II bike lanes needed on First, Second OR Third Streets, or an east-west cycle track between Jefferson and California.	This is being addressed in the Bike Plan.	Figure 6.6
Would like Class II on Coombs Street by library – remove parking on one side to improve safety.	Coombs Street near the library is proposed to be Class II.	Figure 6.6
Would like Class I on Coombs Street near Town Center.	Coombs Street in Town Center is proposed to be either Class I or Class II depending on the future configuration of the roadway.	Figure 6.6
Two-way traffic will be unsafe for bikes.	Safety of bicyclists will be considered in developing engineering for reconfiguring of circulation.	Chapter 6, Chapter 8
Does the bicycle boulevard remain on Seminary Street?	Yes. Seminary remains a bicycle boulevard.	Figure 6.6

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
When the circulation is reconfigured, how do the bike lanes fit in on Third and Fourth Streets? Class II on Third and Fourth?	Engineering will address specific roadway changes at the time the street reconfiguration moves forward. Some on-street parking may be lost to accommodate bike lanes.	Figure 6.6, Figure 6.3
How do bikes cross First Street near the Bounty Hunter?	The plan calls for a future undercrossing below First Street along Napa Creek. In the short term, bikes will need to cross at the traffic signals.	Figure 6.6
Would like good signage for bikes and standardized markings.	The City Bike Plan and the Bike Commission will inform future signage and roadway markings.	
Concerned about impact to cyclists if streets go two-way – very squished	Engineering will address specific roadway changes at the time the street reconfiguration moves forward. Some on-street parking may be lost to accommodate bike lanes.	Figure 6.3
COMMUNITY CENTER:		
Downtown Specific Plan should include a community center and vegetable garden, something for the community; a place to share skills, build a sustainable community, have a tool library, host workshops. She also said something about sustainable design guidelines.	The need for a community center is addressed in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Downtown was not identified as a viable location for a future Community Center.	Parks and Facilities Master Plan
Would like a Community Center – a multicultural gathering place which serves as a source of educational material and experiences – a center to learn and share together (trade skills, work together, tool library, workshops, community garden and kitchen and promote programs related to sustainability) built as a model of sustainable living and construction.	The need for a community center is addressed in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Downtown was not identified as a viable location for a future Community Center.	Parks and Facilities Master Plan
Heritage Park – create a native garden/forest in this area with interactive games and bring native flora and fauna (mainly birds) with all the regular amenities of a Downtown park	Heritage Park expansion into a future linear parkway was recommended by the Steering Committee. The potential for amenities in this area will be determined by the amount of land available following completion of the Napa Creek project.	DSC #10 Summary

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
LAND USES:		
Support for integration of housing and mixed use.	Housing and other mixed uses are allowed throughout the Specific Plan area.	Table 4.1
Support for conversion of residential structures on the periphery of downtown back to residential uses.	Included in the Specific Plan.	Table 4.1 H.
Multi-family residential should be permitted, not conditional.	Change will be addressed in final Specific Plan.	Table 4.1 H.
Encourage affordable rental housing.	Affordable housing is encouraged in that density ranges allow for high density housing and multi-family housing is permitted by right.	Table 4.1 H.
Allowable Land Use Table is too restrictive.	Land Use Table, Table 4.1 is expanded to provide more flexibility.	Table 4.1
DT I should be extended further north per NVAE map.	Downtown I is limited in its location to provide sufficient distance to buffer surrounding neighborhoods from the height allowed in Downtown I. Expanding it northward, would impact neighborhoods to the north.	4.7
OXBOW RELATED:		
Oxbow should include arts related businesses, artist studios which choose to have a gallery (not all artists want their space open to the public)	Art related businesses, studios and galleries are allowed in the Oxbow Commercial district. Specifically, live-work developments are encouraged.	Table 4.1
Hotels are SROs. If SROs are not allowed in Oxbow, hotels should not be allowed either. Eliminating SROs from Oxbow is discriminatory. The comments of the committee that a shelter would be allowed as an SRO swayed the committee to say “no” to SROs.	Hotels are distinct from SROs (Single Room Occupancy) as hotels are intended for occupancy for short durations, while SROs are designed as long term residences or transitional housing. While cities are required to provide opportunities for SRO development, the city may determine the location.	Government Code 65580 et. sec.
Would like residential density and height in Oxbow to be the same as in Downtown I. (20 – 60 units per acre and 75’ instead of 20 – 40 units per acre and 60’)	The Oxbow Commercial area is distinct from Downtown in terms of its character. Downtown I is designed to provide a strong core to the western portion of Downtown. Allowing equivalent height and density in the Oxbow area is less desirable because of the character of the area.	4.7
Would like to see “residential uses” and “hotel” included as	Hotels and residential uses are allowed in the Oxbow Commercial	4.2

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
desirable land uses in Oxbow.	district. Hotels are included in the text description of the district. Residential was not included, although it is allowed, because the description provides a foundation for the underlying theme of the area, which is not residential in character.	
Recommend retaining existing Copia building for reuse without specifying type of reuse as a conference or educational facility.	“Conference or educational facility” will be removed in the final Specific Plan.	4.8
Recommend “preserving or transforming gardens” for use as a unique community open space rather than “preserving the gardens.”	The concept of “transforming” the gardens is not in keeping with the community’s desire to preserve elements of the gardens as a community amenity. “Transform” is open to interpretation, and does not support the idea of preservation.	4.8
Relocate asterisk for “Potential Gathering Space” so that it more generically indicates a space rather than specifically identifying a particular space.	The intention of the asterisks is to provide examples of opportunity areas for gathering space. Most are located in the area of the future continuation of the promenade. They are not intended to identify specific locations.	Figure 4.7
Hand Boat Launch location on southeastern corner of Copia building is not a viable location due to steepness of the bank.	Noted and will be removed.	
Add Residential to Uses Chart.	Residential is allowed in the Oxbow area.	Table 4.1
Add Convenience Market to Uses Chart.	A convenience market, such as 7-11, is not a desirable use in this area. Uses such as those in the Oxbow Market and other surrounding retailers allow opportunities for sale of convenience items.	Table 4.1
Add Grocery Stores and Supermarkets to Uses Chart.	Grocery Stores and Supermarkets are characterized by large “big box” structures and require large parking areas. A grocery store or supermarket would limit opportunities for other uses in this area.	Table 4.1
Add Sporting Goods, including rentals to Uses Chart.	Depending on the size of the store, sporting goods sales may be a potential use in this area. It was not included because many sporting goods stores are large “big box” retailers which are not in keeping with the character of this area.	Table 4.1

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
Add Business Support Services to Uses Chart.	Business support services is not included in this area because this area is tourist commercial in nature and Business Support Services are usually located to support local office based businesses.	Table 4.1
Add Catering to Uses Chart.	Catering may be allowed as an ancillary use to a primary restaurant use. Catering as a stand alone business is not appropriate as it does not support or need the foot traffic and commercial presence that is the nature of this area.	Table 4.1
Add Consulting and Advisory Services to Uses Chart.	Consulting and Advisory Services is not included as the business core of downtown is west of Soscol. Other types of offices are allowed in the Oxbow area but those related to business and financial services are directed toward the area west of Soscol.	Table 4.1
Add Fitness Center/Health Clubs to Uses Chart.	The Steering Committee recommends that stand alone Health Clubs not be allowed, but that Health Clubs be allowed as a component of a hotel or residential use.	Table 4.1
Add Laundry/Dry Cleaning to Uses Chart.	Because this area is largely tourist serving, it is not anticipated that a stand alone Laundry/Dry Cleaning facility would support the character of the area. However, a Laundry/Dry Cleaning facility as a component of a hotel use may be considered.	Table 4.1
Add Multi-level Parking Lots to Uses Chart.	Multi-level parking garages are allowed in the Oxbow District with a conditional use permit. This higher level of review allows decision-makers to weigh in on size and location as well as the design of potential parking structures.	Table 4.1
Add Real Estate Sales office to Uses Chart.	Real Estate Sales offices would be allowed as a component of a residential development for the purposes of providing an on-site sales office as a temporary use. A stand alone Real Estate Sales office does not support the character of the area.	Table 4.1
Add Entertainment Uses to Uses Chart.	Outside the Entertainment District, entertainment uses are allowed with a use permit.	Table 4.1

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
Add Outdoor Dining to Uses Chart.	Outdoor dining is allowed in the Oxbow District.	Table 4.1
Add Theaters/Performance Halls to Uses Chart.	Theatres and Performance Halls are allowed in the Oxbow District with a Conditional Use Permit.	Table 4.1
TOWN CENTER:		
Suggestion that the loading dock for Kohl's be relocated to the north side of the building in the location of the soon to be relocated transit center with access off of Pearl Street, and a breezeway be constructed in the location of the current loading dock.	The future reconfiguration of Coombs Street in the Town Center area and potential redevelopment of the Town Center itself, may result in relocation of the loading dock at Kohl's. The concept of relocating it to the north side will be evaluated in conjunction with future work in that area.	4.8
DOWNTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD RELATED:		
Strongly opposed to large housing projects in "Downtown Neighborhood" transition area. The historic districts should have protections.	Housing is allowed in the transition district at a density of 10 to 25 units per acre. Setbacks and stepbacks as well as historic design guidelines will reduce the impacts of any "large" housing project on neighboring properties.	Table 4.1, Table 4.3
In Chapter 2, note the National Register-eligible district west of Jefferson – it should be listed and receive signage.	Change will be reflected in the final Specific Plan.	Figure 2.6
COUNTY RELATED:		
Note that retail on the County owned property on Main Street occur "if feasible."	Change will be reflected in the final Specific Plan.	Figure 4.1
Superior Court should be public, not Downtown Core Commercial on the east side.	Change will be reflected in the final Specific Plan.	Figure 4.1
Plan should note the City's historic role as the county seat.	Language will be added to the Existing Conditions chapter to that effect.	2.1
County offices should be a "permitted" use rather than a "conditional" use and should anticipate uses beyond office space.	All uses in the Public zone of the Specific Plan are regulated by section 17.16.030 of the Municipal Code. The Specific Plan does not make any changes to the zoning ordinance related to public/quasi public uses (Municipal Code section 17.16.030).	Zoning Ordinance section 17.16.030

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
HEIGHT:		
Support 75' height in Downtown I	Included in the Specific Plan.	4.7, Table 4.3
Consider allowing some structures or features to protrude above 75' to animate roofscape.	Change will be reflected in the final Specific Plan.	4.7
Support 60' height in Downtown II with caveat that new construction adjacent to historic buildings be no more than two stories higher than existing historic buildings or should "step back" a minimum distance. The "step back" should apply to all facades of a building visible from the street.	The Historic Resources Design Guidelines identify specific recommendations for development adjacent to historic structures including the utilization of "stepbacks" to minimize impacts on historic buildings.	4.7, Table 4.3, Appendix G: Historic Resources Design Guidelines
Extending 75' height on the south side of First Street will result in permanent shade of Dwight Murray Plaza in winter and would be an inappropriate building mass in the context of surrounding historic buildings	South side of First Street recommended to remain at 60' height limit.	Table 4.3
The building heights across the street from and within the Transition zones should match and be limited to 35'.	In the Transition area, heights are limited to 35'. If the Transition area is carried across the street from the Transition area, the area will expand into Downtown I and II and will compromise the purpose of tiering the height in the manner it is planned.	Figure 4.3
Building heights for all zones should transition down from one to another.	The building height layout as currently configured has the tallest height in the center (at Town Center) at 75'. It steps down to 60' for the rest of the Downtown area, including the Oxbow area, with a further step down to the Transition area at 35'.	Figure 4.3
Does not recommend prescriptive step-back requirements in all instances, but in specifically identified locations.	Stepbacks are only required in Downtown II where adjacent to residential uses, and in the Transition area in an effort to provide a buffer between Downtown II and the surrounding neighborhoods.	Table 4.3
Concern regarding steep increase in heights from Transition to Downtown II.	The large number of historic buildings, the limited number of development opportunities and the design guidelines calling for breaking up the mass of large scale development will reduce the	Figure 2.11, 5.2

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
	impact of new buildings so that steep increases in height are minimized.	
We should require setbacks in Downtown I on Main Street.	Setbacks are not required in Downtown I.	4.7
Some blocks should have different heights on different street facings or require setbacks.	The Design Guidelines and Historic Design Guidelines address how a proposed building should be articulated to take it's surroundings into consideration.	Chapter 5, Appendix G Historic Design Guidelines
With regard to 75' on the south side of First Street, there is a big problem with the huge areas of shadows that are going to be created because of the heights you are suggesting in all of the areas you are suggesting them. Veterans Park would be in deep shadow.	Height on the south side of First Street to remain at 60'.	Summary of DSC #10
You should model what you are recommending because you could be creating cold, shady, uninviting places that no one will want to visit.	A 3d model is in process and may be utilized in the future to illustrate how proposed development will integrate into the existing environment.	
For ground floor heights, for every foot of ground floor height over 12', an equal number of feet should be added proportionately as an increase in height.	The height of the ground floor on Main Street and the core area of First Street is proposed to be a minimum of 14' floor to floor (which is the equivalent of 12' floor to ceiling). Ground floor height in other areas is not regulated. This allows architects the flexibility to design buildings without the constraint of a tall ground floor height requirement.	Summary of DSC #10
PROCESS:		
Voting process is frustrating and confusing. Questions are leading. Should be more clarity and opportunity to listen.		
Not enough opportunities provided for public input.		
Committee is confused about what they are looking for on the map. You should be showing photos to identify the blocks		

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
about which they are voting.		
What happened to the 3d model? If you had photos to verify the areas, it would be more legitimate to vote.		
Why is there no posting of minutes from the previous meeting? This should be available to the public prior to each meeting.	The meeting summaries were posted on the website as soon as they were available. Due to the closeness in time of the meetings, it was not possible to get the summaries completed and posted prior to each subsequent meeting.	Project website
Your vote on the transition setbacks is garbled again. The committee needs visual aids to understand what they are voting for and against.		
Concern that models are not being used for making decisions.		
Difficult time identifying measurable objectives of the plan How will progress be measured? Who will be the gatekeeper? An executive summary might be a good place for this discussion.	The implementation chapter identifies how the Specific Plan will be carried out as well as a cost and timeline for each implementation measure.	Chapter 8
It would be helpful if we had visuals for the transitional neighborhood because at the last meeting the committee members may not have been clear about what buildings are on what blocks.		
Asked why there was a long hiatus from the last Steering Committee meetings in 2010 and where are meeting summaries and recaps of the discussions that have taken place so far?	<p>The reason for the time that elapsed between the last Steering Committee meetings in 2010 and these meetings was to provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct sub-committee meetings on infrastructure and design • Work with Napa Valley College on 3D modeling of the downtown • Conduct meetings with Napa County Landmarks, Napa Valley Architects Exchange and neighbors • Participate in neighborhood tours in and around the downtown • Complete the Intensive Level Historic Survey and Historic Design 	Project website

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
	<p>Guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare the preliminary draft Downtown Specific Plan • Begin preparing the administrative draft Environmental Impact Report <p>Staff explained that the meeting summaries and PowerPoint slides would be posted on the web before the next meeting.</p>	
DWIGHT MURRAY PLAZA:		
<p>Individual has a vision and is interested in providing design for garden/park at Dwight Murray Plaza.</p>	<p>Any future renovation of Dwight Murray Plaza will involve a process by which consultants may submit proposals with design ideas.</p>	<p>5.4 H.</p>
STREETSCAPE:		
<p>May be soil contamination issues on the south side of Fifth Street and both sides of Brown Street in the Napa Mill area that would impact planting of street trees.</p>	<p>At the time the streetscape plan is fully articulated and implemented, these issues will be addresses.</p>	<p>Figure 5.1</p>
<p>Bring back A-frame signs.</p>	<p>A frame signs are no longer allowed by City ordinance. These signs were replaced by the pedestrian oriented signage for businesses located in strategic locations throughout downtown.</p>	<p>Municipal Code section 15.56.120</p>
<p>Support for promoting and retaining tree canopy, especially in Downtown Neighborhood area.</p>	<p>The streetscape section identifies potential types of future street trees. These trees were selected specifically for their tree canopy.</p>	<p>Table 5.1</p>
DESIGN GUIDELINES:		
<p>Support for design review process for all downtown signage and infrastructure that may potentially block views of historic building facades. Including traffic signs, street signs, way-finding signs, utility poles, power transformers, parking meters, bicycle racks and landscape features.</p>	<p>The Historic Design Guidelines address development adjacent to historic buildings.</p>	<p>Appendix G. Historic Design Guidelines</p>
<p>Support for excellence in architecture and qualitative language</p>	<p>Excellence in design is expected to be the norm, rather than the</p>	<p>Chapter 5</p>

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
that incentivizes excellence in design via an expedited planning and approval process.	exception. Proposals that reflect the recommendations in the Design Guidelines and Historic Design Guidelines will naturally move through the planning and approval process more expeditiously.	
MAPPING AND IMAGES:		
Be consistent in labeling publicly owned facilities and the surface parking lots that serve them.	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Maps throughout
Be consistent in identifying the gardens surrounding the historic courthouse as a public amenity. Also, add as “plazas, parks, open space and promenade on maps.”	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Maps throughout
Identify County facilities that are still in use (Carrithers Building and County Corporations Yard) and should note that the sale and redevelopment of these sites can only occur once the activities in them have been relocated.	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Chapter 4, Chapter 6, Chapter 8
Identify the Community Services Building as a public facility until the City/County consolidation study is completed.	The Community Services Building is not zoned as Public because until the City/County consolidation study is completed, the future use of the site is uncertain.	Figure 2.5, Figure 4.1
Check properties identified as City owned in Figure 2.5 as to whether they are owned by the City or the Flood District.	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Figure 2.5
Specifically include language stating that the Specific Plan does not dictate uses or development standards on County properties.	Language to be added to address this point.	2.1
Would like the “move the jail out” comment on the charette graphic from a public workshop to be removed.	This notation was part of a charette performed at a public meeting. The notation reflects the voice of the community. It is not possible to remove that notation from the rest of the image.	Page 45
Identify both courthouses as state property.	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Chapter 2
Identify the US Post Office as federal property.	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Figure 2.3
Note the publicly accessible open space in building setbacks	Change will be reflected in final Specific Plan.	Chapter 2

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
along Third Street and between the courthouse and the county administrative building - should be added to the plazas, parks and open spaces on many maps.		
On Maps, use historic building names rather than current tenant names.	Will revisit this issue. In some cases, using the historic names may cause confusion in the absence of identifying the current use.	Chapter 4
Chapter 4, page 83 map – visual access to the river is truncated and shouldn't be.	Unclear as to how this is the case in the absence of any proposed development.	Figure 4.7
IMPLEMENTATION:		
Include a more robust Mills Act incentive for residential that has been converted to commercial (See Calistoga and St. Helena)	Implementation of the Specific Plan will involve further research into creation of a Mills Act program for Napa. A process for adoption of such a program will also invite public comment.	Chapter 8
Include TDR's in Transition zone.		
Expressed concern that the land use forecast accurately reflects what is possible in terms of future development, and suggested that allowable uses should be interchangeable to allow the market to decide.	The EIR will analyze different alternatives for land uses which will allow for flexibility in development of various uses.	Draft EIR
GENERAL COMMENTS:		
Estimate of development potential is too low. Numbers should be increased for EIR purposes.	Development capacity is estimated to include a reasonable estimate of development in for the 20 year horizon.	DEIR
Not enough consideration or inclusion given to the Napa River.	Change will be reflected in the final Specific Plan.	
Section on sustainability is not strong enough.	The Sustainability section works in concert with the City's High Performance Building Ordinance to	
Chapter Three needs to be re-worked, often too subjective.	Chapter 3 is revised.	Chapter 3
Plan needs a summary/ending.		
Plan should identify the 'heart' of the city.	First and Main Streets are the primary retail streets in Downtown and are planned to act as the city's "heart."	Chapter 4
Cater to tourists, but also create a dynamic living environment.	This is reflected in the vision.	Chapter 2

COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	LOCATION
Create a weir by the Hatt Building to create a permanent pond with a fountain for boating.	This is not a viable concept due to the flow and tidal nature of the river, as well as potential flooding issues that are now being addressed by the flood project.	Not a part of the Specific Plan
What is Napa's economic reason for being?		Not a part of the Specific Plan
What is the city-wide plan for trees? Does the City have an inventory? How will City be implementing modern practices for tree planting and sidewalk repair?	The city has over 30,000 trees. Currently, there is no formal inventory of trees. The protocol for planting of street trees involves deep watering in an effort to reduce potential for root intrusion into roads and sidewalks.	Not a part of the Specific Plan
Does the plan include markers for special trees? What about special consideration for 'special plants'? And what about a list of community members that make positive contributions in the community?	The city does not currently have a program for identification of special trees or plants. The City Council does recognize individuals who make significant contributions to the community on a regular basis.	Not a part of the Specific Plan