



**Minutes**  
**ZONING & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**August 14, 2007 - 6:00 pm**  
**Town Hall, 6550 Yount Street, Yountville**

**1. Call to Order**

Assistant Planner Hogan called the meeting to order at 5:58 pm.

**2. Roll Call**

Present: Boardmembers Janes, Lamborn, Henderson, and Denton.

Absent: Chair Halliday

**3. Election of Temporary Chair**

On a motion by Boardmember Henderson, seconded by Boardmember Denton, Boardmember Janes was elected temporary chair for the meeting in the absence of Chair Halliday.

**4. Adoption of Agenda**

On a motion by Boardmember Janes, seconded by Boardmember Denton, the Agenda as amended was adopted unanimously. Item 9, Design Review, 6711 Washington Street, Burgundy House remodel is continued to the next ZDRB meeting of September 11, 2007.

**5. Approval of Minutes – May 8, 2007 and June 12, 2007**

On a motion by Boardmember Lamborn, seconded by Boardmember Henderson, the Minutes of the May 8, 2007 meeting were approved. Boardmember Janes was opposed to the motion and Boardmember Denton abstained, as he was absent at the meeting. Staff note: The ZDRB will need to revote on this item in order to obtain the necessary quorum of members who were present at the meeting.

On a motion by Boardmember Denton, seconded by Boardmember Lamborn, the Minutes of the June 12, 2007 meeting were approved.

**6. Public Comment**

None

**7. Presentation & Discussion – Sign Review, 06-SR-05, Jim Brockman, LA Prime, LP**

Site Location: 6476 Washington Street

Subject: Request for permanent approval of Ad Hoc Restaurant signs, which were granted temporary approval on September 12, 2006.

Boardmember Denton recessed himself due to a Conflict of Interest.

Assistant Planner, Katie Hogan, present

Applicant, Jim Brockman, was present to answer Board questions.

**The ZDRB questions and comments were as follows:**

**Henderson:**

- Confirms that the façade is a portion of the sign and is legally non-conforming.
- Confirms that the purpose of the hearing is to formalize and finalize the applicant's past temporary sign approval.

- Finds that the Ad Hoc logo and business are doing well and establishing brand recognition.
- Finds the design of the sign to relate well with that of the building.
- Notes that the logo portion of the sign is blue intentionally to stand out. Supports the applicant's right to have a stylized sign.
- Accepts a business sign that goes outside of the earth toned color recommendation.
- Concurs with Janes that the façade trim could be sand colored to better integrate with the building.

Lamborn:

- Finds the style of the sign to be good.
- Points out that the majority of colors along the Washington streetscape are earth toned.
- Finds that the trim stands out a bit and separates the detailing on the roof from the rest of the structure.
- Notes that yellow and blue are complimentary and a common color pairing, but would support earth tones on the trim as well.

Janes:

- Points out that the existing façade was actually constructed as a part of the signage for the Diner, which preceded the Wine Garden. With the conversion of the structure to the Wine Garden restaurant much thought was put into how to maintain the existing legally non-conforming façade. Much thought and persistence was put into the design and colors.
- Notes that the finding that the signage colors interrelate with the blue trim on the façade is a circular argument, as the blue trim was painted to match the sign. The trim color was changed from that of the Wine Garden to match this signage.
- Confirms that reasoning for the temporary sign approval was the wording of the sign, which none of the Boardmembers are opposing. Does not feel it appropriate to question or require changes to the logo portion of the sign, as the applicant developed their branding based on its temporary approval.
- Finds that blue of the sign and façade are not complimentary to the color of the building. The sign design criteria state that the color shall complement that of the building and finds that it does not.
- Is opposed to the blue color of the sign and expresses preference to earth tone colors.
- Would recommend a burgundy color be used, which would complement the yellow and brown of the building and mirror the burgundy stain of the concrete out front. This concrete was designed and stained to complement the Wine Garden signage.

On a motion by Boardmember Henderson, seconded by Boardmember Lamborn, the Sign Review is approved unanimously, giving permanent approval to the two existing signs, with the Condition of Approval that the blue trim color on the front façade is to be repainted in an earth tone, to be approved by the Town Planner.

**8. Presentation & Discussion – Design Review, 07-DR-07, Ivan Lukrich, Tom Moore**

Site Location: 6703 Yount Street

Subject: Follow-up to proposal to renovate existing single-family dwelling unit, including construction of second story addition, demolition of existing garage/carport, and construction of a garage and second residential unit. A landscape plan and various exterior details and materials are presented as required Conditions of Approval.

Assistant Planner, Katie Hogan, presented staff report.  
Applicant, Tom Moore, was present to answer Board questions.

**The ZDRB questions and comments were as follows: (24.7)**

Henderson:

- Finds the project to be a nice enhancement to the existing structure.
- Would like the location or type of trees by the fireplace to be changed. Finds that these could grow to become a fire hazard. Would like for the Town Planner to work with the applicant to select a more appropriate tree, such as an Italian Cypress. Applicant has already begun speaking with landscape architect about ways to increase privacy in this area while maintaining a soft appearance. Notes that

an ivy is growing along the existing fence as well.

- Confirms that the area at the corner is not to be landscaped, as there is an existing drain in this location.
- Confirms that the fence has the appropriate setbacks and heights for a corner lot.

Lamborn:

- Appreciates the applicant's work in softening the Starkey Street elevation.
- Finds that there may be too many species along the Yount Street elevation. If the Palm trees are to stay, he would like to have the Maple replaced by a more Mediterranean species like an Olive.

Denton:

- Notes the lack of a direct connection between the main and secondary driveways, which are separated by a groundcover. Applicant confirms the groundcover will not be dense and that those parking in the main driveway may enter the backyard through either the garage or by passing over the groundcover to the fence gate.
- Confirms that the fence will have a gate at the front walk along Yount Street.
- Confirms that there will be no lighting under the trellis. There will not, as the light of the fireplace is found to be sufficient.

Janes:

- Finds the home to be well designed and lovely.
- Confirms that the Olive trees will be fruitless.
- Confirms that the Palms overhang the public right-of-way. Notes that the planting of Palms overhanging the public right-of-way are prohibited. As these Palms are existing, they are legally non-conforming. He would support their removal for this reason.
- Confirms that the lighting ordinance only requires a photometric study for commercial projects.
- Reiterates concerns regarding the chimney. Finds that in the preparation of construction plans, the height of the chimney may have to rise, which would require ZDRB review. Note that a wood-burning fireplace would require that the height rise and a sealed combustion, direct vent chimney would allow for the chimney as proposed. Applicant assures that they do not plan for the chimney to be wood-burning. Planner will confirm height of chimney at building permit plan stage.

On a motion by Boardmember Janes, seconded by Boardmember Lamborn, the Design Review is approved with the Condition of Approval that the proposed Podocarpus trees adjacent to the outdoor fireplace are to be replaced by alternative trees that pose no potential fire hazard. The Town Planner will work with the applicant to select trees which are better suited for the space and provide adequate screening.

**9. Presentation & Discussion – Master Development Plan Amendment, 05-MDP-05, 05-UP-07, 05-DR-23, George Altamura, Jr, Gateway Mobile Home Park, LLC**

Site Location: Yountville Inn Unit Expansion, 6409, 6428, & 6448 Washington Street

Subject: Proposed amendment to the existing Master Development Plan, including Use Permit and Design Review for a 32 inn unit expansion to the adjacent Yountville Inn. Presentation of a full landscape plan for the project.

Assistant Planner, Katie Hogan, presented staff report.

Landscape Architect, Parker Smith, was present to describe plans and to answer Board questions.

**The ZDRB questions and comments were as follows:**

***Landscape Plan***

Lamborn:

- Does not like having the trash enclosure along the frontage of the site, but as it is not along California, finds this to be less problematic.

- Concerned that the stone wall will 'wall off' the Washington Street streetscape, particularly now that the new Villagio Spa will have a wall along Washington Street. Would like to see a passive public-type use or public amenities such as a cafe along Washington to open up the streetscape.
- Would like the wall along the Washington Street elevation be a more open barrier rather than solid stone. A fence using post holes would be a more inviting and open, and less harmful to the existing oaks.
- Concerned about the trenching around the existing Valley Oaks along Washington. Per Landscape architect, all trenching beneath the dripline of Heritage Oaks can be done under an arborist's control and by hand if required.
- Would like the retaining walls moved outside of the dripline of the existing oaks.
- Opposed to the backfilling proposed beneath the dripline of the existing oaks from the retaining walls to the base of the oaks.
- Confirms that the required protective measures will be performed during construction.

#### Henderson:

- Finds the proposed landscape plan to be beautiful and likes the integration of new oaks.
- Notes that special care should be made to ensure the safety and maintenance of the Heritage Oaks at the construction phase. The requirements that a protective fence be placed around existing trees and a deposit be secured to ensure the maintenance of these trees should be enforced.
- Would like the requirements for treatment of Heritage Oaks to also be applied to the large existing Magnolia onsite.
- Concerned that the proposed small 'Little Gem' Magnolias will cause a maintenance problem due to large amounts of dropped leaves. The landscape architect responds that these trees will drop less than the full-sized Magnolia, and will drop leaves on the 10 foot planting strip.
- Encourages the landscape architect to select the most native and drought-tolerant groundcovers from the selected options to be used onsite.
- Agrees with Lamborn that the retaining walls should be located outside of the dripline, even though the movement of these walls away from the trees and towards the sidewalk will provide more space for the inn and less public space along Washington.
- Would like for the walls to be post driven rather than solid stone as proposed.
- Confirms that the Gateway Mobile Home Park sign will be set back from the entrance to Champagne Drive with groundcover surrounding it.

#### Denton:

- Commends applicant for great amount of thought and consideration that went into the project, particularly related to the integration of the two projects and the height considerations.
- Notes that all of these concerns were brought up at the preliminary hearings. He did not accept the retaining walls around the trees, but the walls were approved as proposed by the Town Council.
- Agrees with Lamborn that there should be more of a streetscape along the site and more transparency into the site.
- Recalls that the fence was first proposed as a combination as stone and open elements and would like to use this combination. An open fence would create more of a visual spatial relationship between the street elevation and the interior of the site.
- Would like to see the pedestrian path along the south of the property still included. Would like for an alternate path through the site from the Hopper Creek path proposed if the south path doesn't exist. Otherwise they have to walk through the parking lot.
- Concerned that the proposed trellis across the north side parking lot between the existing and new inn units will not meet Fire Department standards. Recognizes that this may be proposed as a reaction to previous comments encouraging more of a connection between the old and new inn site. Compliance with Fire Department standards will be confirmed with the building plans.
- Interested in the solar reflective index and heat island effects of the paving for the parking lot. Would like more information on the paving to be used. Encourages more muted tones rather than black for the asphalt.

Janes:

- Generally, takes no exception to everything that is proposed.
- Notes that the definition of tree removal in the Zoning Ordinance includes actions that kill or permanently injure a tree in any way. Thus, any work around the Heritage trees should not permanently injure the trees in any way.
- Would like to defer discussion of Hopper Creek plantings until Fish & Game has reviewed the plans, as there may be changes. Encourages that all exotic species be removed.
- Also notes that Fish and Game has not been notified regarding the mass grading. Fish and Game may require some more mitigation measures that will affect the plan in relation to grading as well.
- Supports other Boardmembers comments related to the existing Heritage Oaks.
- Suggests that the arborist be required to sign off the final working construction drawings. If this were a condition of approval, any possible negative effects to the trees in construction due to conflicting civil plans will be mitigated.
- Would like any subsequent submittal of plans to include a statement from the arborists that “it is more likely than not that the trees will survive with the project as planned.”
- Finds a large fill around the existing Heritage Oak trees to be unacceptable.

***Master Development Plan Amendment***

Denton:

- Generally, does not oppose the changes to the architectural style of the buildings, as they are oversimplified boxes, but in compliance.
- Finds that the storage units underneath the stairs are not a particularly good architectural feature. Would like clarification on whether a lattice or solid wall will surround these.
- Does not like the movement of the utility rooms from the front to side elevations. While the front elevation is now ‘cleaned’ and simplified, the storage rooms now appear as appendages to the side elevations.
- Recommends that the use of instantaneous water heaters could eliminate the need for some of the exterior rooms. Staff notes that the applicant does not want to use instantaneous heaters.
- Would like to confirm that the kitchen in the Meeting Room still meets Department of Environmental Health requirements with the dry storage and walk-in fridge and freezer removed. This will be confirmed at the building permit stage.
- Recommends that the exterior stairs and storage/utility rooms be removed from the west elevations and placed along other elevations. This would serve to further open up the western elevation to Washington Street.
- Notes that the exterior vents at the roof of the Meeting Room and Administration Buildings are rather large and this size could be reduced.

Lamborn:

- Agrees with all of the architectural comments of Boardmember Denton.

Henderson:

- Also agrees with Boardmember Denton’s comments.
- Agrees with the suggestion to move the exterior stairs and storage/utility rooms from the west elevation to open up the Washington Street elevation of the project.

Janes:

- Finds the increased FAR of the inn unit portion of the project to be acceptable as long as the FAR of the entire site (including the affordable housing portion) remains below the required 25% FAR. Compares this to the Vilagio project, in which more concentrated buildings are allowed due to the provision of a retained vineyard area to the south.
- Other Boardmembers concur with this suggestion as well. Staff responds that the overall FAR for the site is 25.82 %.

**10. Presentation & Discussion – Design Review, 07-DR-13, 07-UP-09, Douglas Thornley, Michael Polensky, Burgundy House Remodel**

Site Location: 6711 Washington Street, Burgundy House

Subject: Proposal to renovate the existing Burgundy House Inn building and change the use to retail commercial. Renovation will include removal and replacement of interior partitions, complete seismic upgrade, new roof and windows, and replacement of existing shed with new storage shed.

**THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED TO THE NEXT ZDRB MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2007.**

**11. Staff & Board Reports**

Update on Current Projects:

- 1 The Finnell Road and Ad Hoc Affordable Housing Projects received Preliminary Master Development Plan approval at the August 7, 2007 Town Council meeting. The plans were updated to include many of the suggestions by the Board.
- 2 Boardmember Janes confirms that his comments regarding the FAR on the Ad Hoc site were given to the Town Council at this meeting. Would like to confirm the FAR that will result for this front parcel following the construction on the rear parcel. If this FAR is non-conforming, would like for the council to explicitly recognize this non-conformity. Staff clarifies that this comment was included in the Staff Report to the Town Council at the July 17, 2007 meeting.
- 3 The Knight Subdivision project received Concept Review at the July 17, 2007 meeting. Staff confirms that the project will return to the Council for further Concept Review at a later date.
- 4 The Burgundy House remodel project will be coming back to the September meeting, reacting to the historical review. Boardmember Denton comments that the ZDRB should always have historical comments prior to reviewing historical projects.

Election of a new Chair and Vice Chair will occur at the next meeting on September 11, 2007.

**12. Adjournment**

On a motion by Boardmember Henderson, seconded by Boardmember Janes, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.