



MINUTES ZONING & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

November 20, 2008

1. **Call to Order.** Marita Dorenbecher was introduced as the newly appointed member of the ZDRB.

2. **Roll Call.** All present.

3. **Adoption of Agenda. M/S Lamborn/Janes.** Approved 5-0.

Member Janes disclosed that he is the applicant of Item 8.2 and indicated that based on his review of FPP Guidelines, past practice, and discussion with staff, he'll be present during presentation and discussion of the item, but he'll recuse himself during deliberation among the members of the ZDRB.

4. **Approval of Minutes** – Minutes of October 14, 2008 Meeting.

Member Lamborn clarified the spelling of his last name and asked that “compatible” be changed to “incompatible” regarding the Washington Square development to capture his true intent.

Member Stitt asked that the last word of paragraph 6 on page 8 be changed to “properly.”

Member Janes asked for the following addition to the 6th bullet point on page 5: “subsequent in the meeting Director Tiernan clarified that the area was included in the FAR calculations and properly so because the front lot doesn't take its access from the common area, so that there is no net effect on the FAR calculations.”

M/S Lamborn/Janes with the correctionS noted above. Approved 5-0.

5. **Public Comment (five minute limitation per speaker).** None.

6. **Consent Agenda – no items**

7. **Presentation and Discussion – no items**

8. **Public Hearing**

8.1. Design Review – Mary Anne Stapleton, 6903 Jefferson Street

Item considered at 6:05 PM.

Member Janes recused himself because of the proximity of his residence.

Associate Planner Smith presented staff report. This is a proposal to construct a 489 square foot two-story addition at the north-east portion of an existing single-family residence and to extend the front foyer 18 square feet into the existing covered front porch.

Members Stitt, Lamborn and Dorenbecher each noted that the plans are in full conformance with the Town's codes and believed that it is a nice addition.

M/S Stitt/Dorenbecher. Approved 4-0.

8.2. Design Review – Rossi Residential Construction, Inc., 1904 Finnell Road

Item considered at 6:12 PM.

Associate Planner Smith presented the staff report. This is a proposal to install a freestanding non-illuminated identification sign and a US Postal Service cluster box for the Ghirardi Place residential development. The sign is proposed to be located within the on-site planter in front of the site to the right side of the private access roadway; the clustered mailboxes are proposed at the southeast corner (front) of the site near the curb.

Member Stitt asked for clarification on whether a 10 foot setback from the street is required. He mentioned that rounded sign corners would be nicer than the sharp corners that are proposed.

Director Tiernan responded that the referenced standard only applies to signs 10 feet or taller.

Member Lamborn noted that the vinyl image proposed seemed to be a departure from existing signs in town and voiced a concern that approval may set a precedent, especially for a residential sign.

Public hearing opened to the applicant. Mr. Janes addressed the questions and comments of the board members. He noted that the graphics are intended to highlight area and family heritage and that the vinyl image of the hay rake is intended to communicate the historic use of the land. He concluded by raising the importance of identifying the street as private in terms of private maintenance responsibilities.

Member Stitt asked whether the applicant had considered laser etching the wood, rather than introducing vinyl.

Mr. Janes responded "yes," but that a carved wood image would not communicate the desired message. The other option is for the whole sign to be vinyl, but he likes the effect of natural wood, which will age. He noted the small size of the images, since they are situated over 20 feet from roadway.

Public hearing opened.

Tim Brigman raised the conflict of interest rules and believes that Mr. Janes cannot represent himself. He believed the sign language was offensive.

Member Dorenbecher asked about conflict of interest rules.

Member Stitt likes the sign. The imagery is low to the ground, is not obtrusive, and its size is not out of proportion to the development.

Member Lamborn likes sign but is concerned about the vinyl image and feels it is not appropriate for residential signage. He noted that wood will age, but that vinyl will not, so over time the image will stand out. He agreed that the language is exclusive and would like it toned down.

Member Stitt disagreed with Member Lamborn regarding the language, but concurred with the comments on the vinyl material. He asked the applicant to consider brass or etched metal, wanting to get away from the plastic image, indicating that sign material should endure for at least 10 years.

Member Dorenbecher thought vinyl was an odd choice, and that metal would be more attractive.

Chair Halliday saw no problem with the vinyl.

M/S Lamborn/Stitt adding a condition that the applicant provide staff with sign specification demonstrating that the vinyl image will withstand the elements, including sun exposure. Approved 4-0

9. Review and Comment

9.1. Preliminary Master Development Plan Review - Sorrento Building, 6488 Washington Street

Item considered at 6:35 PM.

Director Tiernan presented the staff report for a proposal for a mixed-use development consisting of two new buildings. Building A would be a two-story structure, featuring an 1,902 square foot ground level wine tasting and retail use, a 583 square foot mezzanine with a meeting room and office for the wine tasting/retail use, and a 608 square foot upper level apartment. Building B would be a one-story structure, for an anticipated coffee shop use, with a view terrace on the rooftop. A breezeway would separate Building A from Building B, leading to a shared open courtyard (near) and a 13-stall parking lot (far).

Member Janes noted that FAR does not exceed 25 percent even when the rooftop deck area is considered. Director Tiernan concurred, but indicated that discussion of definitions is necessary, since area is either considered FAR or open space. Open space must be available to everyone, including the public. In the past, the Council has exempted open space from FAR. In this case, the rooftop deck is not an essential part of either business; it is presented as an area of open space available to the public, and thus not counted toward FAR.

Member Janes raised that since the courtyard and terrace are considered open space, future tenants should be constrained from using the courtyard for formal seating or serving. Director Tiernan mentioned that these areas would be open to guests at wine tasting special events.

Member Janes commented on the open space for the residence and felt that one half of the required 200 square feet could be provided under the stairs, where the tenant could use a barbeque.

Member Janes asked whether there are any mitigation measures proposed related to the removal of three oak trees. Director Tiernan responded that landscaping is proposed, but that there are no specific mitigation measures.

Member Janes asked what the fence at the east side that separates the residential use is made out of and Director Tiernan responded "wood."

Member Janes asked whether the Town will require the access driveway to be built to the full 24-foot width at the time of development and Director Tiernan responded "yes," noting that the Fire Department has reviewed the plans.

Member Janes noted that the Town has applied residential FAR exemptions to commercial properties and used the Hotel Luca basement as an example. In this case, since the interior stairwell was excluded, he asked whether the Council has made a conscious decision to exclude stairwells and basements. He noted that exterior stairwells are excluded from FAR, that stairwells represent unusable space, and believes they should be exempt in any case.

Public hearing opened to the applicant at 6:56 PM.

Steve Henderson at 1894 Larkspur Street introduced Bill Byland, the architect, and Craig Becker and David Zurowski of Somerston Wines and High Flyer Wines, and presented the project.

Member Janes commented that a compact sized stall is reserved for the residential tenant, noted that not all tenants have compact sized cars, and suggested that the residence be allocated a full sized parking stall.

Member Janes noted that most open space should be physically open to the public, but that all of it should be visually accessible. He asked the applicant what height and make-up the courtyard entrance from Washington would exhibit to preserve visual accessibility.

Bill Byland stated the fence/gate would be four feet high, that it is constructed of wrought iron, and intended to keep kids from wandering in at night.

Member Stitt asked whether the motorcycle parking at the building frontage was a good location. Mr. Henderson did not know and suggested that another area might work better. Director Tiernan noted that it serves a pedestrian purpose and that bicycles are proposed for that location as well.

Member Stitt asked about the voided areas on the plans. Mr. Henderson responded that these areas represent pervious paving, perhaps brick with gravel infill. He represented that the applicant wanted to provide as much permeable hardscape as possible.

Chair Haliday raised that she was concerned about the compatibility of the residential tenant and the courtyard activity. Mr. Henderson indicated that the landlord would communicate special events to the tenant. She mentioned that the restroom would be used by visitors to the Chamber of Commerce and noted there are at least five proposed coffee serving businesses in town.

Member Lamborn asked the applicant to explain the ideas for the landscape plan and indicated that he wanted to see more landscaping surrounding the building to soften its edges and trees on the east side of the parking lot.

Public hearing opened.

Tim Brigman likes asked whether the tasting room will allow retail sales of brands other than the tasting room owner. Mr. Henderson responded that all Sommerston wines would be sold, but these are from a single source.

Public hearing closed at 7:20 PM and returned to the Board.

Member Janes emphasized that the courtyard entry should be as low as possible, three feet in height rather than four. He thought that the Town should consider a standard that all fencing separating residential and commercial properties be cast in place concrete or CMU.

Member Dorenbecher noted that the scaled back project is a good improvement.

Member Stitt likes the architecture and is ok with the motorcycle parking, if it is limited to two. He prefers a surface more stable than gravel because of the maintenance issues associated with it spreading around.

Member Lamborn likes the overall design and is pleased to hear about the applicant's plans to incorporate permeable paving, since a lot of paving is proposed. He feels the parking lot is too "walled in" and would prefer to have more "eyes" on the lot. He wants to see more landscaping, with planters or pots at the front elevation. He would move the coffee shop building back at few feet from the street to increase the opportunity for tables immediately accessible to passers-by. He also believes the entry gate should be no higher than 36 inches and constructed of wrought iron.

Chair Halliday reiterated her concern that the residence was incompatible with the commercial uses and asked the applicant to consider business alternatives to prevent the duplicity of uses.

Item completed at 7:26 PM.

10. Staff and Board Reports 7:26.

Director Tiernan gave an overview of construction underway in Town, including the Bardessono Inn and Spa, the Yountville Inn and Spa, Hotel Luca, Bottega Restaurant, Gordon's remodel, Ghirardi Place subdivision, and the Community Center. He noted upcoming projects, including Vita Restaurant and the Knight subdivision.

Chair Halliday raised that she would like to bring a proposal before the Board limiting the amount of time people can speak, noting that there is a lot of repetition.

Member Stitt commented that he does not believe there is a problem.

Member Janes noted that the Board already has the authority to cutoff comments when it notices repetition.

Director Tiernan provided that staff encourages applicants to make presentations to advocate for their projects so that staff can limit its discussion to project observations. He noted that on larger projects there is coordination between staff and the applicant, especially with PowerPoint presentations, to limit repetition.

11. Adjournment. M/S Lamborn/Halliday, all in favor at 7:42 PM.