

Napa Pipe Design Guidelines: Joint Commission Meeting Feedback

The following summary includes Commissioner comments and questions voiced at the Joint Meeting of the Napa County and City Planning Commissions on February 6, 2014 regarding the Napa Pipe Design Guidelines.

Commissioners in Attendance:

County Planning: Fiddaman (Chair), Basayne, Phillips, Scott

City Planning: Kelley, Murray, Trzesniewski, Huether, Roosa

Overview:

Overall the comments and questions at the February 6 meeting both request and reflect the need for a greater understanding of the policy context around the Design Guidelines document, its scope, its relationship to the Development Plan and Development Agreement, and the process of project approvals going forward, particularly as related to issues of quality and creativity in the Napa Pipe project. Topically, the majority of the commentary centered on the Architectural Stylebook and the types of styles that are included in the project – with different viewpoints among the Commissioners on the amount of styles and types that are appropriate. Additional comments relate to the quality of landscape and the Costco, opportunities for art, reuse of site materials, affordable housing, setbacks parking, and document formatting.

Comments are divided by topic into the following overall sections:

- I. Process – Project process, approvals, policy
- II. Development Plan – Relationship between the Design Guidelines and the Development Plan/Development Agreement.
- III. Quality and Creativity – Balance between restrictions and allowing design flexibility
- IV. Architectural Stylebook – Styles proposed, their function, and restrictions
- V. Landscape – Relationship to the public realm, quality and continuity
- VI. Costco – Guidelines related to Costco as a tenant
- VII. Art and Materials – Provisions for art and reuse of site materials
- VIII. Additional Specific Topics – Detailed questions on specific items such as affordable housing, materials, articulation, setbacks, and parking
- IX. Document Structure – Related to formatting, layout, tools and techniques of the document

I. PROCESS:

1. What is the process once the Design Guidelines have been accepted – what is the procedure for confirming that the guidelines have been complied with prior to permitting? Is it strictly a staff function to confirm that the guidelines have been met?
2. Why are we having separate planning commission meetings? We should have joint sessions (3 Commissioners)
3. Understanding there is still a lot of work to be done on the project and the process.

II. DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

1. The Design Guidelines need to be more open and inclusive, whereas the Development Plan can be more exclusive and restrictive to deal with transitions in Styles, for example.
2. Clarify the scope of the Design Guidelines in relation to the Development Plan – how do they relate to the industrial land east of the rail ROW? Is that area dealt with later?

III. QUALITY AND CREATIVITY:

1. This is a unique opportunity for Napa – likely never to appear again. The location is singular. We need to do a great job.
2. Qualitative decisions embedded in the guidelines – such as related to approaches to Stylebook and mixing of Styles – need to be thought through by the Commissions.
3. Our design review committees should have more expertise in architecture, engineering, and landscape – to provide experience and help revise the development plan in concert with the developer. We need a design review committee. Maybe SITELAB could do design review.
4. Quality is actually more important than style. How does the document insure high quality and creativity? Given that we are ceding design review.
5. Do we require specific architecture/builder qualifications? Or have a pre-approved list of architects and builders?
6. How do we make sure that we're getting really qualified, high energy, super creative, qualified architects and builders to work on these projects? We need great architects.
7. How does the document really prevent the "bad" examples from being built? These guidelines are not scientific – there is a certain level of interpretation here.
8. There are a lot of requirements embedded in the document, a lot of "shalls" as opposed to recommendations.
9. What is the process for City Staff to insure quality and longevity in the proposed projects – since the projects will not come in front of the Commission?
10. What is the relationship between "shoulds" and "shalls" – can a "should" become a "shall"?
11. Who is doing the review to make sure that the applicants are conforming to the Form Based Code and Design Guidelines. Will staff need additional training?
12. How do we insure and control that the values and specifics of the project are upheld? Who is involved and are they qualified? What is the review process?
13. The standards matrices impose a lot of requirements in terms of building design.

IV. ARCHITECTURAL STYLEBOOK:

1. The Market is going to dictate sales. Things are going to change in the next ten years as the project is built and much of the discussion of style will be unnecessary as the Development Plans emerge.
2. Are Architectural Styles mixed within the same parcel? Could you have different styles across the street from each other?
3. Is it possible the entire project could be one Style? Bay Area Modern, Farm Industrial, Loft Industrial are appropriate for Napa Pipe, but Farmhouse and Craftsman are not appropriate.
4. The Craftsman Style is not appropriate for Napa Pipe
5. Please clarify the difference between a lot versus parcel versus block and how they relate to builders and the mixing of styles. (2 Commissioners)
6. Having the entire project one style would be destructive to the area and should be prevented with a guideline.
7. Is the intent behind the Styles to have a sense of individuality and variation along the block and not continuous buildings of the same style? We need to get away from the homogeny and monotony of style in typical developments and have more control over diversity and variation as well as the transitions among different adjacent styles. (5 Commissioners).
8. How do the guidelines allow design and style to evolve over time?

9. The five architectural styles limit developers and may limit the project economically in the future. Explain the process of the Style selection. There should be more Styles offered.
10. While diversity is important, Farmhouse and Craftsman do not fit in the context of Napa Pipe. The context of the water, industrial setting, and blue-collar history should drive the Style palette. There is a lot of potential variety in Farm Industrial and Loft Industrial. To have a Farmhouse style next to a Loft Industrial style built almost simultaneously might not look organic. We need to look back on the design in the future and be proud of our work.
11. Styles should reference less the context of Napa town (which developed over generations) and instead be more compatible with the Napa Pipe site context.
12. Clearly there are different opinions among the Commissioners on whether there are more styles or fewer. There is a lot to absorb in the guidelines document.
13. It is clear the five styles are not exclusive, just examples of what the styles can be.
14. There needs to be more variety in the styles because developers are not going to be creative.
15. The Commissioners are torn between having some variability here to create a nice neighborhood, but at the same time have assurance on quality and creativity. We recognize in our requirements that developers, builders and architects are reasonable.

V. LANDSCAPE:

1. Landscape features could help with continuity, since the Styles do not appear to be incongruous.
2. How can the street bring consistency in terms of lights, furnishings, and landscape? How do the guidelines relate to the public realm – need a better understanding of the scopes and relationship between the Development Plan and the Design Guidelines. The private realm and public realm are closely linked – the design public realm will impact recommendations in the private realm.
3. Is requiring two-foot minimum boxed trees a reasonable requirement in this day and age? The smallest trees that are allowed are two foot boxed, and some of them are three foot boxed, I think, in front yards. Two foot or three foot trees are better.
4. Landscape plans are often so boring and poorly maintained. How can we insure good landscape maintenance? Especially concerning budget?
5. It's in the developer's best interest to do quality landscaping in the early phases.

VI. COSTCO:

1. How do we get the best-looking Costco in the country? And does it have to have a red band around it? We should set specific standards regardless of tenant. Does this represent a lower bar than the norm? (2 Commissioners)
2. The Costco is a very visible and central site and we should set stronger guidelines for that project.
3. Guidelines for the Costco should include signage guidelines.

VII. ART AND MATERIALS:

1. Are there any standards about art pieces or public art? There should be a public art program in the project. Understanding that we don't know exactly what the art will be. Art can reinforce the neighborhood, this is not a typical project and we should not do it in a typical way.
2. Public art should be consistent with the context of the Napa Pipe site -- the crane, the artifacts and the steel structures that remain.
3. Reuse raw material from the site in the landscape, details, art, hardscape – this would be very exciting.

XIII. ADDITIONAL SPECIFIC TOPICS:

1. Affordable Housing: There needs to be stronger language committing to workforce and affordable housing. This is a core value of the project. Affordable housing should be indistinguishable from market rate housing on the outside. The commitment should to build it, not just be paid into a housing fund (3 Commissioners)
2. Articulation: How do you prevent too much articulation?
3. Materials: Some of the language is inclusive, but not explicitly exclusive. For instance, in terms of materials, there are more that could be used. Stone and rock should be added more consistently. There are a lot of stone and rock resources in the area.
4. Materials: Explain the diagrams related to materiality.
5. Setbacks: Is the five foot deviation from the datum for setbacks a should or a shall?
6. Parking Garage: Why have we anticipated a parking garage and is there a location specified? Or would it just be up to the market to determine how that would relate to different office buildings?

IX. DOCUMENT STRUCTURE/FORMATTING and TECHNIQUES:

1. Can there be some simulations or animations of possible project scenarios illustrated in context from a Style perspective? It might help to understand the hypothetical possibilities.
2. Great job, this is going to be the best planned and regulated project. There are also clearly some tweaks and comments to revise.
3. It would help to see a sample checklist for the design review process. We could look at some sample projects and see how they comply or do not comply with the standards.
4. Structurally there needs to be more agreement between the language of standards and the diagrams and captions that illustrate them.
5. Some images should be changed out – especially if they have site conditions not found at Napa Pipe.

TRANSCRIPT:

Special Meeting of the Napa City and County Planning Commissions. February 6th, 2014.

Chair Fiddaman: Good evening. Welcome to a special joint meeting of the Napa County Planning Commission and the Napa City Planning Commission. Thursday February, 6th. 5:00pm. May we have a role call for the County Planning Commission, please?

Secretary: Commissioner Basayne.

Commissioner Basayne: Present.

Secretary: Commissioner Phillips.

Commissioner Phillips: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Scott.

Commissioner Scott: Here

Secretary: And Chair Fiddaman.

Chair Fiddaman: Here. And, also for the City Planning Commission, please.

Secretary: Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: Here.

Secretary: Commissioner Murray.

Commissioner Murray: Present.

Secretary: Commissioner Trzesniewski.

Commissioner Trzesniewski: Present.

Secretary: Commission Huether.. Huether..

Commissioner Huether: Huether Huether? Here. Present.

Secretary: And Chair Roosa.

Chair Roosa: Here

Chair Fiddaman: Alright. We will have the Pledge of Allegiance. Ken, would you lead us in that, please?

(Ken leads the room in Pledge of Allegiance)

Chair Fiddaman: Well, I would particularly like to welcome our fellow Commissioners from the City of Napa. And I would also like to welcome the staff from the City of Napa.

Citizen comments and recommendations - The Commission invites citizen comments and recommendations concerning current problems and future prospects of a planning nature, which are within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. Anyone who wishes to speak to the Commission on such a matter, if it is not on the agenda, may do so at this time. I see none.

Then I would invite Arthur to call your meeting to order, I guess.

Chair Russa: Okay. Well, then the City of Napa Planning Commission meeting for February 6th is called to order. There is no role call to take, it has been taken.

Chair Fiddaman: Sorry. Okay. We have one item on the agenda tonight, which is an administrative item. It is item 4A, which is the Napa Pipe Design Guidelines study session three. No CEQA action is requested and the CEQA does not apply. So, we'll turn it over to the staff.

Rick Tooker: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'm not hearing that this is on, so let me know...

Chair Fiddaman: Is there a green light on there?

Rick Tooker: I just turned it off, so thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to both Commissions, just briefly, maybe to set some context for what you will be hearing tonight. I'm Rick Tooker, I'm the city's Community Development Director. The city staff has been working with the county since, really, last fall, on the suite of documents that are associated with the Napa Pipe project, including these design guideline. We have a project manager, Tim Melotian, who's in the audience behind me. We've been working, as well, with Thompson Claire from the county's consulting staff. So, it's been a very very strong effort for these many months since last fall.

The suite of projects, as you recall again for context, that really evolved from the MOU between the Board of Supervisors and the City Council, include about six or seven different agreements, what we call sub-agreements. I won't read them all off, but you will recall things like the Arena Share Agreement where the city had agreed to take on 80% of the county's future housing obligations starting in 2022, the tax revenue sharing agreement and some others. We've made substantial progress on those sub-agreements. They've been drafted and revised on a couple occasions, so we're very close on each and every one of those.

The remaining entitlements, if you will, or agreements, are really what I sometimes call the 'Big Three.'

There's a development agreement between the county and the developer, which part the city plays a role in ensuring that concerns are addressed there because, ultimately, we're presuming the property comes into the city. So, that becomes then the development agreement between the city and developer.

There's the development plan, and the developer has submitted to us now two versions of that development plan. The development plan is essentially the design of the public realm. So, the streets, the sidewalks, the open spaces. That second plan was submitted in about mid-December. And comments

have been received. Just think last week those were received and so we're certain there will be a third submittal, presumably, close to the spring. So, we're getting closer to concluding that as well.

This last component part, this last document, is the design guidelines. And the design guidelines are something that the County and the County's consultant is preparing. We're looking, again, closely with them on its preparation. The importance of the design guidelines is really... I mentioned the development plan as being the public realm a moment ago. The design guidelines are really the development plan that is the blocks and the parcels contained within that. So, it's what we'd traditionally say the private development, but because the private streets are private, this is really the blocks and the parcels.

You'll recall that as part of the MOU between the Board of Supervisors and the City Council, the city, essentially, ceded its design review authority. And that was a pretty big deal, because as you know, the city conducts design review on most buildings. And this will have, potentially, tens, dozens, a hundred plus buildings, ultimately, when built out here at Napa Pipe, and ceding design review, from a city perspective, is pretty significant. However, where the City Council and the Board of Supervisors have agreed is that the design review, kind of in quotes, would be conducted through these design guidelines that are being prepared by SiteLab. So, this represents the first opportunity tonight. We've already had an opportunity to talk about what design guidelines are, and to tour properties, whether they are the city of Hercules or down in the San Mateo area. We've already seen how development can result from comprehensive design guidelines.

Well, this represents, really, the first time to see the first draft of those design guidelines. The hope tonight is to get a presentation from Evan and Eleanor, who can walk us through this document, get us familiar enough with them so that we can understand where the important... most important elements are to navigate them so that in the next steps, or in the future, our Commissions can then work independently on identifying where there are issues, identifying where clarification is needed. Ultimately, what I think the city wants, and I speaking... I know its... a little bit central to what the city wants, but ultimately, because we don't have design review authority, we want to feel comfortable, that within this document, that we understand what the project will look like and it'll meet the context needs, the surroundings, the things that are important to us from a site planning and from a design perspective so we're comfortable what the next ten, twenty, through the life of the project years lead to. So, I don't have anything other than that to add, just for context. I don't know if Larry has anything he wants to add.

Larry Florin: I just maybe want to explain where we are in the process in terms of where this review comes and what the next couple of weeks will involve. So, today we really set this up as an opportunity for SiteLab to take you through this document. We've really... we've sort of characterizing this as an orientation meeting, in an essence, since this is a new concept. There are a lot of new ideas in here and things you are seeing for the first time, or that you've recently seen for the first time. That will have lasting impact. We wanted to really have them walk you through, painstakingly through, this document to tell you both what's in it, how it's to be used and, I think, to try to focus you on issues that you probably will want to deliberate on. We've discussed that there will be upcoming meetings, but those meetings will be separate by each of the Commissions to really get into the meat of this and start to some have discussion about changes you may want to see or what do you see in here, or whether you're okay with it or what you'd like to... what recommendations you would make. Both our city... our county Planning Commission and our city Planning Commissions, I think they're elected bodies, respectively.

So, this is just the first meeting. So, we want to encourage you to ask questions to help you understand all these aspects of what is in front of you. We realize that this is brand new for you, so...

Chair Fiddaman: Do we have any questions from the Commission at this point? I do have one question that doesn't relate to the guidelines themselves, but really to what the process would be in the future once the guidelines have been accepted. And that would be, what's envisioned as the procedure for confirming that the guidelines have been complied with? I mean, there are requirements, there's recommendations and suggestions. And how do we go about, you know, for the sake of the county and eventually the city, confirming that the guidelines have been complied with?

Larry Florin: If I understand your question, so after sort of the project has been approved, a permit's been issued or something? To ensure that there were--

Chair Fiddaman: ... No, I'm thinking front end. So, somebody comes in with a design for a project and wants a permit. It's strictly a staff function to confirm that the guidelines that been, sort of, met?

Larry Florin: Yeah, I think Evan's going to get into the use, a little bit, of this. But, that does speak to the process of what happens when an application comes in. Yeah, the idea is that, in essence, there's a checklist and there's a place in the document that you can go to and say, "Does it conform with whatever that particular typology for housing is, in whatever block it is?" And if it does then the staff has the authority to approve this. But I think, probably, that's best... question best put to our consultants because that's one of the things that they want to...

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, and you can save it for a future meeting, if you want, since it doesn't really apply to these guidelines. I know that's the purpose of this meeting. So, thank you.

Commissioner Huether: Mr. Chair. I did have one question for either of you. So, both of you mentioned that, going forward after this meeting, the planning commission meetings are going to be separate. I'm just kind of curious, process-wise, why we are doing it that way? So, we'll have a set of meetings city-side, then countryside, on the same issue, on the same documents. And so, if you're going to be separated, then how do you merge those two? And why are the separated?

Rick Tooker: So, one of the things I think we spoke about during our early discussions, perhaps our first joint meeting, is that having separate discussions and then coming together with issues would probably be sensible. There are comments... I envision that through this process of reviewing, and we're reviewing this, really for the first time, comprehensively, as well. So, we're going to have our own comments. But, they're probably going to be packaged in two ways.

One package will be simple clarifications, maybe issues that require making the document more, quote/unquote, correct. Those kinds of things, actually, can be fed through the city staff back to Evan's team, and those can be then implemented.

There's going to be a second set of comments or questions or issues that are going to be bundled that we as county and city staff will get together and look at those and say, "Oh, these are really things that we need to bring back to the Commission," because they may be crossroads issues where city commission is saying turn left, and county commission is saying turn right. Well, we ought to bring you all together to work through those. But, trying to get a Commission, or two Commissions, of ten folks plus the city staff

together to try to do this in a series of meeting would be really unruly. And, we even have to determine at the city planning commission meeting, which we're holding our first one on March 4th, you know, how we want to go about this. Because how unruly is it to review a document of two hundred and some odd pages and try to do that through a Commission process of five and public hearings?

So, I think what will happen is we'll have another joint meeting, if not multiple joint meetings, but we really have to get through the process of really digging in and determining where there are issues.

Larry Florin: I also want to clarify, maybe, Commissioner Huether, that at least on the county side, and I can't speak for the city side, but planning commission is an advisory role, in this capacity, to the Board of Supervisors. And so, they're going to be forwarding their recommendations. I believe it the same for the city? And so, you'll be diverging at that point, anyway, in terms of your recommendation. And then it's up to those two bodies to, ultimately, adopt this.

Commissioner Huether: Thank you.

Chair Fiddaman: I guess I'd have to say for myself, you know, work the process as you think it needs to be done so that it's workable from a staff standpoint. But, personally, I really like the idea of meeting jointly, particularly if there are aesthetic issues. You know, various areas... If there's any controversy here I think we ought to get together as a group and talk it through. So, I feel pretty confident that we will come up with a consensus between us.

Larry Florin: We can certainly discuss that. We're open to that as staff, yeah.

Well, with that, maybe we should begin the presentation if you'd like? No, yes, that's what. Please---

Chair Fiddaman: Terry, did you? -- I'm sorry, Terry Scott has a question here.

Commissioner Scott: Larry, actually it wasn't a question. It was basically to underscore what Bob just said. I can't speak for the other Commissioners but his comments reflect my views as well. I'm very supportive of having future joint meetings. I think that a lot can be accomplished in that matter. And I recognize it requires great train.. planning, etc. And we need to do it at critical junctures where it makes sense and we're not just, you know, going through a labyrinth, what have you. But we need to continue to do that.

Larry Florin: Duly noted. Thank you.

Evan: Okay. So, everyone knows I have some vocal issues. So, we can do it this way. Or, I can do it this way. This is probably better, right? And I can even get louder. You tell me, is this good?

Unnamed voice: What's best for you.

Evan: Doesn't matter.

Chair Fiddaman: That's easier.

Evan: Alright. I'm just adjusting the tone. I like it a little bit deeper. It makes me feel older.

First of all, Commissioners, it's a real pleasure to be back here with you after all these months. And actually, some of you I've worked with for years. It's like coming back and seeing old friends, which is always a wonderful thing to do, especially when you have to talk about a two hundred and forty page document. And this is double sided. It's probably the biggest set of... thickest set of design guidelines I've ever written.

But that's okay. Our challenge here today, and with this project is to write a set of design guidelines that are so comprehensive that you feel comfortable with the staff making these approvals. So, we need to take the time for you guys to a.) read all 240 pages, which I'm sure you've done, right? And also, to take the time to walk through them so we all understand how they work and we're all comfortable with what they're trying to say. So, why don't we get into it? I'm going in to everything I cannot to talk for hours and hours, but I want to give you...

Larry Florin: Do you want me to turn the lights off?

Evan: Sure. ...As much as possible, as detailed as practical, walk through a 240 page document without going through all 240 pages. So, we're going to talk about the process, the policy context, what we're trying to do, the framework, the form-based code, style book and the guidelines. Those are essentially the chapters of this tome. It's important to understand how all of these things work together.

There's the zoning, which sets the uses and the height and the density. There's the development plan, which, as Larry mentioned earlier, is basically the public realm. It establishes the blocks and the streets, etc. Then, the design guidelines, and the design guidelines' F2 components. The form-based code, which deals with things like lawn area and lawn coverage, things like that. They're very similar to what you would see in zoning, for example.

Then there are the design guideline elements, or the design standards, as we call them. And there are two types. There are shalls. Shall add the weight of law. 'You shall do that.' If you don't want to do it, you need to get an exception. Then there are shoulds. Shoulds are, 'We'd really like you to do that, but we're not going to force you to do it. But it gives you a sense of our intent and the things that we would like to see. But, we recognize that you hire great architects and we want them to have some flexibility within that.'

So, the approvals process. I know, Bob, you asked a minute ago about that. So, design comes in. Staff approves it. If there's an exception it goes through the same exception process that the zoning... some exception to zoning would be. In other words, it would come to the Commission. If they meet the form-based code and the shalls, it's an entirely staff process. And, if you want, I've worked on projects where we've done this before, where I've developed a spreadsheet template of all the standards and the shalls, if you will, and so it makes it very easy to look and compare a project. It's like a checklist of all those requirements. So, I can share that with staff on a project where I've done that.

The intent of the guidelines is pretty simple: to establish a certain level of quality. To encourage high quality development. So, the guidelines are really taking these drawing which we've all seen and we love, and trying to codify them into details to protect the safety of the residents and the visitors. So, there's a level in the guidelines that aren't just about aesthetics, but they're also about the quality of place. And

how do you deal with how buildings affect the quality of place. And very important to ensure a mix of housing and housing types that are accessible to the broadest range of the community.

These are the development parcels. Now, one of the things we've done with the guidelines is we've worked closely with Keith's team. And one of the things we've tried to do is, really, try to marry their intent. And they've spent a lot of time thinking about the design of this place, and trying to marry that design intent with actuality as things get built. So, we've started with a set of design frameworks, we're calling them, which are things that have to do very much with some of their design intent. So, for example, if you remember... if you've seen any of the earlier drawings that Keith's team has done, they had a very clear idea about how buildings should meet the street and where cars would go. Well, that very much affects building orientation. And you'll see this in a second. So, if you can see... let me see... see these arrows right here? And this arrow here? What that's saying is that the buildings should be oriented along these streets to maintain these views to the water, so that we don't have streets with a bunch of driveways on streets that are going towards the water, so that you get that consistent frontage on streets that go to the river. So, the arrows are a standard for how buildings meet the street.

Similarly, around the dry dock right here: there's a level of, sort of, robustness to the dry dock and the grain. So, there's a minimum height that's established around the dry dock to create a sort of sense of place around the dry dock. There are other frameworks as well, but these seem to be the two most important ones.

So, one of the things we did was, recognizing then, blocks, observe dominant orientations. We started to look at all the different types of housing that might be built out here, ranging from small single family to multi-family apartments. And we started to look at, given that there's a sort of average density that needs to be achieved across the site to meet the unit count yield. Starting to look at how we might start to combine different unit types in ways to achieve certain densities. So, you can see in the book, there are a series of these pages where we look at how we start to layout different typologies. And this is a way to let the developer and future developers, in a sense, have a cheat sheet about layout blocks. Recognizing then, there are infinite permutations. But these give us a good start to understand how guidelines lead to block layouts in a way that allows us to meet the yield.

Now, the form-based code is the next section. And the form-based code, I think we talked about this last time, whenever that was, in the summer. The form-based code has these standards, and we're looking at, I think there's maybe ten or fifteen different sub-categories we're looking at. But, these are the major ones: Townhouses. Single family. Multi-family townhouses and multi-family apartments. Within each of these there are a couple different ones. So, for example we have three different types of Townhouses. Each one gets it's own page. And just to reiterate, the idea is these are basic zoning parameters. If the project... if they come in with a Townhouse Small, which is defined a certain lot area, and they meet these certain requirements and they meet the shalls, it's approved. So, we spent a lot of time going back and forth between Keith's designs, how typical production home builders in Northern California build, and what is best practices to come up with these cut sheets for each of these building typologies. I'm happy to talk about any of them in detail, but my goal tonight is to sort of cover everything. Some, but not everything, in detail. But, you get an idea about the Townhouse Small. It's about how buildings meet the street. It's about where driveways are, etc.

The next one is a Townhouse Large. What's the big difference between a Townhouse Small and Townhouse Large? The big difference is the size of the lot. The other big difference is in a Townhouse

Large typology, you can actually do stacked flats, right? So, you can actually do apartment, apartment above each other in a stacked flat with no elevator.

That's different than a multi-family townhouse, which is more of an apartment building. And you can see these buildings right here are all probably four units around a single stair. And they're combined, but they're not like a Townhouse where it's a single flat per floor with one stair with one stair serving two or three units. It's a complex of a bunch of these together that's an apartment complex. It's a way to do an apartment without having to do elevators.

One of the things we did with this, is actually, we could have jammed more of them on the lot than we showed. But we wanted to do something to make sure that it wasn't too dense. So, for example, one of the design things we did here was, see that? We said one of the requirements for these multi-family townhouses is they have to have a front door that faces the street. By doing that, because we know what all the plot sizes are, it ensures that this middle area right here is always open. And we think that informs the goals of the project of having open space, etc. It was a simple design guideline standard, in this case, that makes it impossible to put a building right there with this typology. We hope it's impossible.

The next typology is the multi-family townhouse mews. And the idea of the mews is that there's a building in the front and then a smaller building on the other side of the backyard. It's like a in-law or Granny apartment type thing. This typology can be built with parking here, as well as a small lot there. There's also a version of it that has half of a parking level underground. It's a very efficient way to build higher density without having big buildings.

This is apartments with service parking. A very efficient and inexpensive way to build apartments. One of the things we wanted to make sure with this is that we didn't have streets with big parking lots on it. So, you'll see that the typology is about wrapping that interior parking with apartments. So, it's similar to what you've seen. I think all of you have been to that project in Petaluma, right? So, we've started to get typologies like that.

Now, there are many others in this section. And if you guys want to talk about any of the others, that's fine, you have them all here and I'm happy to answer questions. But again, in the interest of brevity, I just gave you some highlights.

The next section is the architectural stylebook. And, you know, it's really important. And you guys would say, you know, well why would we take the time to do a style book? I can't tell you how many times I've seen someone start to mix styles, and not do it in an elegant way. And the thing is, while Frank Gehry might be able to jam a bunch of styles together, most of us don't do it very well. So, in our experience, if you're going to use a style, we want to show you some things about how those styles are typically done. Yeah?

Commissioner Phillips: So, I have a quick question with this stylebook. So, there's five different styles and the way that it would work is you would say, 'Builder A is going to develop Parcel 2, and he's going to use 'Farmhouse'.' And then, Builder B could come along and develop Parcel 3 with 'Loft Industrial'. So, within the parcels, the architecture is all the same, but the architectural styles can... you could possibly find styles within... across the street from each other?

Evan: You could even, within the parcel, find the style. Half the parcel might be one style. Half the parcel might be another style. Whenever I'm here and I drive around the city of Napa, you'll see this, right? You'll see a Craftsman next to a Farmhouse next to a, you know, non-descript modern, mid-century modern. And that's okay. I mean, I actually... and we talked a lot about this in our office. Did we want to have guidelines about how many styles could be on a block? Or, whether the mandatory should be differences in style? Or, whether one project could employ more than one style. Honestly, I don't care. And that's just sort of my personal design approach. What I want is, if someone's going to use a style, I want to make sure they do it right. And whether...

And two styles next to each other? And I think that good cities are built over time, and good places built over time, actually to have that sort of mix. But that's my... that's sort of my design approach and so that's what's sort of baked into these guidelines. If somebody else has a different opinion we're certainly open to that discussion.

Larry Florin: That's what I was going to do, was suggest to you that... that's an example of one of the points that... where Evan and his shop has made a qualitative decision that we really need to think through if that's what you want to do, or not. That's exactly the type of example.

Chair Fiddaman: Go ahead, Gordon. And I'll ask after.

Gordon: Well, I know that you're just at the first page of your style book, but already I had some comments and questions, if I could. Just speaking for myself, I actually do care very much that, I guess, what's in proximity to what. And we have five styles listed here and I suppose the style du jour could be Farmhouse and the whole thing turns into Farmhouse, is that right? The way it's set up right now? Well, I have a little bit of an issue with that so, but I'll wait til you get through your sketchbook to talk some more and see what my colleagues up here have to say about it.

But also, when we look at the five styles, Bay Area Modern, Farm Industrial, Loft Industrial, those all, to me, totally resonate and make sense for Napa Pipe. There's a context there of what is there, what was there, what it was used for, etc. I'm having a hard time of understanding what Farmhouse and what Craftsman have to do with the context that site. So, again, I'm going to have more to say about it, but I just wanted to lob one out there so you kind of get where I'm going. And you're probably not surprised to hear that from me, right? Okay.

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, I had similar thoughts, particularly with respect to Craftsman. I don't see it fitting this site. But.. and particularly I noticed that Craftsman, it was a guideline it wasn't a prohibition that it be used for apartments. And I can't, myself, envision a Craftsman apartment making any sense. But, actually, my question was a little bit different than Gordon's, from the standpoint that... could you confirm the definition of a lot versus a parcel versus a block. Because I am a little confused... somewhere in here I recall that, I believe it said you couldn't mix styles, I don't remember if it said on a lot or on a parcel. You could on a block, that's understandable.

Evan: It's on a lot.

Chair Fiddaman: You can't mix them on a lot.

Evan: You can't mix them on a lot. So, like, the block could be subdivided into... and the block is essentially the parcel, right? You can subdivide that parcel into lots. And the idea is, a lot is typically one project, right? So, say the lot is ten townhouses, or the lot is half a block and it's multi-family townhouses and it's this one, right, which is half a block. The idea was that that's one project built at one time, and it gets real busy when it starts to be mixing styles on that lot. If the lot is one house, right, and it's a separate lot, then it's okay to go Craftsman, Farmhouse, Modern, that's what you see all around town, right? But, it doesn't make sense if the lot is, say, five townhouses, to go... each one of those being something different. Then it starts to look really weird. And we can clarify that if it's confusing.

Commissioner Murray: Yeah, this is along the lines that Commissioner Huether has mentioned, but since there's... since we're trying to do this entire thing in code, there's nothing in here that I saw that would prevent the entire project from being one style, if that's just simply how it turned out. I think that would be destructive to the area but there would be no way to prevent that. So, I would want to see something in the guidelines that not just discouraged, but prevented that from occurring.

Evan: We can do that. I worked on a project where we actually... on adjacent lots there were actually a certain number of things that needed to be changed. Style, color, blah blah blah. So we can write things like that.

I too want to address the list of styles for a second. We originally sort of came up with a much longer list and then we narrowed it down to the three that you mentioned which really seemed to be part of Napa by right: Bay Area Modern, Loft Industrial, Farm Industrial. And the other two, like this Farmhouse style with the board and batten and things like that, which is, one could argue, the Carneros Inn is some sort of intersection between that and Farm Industrial, right? And, in fact, if you drive around Napa, you see a lot of these, sort of, reinterpreted Farmhouse buildings. And they're quite beautiful. And even across the street from here, I noticed today, there are a lot of Craftsman homes. It's a style that you find all over the town of Napa. And, in fact, I think we showed you, and we can show you again, there's a beautiful Craftsman style apartment building that was done in Palo Alto a couple years ago and it's actually done quite well. So, that's why we put it in. Again, we're open to your comments and edits. That was our thinking when we put it in.

Commissioner Murray: So, is that... philosophically what you're describing there, is that... I mean, it seems to me, sort of the dominant paradigm of the last, probably 30s or 40 years, in a lot of the western states, particularly when you look at single family home development has been this real strikingly cookie-cutter design when a developer goes in and builds a number of homes. And, you know, you look at... A great example would be, like, the suburbs of Vegas, which are just miles and miles of indistinguishable homes. I picture what you're saying about when you drive around downtown Napa where a lot of homes were built long before that trend. Was that, philosophically, sort of the idea behind it that we want to, within a block, have these strikingly different homes that look like each home was built with a sense of individuality and you know, specific purpose as opposed to just a huge row of the same thing?

Evan: Yeah. I mean, I think, and Eleanor can correct me if I'm wrong, I think we do have a guideline about differentiation on adjacent blocks, certain things need to change. But, I'm not sure we recommended changing styles. And part of it was we weren't convinced that there would actually be very many single family homes here. It could be that we need to be a little bit more proactive about this, because it's definitely more of an issue when you have a lot of single family homes. But, conceivably, and I think it's

important that we should discuss, and it's a good point, which is do we want to have some sort of guideline to try to manifest more diversity in architecture. I think it's a very valid discussion point.

Commissioner Murray: Yeah, because I'm not necessarily referencing single family homes in this project, but just the stylistic idea all together. That's it's, you know, to kind of get away from this mass homogeneity that we've sort of made the paradigm in the last thirty or forty years.

Chair Fiddaman: Mr. Scott had a question.

Commissioner Scott: Evan, my perspective is very similar. As I look at the different property sites here, and the number, how many lots are reflected in each one of those numbers?

Evan: Which page are you referring to?

Commissioner Scott: Page 22, 23. Where they have the blocks indicated.

Evan: I don't think it's been subdivided into lots yet.

Commissioner Scott: Okay, well I think that that speaks to the concern. And that kind of touches on the shall and will versus recommended or preferred. And what... depending on the size of the properties that we're talking about, or the size of the lots contained in those particular blocks, I can see where a similarity or a similar development, the same developer, for example, using it for a quarter of that block or whatever the size of the lot may be. But, if you start getting into taking a whole block of those buildings or blocks across the street from one another, then, I think, the similarity becomes monotonous and it begins to go into the area of cookie-cutter that we'd like to avoid.

Evan: Yeah, there's a section on page 88 that starts to get at this a little bit, and I think that we might need to add more to it. It's a section on block layouts.

Commissioner Scott: I can imagine some of that is differentiated between townhomes, apartments, single family dwellings, etc, so there's a natural division in terms of construction types that would take place. But, the concern, I think, that we could have is that there needs to be some control that can be exercised.

Evan: I think it's a very important point. I just want to add something to that. Like, if you remember when we went to Bay Meadows. It actually was kind of disturbing that everything was in sort of this clay tile, really bad... I don't even know what you'd call that sort of mission style, Stanford University sort of thing. But, the townhouses were doing it. The apartments were doing it. The offices were doing it. It was a little relentless and it looked really weird to have this same style at every scale. So, I think it's a good point. We need to think about that. We did talk about, on the block level, encouraging multiple typologies, etc. But, I think we need to think more about this and I think it's a good point. Sorry.

Commissioner Phillips: Oh no no. One thing that, just so I can kind of try to see how the process works. So, when you have the area two, are we referring to that as a parcel?

Evan: That's a parcel right now.

Commissioner Phillips: But you could have multiple builders within one parcel?

Evan: At some point each parcel will have to be a decision about whether or not it gets subdivided. Is it one builder coming in and doing the entire parcel? And whether they want to subdivide it depending on their building typology. Or, do you subdivide it. So, for example, if you wanted to do this typology, you could subdivide the block into two lots and have different builders building each building on half the block. Or, you could have one builder build both of them even though it's two lots. These are all decisions that will happen as the takedown of land happens.

Commissioner Phillips: Well, its interesting, in terms of the different builders. That was one of the points that you had brought up when we were visiting Bay Meadows, about how you could see the difference between, just right across the street from the different... the same style but different builders.

Chair Fiddaman: You have a lot of interest here, Evan. Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Basayne: It's actually me. Unless you have something, Commissioner Kelley.

Chair Fiddaman: He did.

Commissioner Basayne: Please go ahead.

Chair Fiddaman: We'll get to you in a second.

Commissioner Kelley: Thanks, Evan. You know, talking about the... and I agree, I want to chime in with what everyone else has been stating here - the diversity we're hoping to achieve through the design. Maybe I'm a little ahead of myself, but, the question is: if someone proposes something outside the box that's not within any of the styles, or as design evolves, how do we prepare for that with this code?

Evan: So, the idea of this stylebook is that it's not meant to be exclusive. It's not meant to say these are the only five we want to build. It's really... It's almost like a... It's like a textbook, if you will, that says if you're going to build one of these styles here are things that you should be aware of, this is how we do it. And it comes from a little bit from me having to deal with production home builders. And one of whom, who should remain nameless, who would come in with the building being half Tudor and half Craftsman and I'd be like, are you kidding me? Right? And so we're trying to get people to... it's a little bit educational. But someone could come in, you know, like, I've worked with a lot of architects, some of whom have done really amazing work here in Napa like Richard Pernot, for example, who have a wonderful sort of collage way of coming up with new styles, if you will. And I think we need to be open to that, and we can't really write a guideline to that. So, the answer is I hope people come up with new ideas and I hope they do it well. And we hope that the guidelines that we've written about architecture and materials and things like that will ensure that they do it well. We will do everything that we can to prevent them from doing Frankensteins, but... And that's a little bit about what this section's about, that it's not meant to be exclusive.

Chair Fiddaman: Commissioner Basayne.

Commissioner Basayne: That might be a segway to my question, which certainly, I am opposed to the notion of a homogeneous approach to design. And I embrace the notion of diversity, and I think we all do with regard to architectural styles. Where I'm a bit wary, or just hesitant, is when we have two

diametrically opposed architectural styles, radically different architectural styles. You've got Tomorrowland next to Frontierland, or what have you, and the real question I have is how do you transition between the two? And how do you soften the blow, so to speak? And, yes, to your point, cities tend to have diverse architectural styles and you could have a spaceship next to a Kwansit hut, but it isn't necessarily aesthetically pleasing. As you say, a Frankenstein. So, how does one sort of smooth out the rough edges in this case?

Evan: That's a good question. I mean, there are a lot of things we could do. You could, I've seen this before, you could say, 'These are the five styles and you can't... anything besides these five styles is an exception, so would have to go to a higher level of review.' I mean, that's one way to do it. You could have a set of guidelines that says they can go next to B, but not next to C. I'm not sure we'd want to do that, but you could do that. There are probably other ways, but off the top of my head, those are...

Commissioner Basayne: Well, or you, you know, you have, perhaps, some kind of landscaping feature, or... as an alternative as well. It doesn't appear as if you have one style growing out of another style.

Evan: Well, the landscape will be a very very strong feature in this project. So, in some levels that's going to be baked into the public realm, already. But hopefully we don't need to... I mean, hopefully, we're not trying to hide any spaceships. I think we probably want to try to figure out a way to prevent spaceships.

Chair Fiddaman: Definitely.

Evan: Exceptionally.

Chair Fiddaman: Commissioner Phillips? Or Murray?

Commissioner Phillips: Murray.

Chair Fiddaman: Murray.

Commissioner Murray: Yes, Evan. In my opinion, by limiting the architectural styles you are, in essence, handcuffing the developer into a way that this is what you're set on. Can you explain the process, how you went through to develop these styles? And how much were the stakeholders, the owners of the property, involved in this? There's a lot of economic concerns and things that, you know, a Craftsman style house, in ten years, might not be selling that well. People might want an ultramodern with glass front, or something like that. So, if you could explain the process your organization went through, I think that would help me understand.

And also, second thing is that I would think that we would offer more styles in the guidelines than limiting it to these five.

Evan: Well, I will say that what I do it's not a science, alright? It's completely subjective. So, we took, for example, these drawings that Keith's team had done and we started to try to figure out what they represented. And we really started to realize that they are very much, sort of, Bay Area modern. And then there were elements, if you started to look at some of the other precedents that they've talked about, they were very much influenced by farm industrial and things like that. Then we look at the site and we really got a sense that there was a real farm industrial sense of the site. And there is a sort of intention of not

making it bit about the past, but making it about the future. So, that was really what drove the Bay Area modern and the farm industrial. The loft industrial was very much, again, influenced by the site, in the industrial past of the site, but also, a lot of the things that we saw on our tour and other things we've shown you that people reacted well to about the typology of buildings and how they might look, and that, sort of how these materials that you find the site could be manifested in buildings. So those were those three.

The farmhouse was very much influenced by... a little bit by Carneros, but really by driving around Napa and seeing that some of the most interesting new architecture that I had seen around here was, really, interpretations of farmhouses. Like, for example, this, which I thought... the lower right. And there are some really nice projects wood and things like that that play back into that heritage. And I thought, well, that's a really interesting style that seemed very relevant in context.

And then, the Craftsman was, you know, driving around downtown Napa and seeing so many Craftsman homes. Seeing that that's very... a tradition. And again, that project in Palo Alto.

We pretty much didn't want to do sort of Spanish Mediterranean clay tile roof, didn't seem to make sense. The sort of boring stucco box didn't seem to make sense. If someone wanted to do a beautiful mid-century modern, I think we could argue that that fits within Bay Area modern. Erickson and Aalto and all those things. Eichlers. Those are Bay Area Modern and they're pretty Mid-century modern at the same time. So, we tried to come up with some that made sense for this site without having an exhaustive list. But again, it's not a science. I hope that Keith, I mean, we certainly talked about it a lot with Keith and Keith's team, I can't speak for Keith and hopefully you're comfortable with them.

Keith: Well, but with this larger process, I mean. (off mic, unintelligible...) This is the input that's going to shape it.

Chair Finnaman: Okay, we have a question at this end. Was it Commissioner Huether?

Commissioner Huether: If you don't mind, thank you. Well, Evan, you can see from all these questions it kind of points to some of the potential pitfalls and challenges going form-based code, and it's no wonder that the city was a little uncomfortable ceding design review. I mean, the questions are coming up right away. So, on the... again, on the Farmhouse and Craftsman, I can appreciate driving around Napa and seeing all of this rich, actually, architectural heritage that we have. But it happened organically over 150 years, and this project's going to happen over twenty, so I don't know how you're going to capture everything in these design guidelines. And I don't know if all ten people here are going to necessarily agree on everything. So, that's the other part is putting that all in and stirring it up in the pot and seeing what comes out.

The Carneros Inn and the whole farmhouse thing, it's almost kind of becoming the, you've heard of Howard Bachen, I'm sure, so it's kind of the 'Bachenization' of the Napa valley. So that's kind of the, kind of hip things right now, which I get. So, we go through, historically, kind of hip area... times of architecture and all that. I still feel like, though, I mean, it's good to have as much diversity as possible, I think all of us agree to that. I'm not sure if I'm the odd man out here, but I just don't really see where Craftsman and Farmhouses fit in the context of Napa Pipe. Because Napa Pipe is, I know that it's not a town, but it feels like one. We're creating a whole new community that's not growing organically over 100, 200 years. It's

just add water and mix. And there we're going to have it. So, this is the bible because we're not going to have oversight later. Alright?

So, for me, it's so important to work with the context of the site. We have the water and the have the kind of blue-collar background history that we have there, and the cranes and all that kind of stuff. I think that's kind of the context and I think that's what should be, to me, driving a lot of the... your palate, if I can call it a pallet. And, you know, maybe there should be five, maybe there should be seven, maybe there's only three. I don't know. But there's a lot of variety just in farm industrial, loft industrial, that doesn't mean they're all going to look the same.

And, Mike, what you were talking about before, Mike Basayne, to have that next to, I don't know, loft industrial, that would seem kind of weird to me. Because everyone's going to know the barn wasn't there a hundred years ago and then we built that, they were kind of built within the same... within two years of each other. So, they're going to kind of be looking at us saying, 'What were we thinking back in those days when we designed that thing?' And when they take their little bus tours like we took together fifty years from now, man, we want them... they would be so proud of us, not, 'what the hell were they thinking?'

So again, diversity of style I totally support within the confines of the context of where we're building that. And, again, I don't see too much of the analogy with driving around the city of Napa. Because, again, that happened over generations and we're doing this, like all things in our times, like that. Overnight. Thank you.

Chair Fiddaman: I think you're hearing, you know, let's have more styles or let's have fewer. I guess I would have to say, from my own point of view that having... I spent quite a bit of time with this and there's a lot to absorb here and it's a little hard to understand some of it, particularly when you get into the details of how everything works on a block and so on. But, I would have to say that I think you've really done a pretty terrific job here, and it's... but it's... it's going to get a lot of interest from us. And I can see a couple more lights have come on up here, so...

But I do want to throw out one question and you don't have to deal with it right now, but in my own mind, something that I didn't find fully addressed here, and maybe I missed it was, what's going to go on on the street level as far as bringing some consistency? Or is there not going to be consistency in terms of things like streetlights and street furniture, trash cans, and so on, sidewalk pavings and, you know, things of that nature which... and particularly street trees, I think? They can give a sense of community to this thing that would absorb a lot more variation in the architectural styles. And so, you can deal with that now or later, but...

Evan: It's actually a short question. I can tell you that I spent a lot of time designing down to the finest grain detail, and that's all in the development plan – the design of the streets and the public realm.

Chair Fiddaman: So, we're not seeing that here.

Evan: It's not in this document. This document deals with everything that happens from the property line inward. Whereas the development plan is everything from the property line outward.

Rick Tooker: You raise a good question, though, Mr. Chairman, because the development plan, its hard to separate that out from the design guidelines and the development of the blocks or the parcels. So, one of the things that we were thinking about internally as our presentation to the commission... city planning commission on the 4th is to try to bring that back together. Ultimately, The Board of Supervisors and the City Council will have to make a determination that both these documents address their concerns. And so, we see them as connected. But, Evan's correct, it wasn't the intention of the design guidelines to set... review authority for the public realm. But, at the same time we're going to seek recommendation from our Commission on those issues through to the City Council.

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, and I think we're going to want to understand what's being decided in the public realm in terms of how it impacts what our recommendations would be in the private realm. Because, to me, they're pretty closely linked.

And we do have more questions down at the far end. Do we have Tom? Or Matt?

Matt: Yeah, I think Commissioner Huether raised some really good points. I'm just wondering if there might be an opportunity, I know it's really hard to predict, hypothetically, every design combination, but maybe similar to what each respective commission does when we're looking at a proposed project, and then there's oftentimes computer generated or, you know, photograph with computer inserted, animations that sort of put what the ultimate thing might look like. And I was wondering, there might be some options to take some of those scenarios that have been described here, such as, like, a farmhouse and an industrial side and kind of give a chance to look at, kind of hypothetically, what it might look like together and you know, base some of those situations for the future. And, you know, we don't necessarily have to have a meeting. Maybe it just could be blasted out to everybody to get a look and see.

Chair Fiddaman: And I have another light on at that end. That was... is that you?

UNNAMED: Yeah. I guess I understand the need for the design guidelines to be more... to be broader, sort of exclusive... or inclusive, if you will. And, but not to the extent that... We expect that the development plan is going to be far more exclusive, more restrictive, etc. And, I like, in part, this is... If I were to describe this, the kind of... the development guidelines are more of a broad vanilla and we're going to get into specific colors, flavors, etc when we get into the development plan. I think that this needs to be open. There needs to be plenty of room for alternatives and flexibility and creativity on the part of the developer, etc. As we get into the development plan, I see that as becoming... then we're going to be comparing one lot versus the other lot, and as, as one Commissioner mentioned, the need for effective transition from one style of architecture to perhaps another. But this, you know, I think this creates a fair amount of flexibility. I interpret the five different styles, home styles that were proposed, as just that, five different style. Not exclusively to those five styles, but examples of what the styles can be. And, I'd be interested to see if the other Commissioners feel the same way.

Evan: I think there's three things, I think, for the stylebook that you guys could be thinking about. One is, are these the right styles in this stylebook? Which, obviously, Commissioner Huether has been raising. Two is, how do you make the connection between the styles and the guidelines? Because the styles are really meant to be educational, right? It's to say, if you're going to do this, this is how you do it right. And I think there's been some discussion about do we want to mandate variety or mandate what might go... what next to what. Right now we're not doing that because right now the focus has really been on the educational part. So, I think there's a question that... or discussion that we have to really think about

together about is there a bigger role for the stylebook beyond just educational that says, 'If you're going to do this. This is how you do it.' Does it need to become more standard? Like, to say, 'this is what we want you to do.' Does it need to be more exclusive? Does it need to be less exclusive? These are open questions. We took a position of not exclusive and not mandatory. But, again, this isn't a science. That was just our starting thing and we're open to what you think.

Chair Finneman: I think, Commissioner Phillips? Or Murray? One of you.

Commissioner Phillips: It's Phillips. And it's actually, I think that sounds like a great approach and I think we're kind of in consensus, it sounds like. But one question that I had that's somewhat of a different topic but that came to mind when we started talking about the development plan versus the development guidelines is that, I know that the development plan is also where we really start digging into things like affordable housing, that's really covered under there. But, one thing that did come...when I was reading the introduction it talks about that this document will ensure that Napa Pipe's 'core values and intent are not compromised'. And, I know this is a little off topic, but it just came to my mind. I'm wondering if the point of 'ensure a mix of housing styles and scales that are accessible to a variety of income levels...'. I mean, this was really sold as a Napa for Napans, and personally I would like to see that language strengthened to really reflect the commitment to workforce and affordable housing and that that is one of the core values of this project. So, that can also be, I think, reflected too on page 14 in the quote that used kind of as... talking about the overview. So sorry.

Chair Fiddaman: Alright.

Commissioner Phillips: It's just come to mind, talking. We do not get into that in this document, but I do feel that it is a core value of this document.

Chair Fiddaman: Okay. We have more comments from the other end here. And I just want to get a feel from anybody in terms of how we're doing here. I mean, there's obviously a lot of thought from the Commissions on this. And, I know where all here to have this presented by Evan, but I think everybody's had a chance to look reasonably through this. And so, we'll continue on with the questions if that makes sense for everybody.

Larry Florin: That's exactly what we were looking for, thank you.

Chair Fiddaman: Okay, great. Tom?

Tom: Thank you, Chair. Evan, you talked about, when this is built you want to show developers how, you know, how all the pieces fit, so you don't have this type and this type together. But with five styles like this and not getting into more of an industrial look that a lot of people think fits the context of this site, developers are going to come in and they're going to look at this stylebook and that's what they're going to give you to build. They're not going to go outside the box. So, I think it's important that we have a little more variety here for people to look at. And that's just my personal opinion. Thank you.

Chair Fiddaman: Okay, and then Commissioner...

UNNAMED: I'll go first, and then Commissioner Huether would like to speak as well.

Chair Fiddaman: Okay.

UNNAMED: I guess my interpretation in, and kind of in concurrence with Commissioner Phillips' thought, I saw the portion where you're talking about to appeal to different, you know, needs, particularly income needs, etc. I saw that as a difference between apartments, condos, single family dwellings, etc. That's what that really applied to. One of the things that we've talked about in the past is that the affordable housing, we don't want to be indistinguishable from the exterior. Maybe the interior, of course, they are going to be... those dwellings may be somewhat, slightly smaller, or what have you. But, I don't want them... you know, we don't want affordable housing site, you know, a ghetto within a neighborhood type thing? We want it to be pretty standard across the board. And, but we realize that there's going to be a difference in sizes and types of housing, etc., types of construction, perhaps, as well, and certainly building materials and so forth. And we'll get into all of that when we get into development plans. But, that was my interpretation. I don't, you know.

Commissioner Phillips: Or, that it gets built. And not just paid into a housing fund, right? So...

UNNAMED: Yeah, so..

Commissioner Phillips: It's a core value.

Commissioner Huether: Well, with all stuff I've said and my colleagues have said about style, I think that one that would trump style would be quality. So, I don't know how you, I don't know, legislate or ordinance or guidelines or whatever that Thou shalt do quality work? The same would go with encouraging creative. I mean, how do you put that in the guidelines? I mean, how do you... You know, I understand ceding the design review process and all that, maybe in the interest of expediting it. But I think, everybody wants the same thing, and that's a really high quality product. A high quality community where any of us would actually contemplate even living there, because just of the way space works and the architecture. And well, how in the world do you put that in your binder? I'm just kind of curious about that. And then, at the very least, is there any way to put qualifications for an architect or a builder to be able to even work on this project? I mean...

Chair Fiddaman: A list of names.

Commissioner Huether: I mean, if a person's only done a trailer park... well, that's not fair because Carneros Inn came out really nice, but, you know, if they haven't done anything of any consequence, but the builder brings them along. And it's usually the builder these days that's kind of, you know, driving that truck. It's not the architect. So, they're the ones who decide who the architect is, and their negotiation, their fees with all that. And, I know there's a lot there but, how do you encourage creativity? How you make sure that you get quality? And how do you make sure that we're getting really qualified, high energy, super creative, qualified architects and builders to work on these projects?

Evan: So, actually this entire document is designed to try to address those questions. How do you ensure quality? Well, from my perspective, what you try to do is to encourage people to do things you know work, and to make it very difficult for them to do the things that you know aren't going to look good, right?

So, how do you do that? Well, one of the common mistakes that people make is bad architects and bad builders makes things, in a way... You know, there's sort of two ways of mixing things. There's the collage

way, which we all like, right? It's sort of beautiful collage composition. And then there's the hodge podge way, which none of us like, because it's just a bunch of different things slapped together with no composition.

The goal of the stylebook is trying to prevent hodge podge. To say, if you're going to do something, this is how you would do it. But, it's not meant to be exclusive. So, if someone comes in with a really creative idea then we hope they come up with a style, something new we haven't thought of. Alright. But when you go through the guidelines, there are page after page of guidelines that aren't in the stylebook that are the guidelines in the standard section of the document that are doing everything they can to prevent people from making really bad mistakes, and doing everything they can to encourage them to do things the right way while giving them the flexibility to be creative.

So, it's very difficult to push a string, if you will, and the creative process is kind of like string. But, what you can try to do is pull the string by encouraging people to go this way without forcing them to do it. And that's what we tried to do in the guidelines. And, you tell us whether we're successful, but that is the goal.

The last thing, about how you get people to hire good architects? If I knew the answer to that, I'd be very popular among my colleagues. But, you know, the thing is some of the greatest architecture is done by people who've never built anything, right? You know, the young person out of school who's really great at drawing things and does a house for their parent, right? Richard Meyer, Frank Gehry, Le Corbusier, Nis Van de Rohe, I mean, the list of people, of famous architect who's first house was for their parents, who let them take some chances. Robert Venturi, I meant that list is pretty damn long, so, not sure there's a good...

Commissioner Huether: Hire all those guys.

Commissioner Phillips: Done and done.

Chair Fiddaman: Evan. I think that, for me, this is the crux of the issue of the form-based code. On Page 92, there are a couple of pictures at the top where you've labeled one good and one bad. However, I don't see how, and you're going to have to sell me on this, how it is you write code which prevents the one on the right from being built while allowing the one of the left to be built.

Evan: There are actually a number things in the guidelines that the one on the right doesn't meet. For example, window reveals. The windows, you can see on the... I do think we have it in here. We would not allow this right here. Those windows do not have the required reveal. We would not allow this right here because it doesn't have the proper proportional relationship of basement to top. There's another number of things that would be difficult to do under the guidelines as they're written.

Ultimately, though, the challenge of a lot of this there is... is that these are not scientific, right? There is a certain level of interpretation there.

Chair Fiddaman: I would have to say, you know, I've read through this and I've read all the big stuff, but I didn't spend a lot of time reading the... the grade out, the guidelines that said, you know, to be updated pending final standards. And maybe that's where a lot of the answers for a lot of people are because I was just looking at them and I see you get very very... I mean, there's a lot of shall in there, as opposed to suggesting.

Eleanor: Sure. Just to explain a little bit on that. That came over as a request, actually, from the County through, also requests. Anticipation from the city as well that it would be really nice to have a matrix of all the standards per this checklist that Evan was commenting on earlier. And the reason why it's not up to date yet is that we anticipated this conversation that we're having now. Which is, we're not sure which are the shoulds and which are the shalls right now. So, currently, all of the text that is in those pink matrixes is the same text that is in the document in terms of shoulds and shalls. But, we do expect that will change after tonight. And, so those final matrixes are pending all of the decisions.

Evan: There are actually a number of guidelines that the building on the right violates, as I read through it. There are things like, we don't allow simulated multiple buildings. And when you look at this, what they're doing in simulated multiple buildings. By changing material, style and color, they're trying to simulate multiple buildings along the street. We actually have a guideline against that.

So, I think it's a really good idea for you guys to sort of do what we do, which is sort of - we argue inaccuracies. We try to do this: we try to put on our bad architect act and find all the ways to do really bad buildings with the guidelines as written. And that's how we try to test them. And, I might miss things. I'm sure I do miss things. I do everything I can not to miss things, but I'm sure I do. When you guys, it's be great if you guys all put on your sort of bad architect hats. I don't know if any of you have them, but if you could find one, try it and see, you know... Or, you know, drive around and see things that you don't like and think, 'Could that be done under these guidelines?' We have tried to prevent most of the common mistakes that we know, and this, for example, is one of them.

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, I had exactly the same question that Arthur did about this where, you know, too much articulation and how do you prevent it. And, so I think what you're telling us is that you do have some guidelines here that would prevent that.

I guess I... I might throw out to my Commissioners at this point that back when I used to finance real estate myself, I did a fair amount of business in Houston. And, I find that a number of us here are kind of torn between, you know... well, we want to have some variability here and, you know, create a nice neighborhood that's not all the same. But, at the same time we want control.

Commissioner Huether: That's right.

Chair Fiddaman: And, I'm not sure how many people are familiar with the fact that Houston has no zoning and you rely on the marketplace to do the sensible thing. And I think, to a certain extent, we could all take some comfort that developers, builders and architects are going to use some sense here in terms of what they're going to put across the street from something else or next door to something else. It's not that we want to just let them do anything. But I think we need to be reasonable in terms of what we require, in that respect. So, who is...

Commissioner Scott: I think we both do.

Chair Fiddaman: Okay.

Commissioner Scott: First of all, I agree. I think that what we haven't addressed here and what will be addressed is the marketplace. The marketplace is going to dictate what is going to sell, what is going to

be marketable, if you will, what is going to be attractive. And again, I think that you've taken what I consider the appropriate approach, in that you're... the verbiage in many of your descriptions is inclusive but not specifically exclusive. And I used as an example, on page 122, for example, in local retailing and you actually used it in several others... but under the architectural character, you used 'appropriate materials might include steel, corrugated metal, heavy textured wood, textured block concrete, stucco, etc.' And in other cases I know that you use things like stone or stone facing. So, there are additional materials that can be utilized.

Again, what is attractive? What is going to be attractive to the market place? To potential buyers? What is going to be the style? Because some of these phases of development are going to be eight or ten years down the line and things are going to change between now and then, as things have changed in the last ten years. And so, I think that a lot of that is going to work itself out and will be apparent in the development plans as they come forth.

Evan: Commissioner Scott, that is a very very astute and important observation that I want to hallucinate on a little bit. So, for example, we have these sheets where we talk about the types of materials that are found on site and found in the region or in this climate that are appropriate. And, we want to give people lists. We recognize, though, that new materials get invented and things like that and great, we're open to ideas. I mean, if someone wants to come in and do a terra cotta rainscreen, even though it costs a fortune, more power to them.

But, we also recognize that one of the big mistakes that builders make with materials is they use disposable materials nowadays, or veneers. Veneers allow you to do anything. Now, if you're Frank Gehry, that's okay. He's a genius and he can do things that none of would have expected and he pulls it off because he know what he's doing. But most people, when you look at something where, for example, bricks are used in a way that defy gravity. You look at it and you go 'that's really odd. That looks really cheap,' right? Because, in fact, over time it'll degrade in ways that you can predict if you really thought about it, but no one does.

So, going back to Commissioner Huether's comment. Like, how do you ensure quality. One way to ensure quality is to get people to use materials in a way that inspires a sense of quality. So, for example, we give people some inspiration. But then we get into some ideas about, alright, when you start to use materials there are things you can and should do and there are things you shouldn't do. Don't put stone over wood, for example. It never looks good unless you really know what you're doing, which most people don't. So, I think that's a really important point.

Chair Fiddaman: Actually, while we're on that page, that was one that I had a question about. If you would explain those diagrams at the bottom then I would feel that I understood them a little bit better.

Evan: Okay, so the idea of these diagrams is to encourage a little bit of control, if you will, while not re-inventing everything. And, one of the things, when you look at bad buildings that people do, is they get composition wrong because... Yes, it's page...

Chair Finneman: 74 (muttering of the room while everyone finds the right page for reference)

Evan: 114. This is actually 114.

So, what we're trying to get at is.. So, when you read the text, we want material changes that relate to the architecture. We don't want it to be random or be arbitrary. Now, again, it's about composition. There are people who inherently do composition who know what they're doing. Richard DeMacorn comes to mind. But most people... and composition is really hard, you know. So, these are sort of common mistakes in building composition that we see. So, the row on the bottom is like, 'Don't make these common mistakes.' Like material changes which have no relationship to the units or the facades, materials that don't reflect the overall massing in the building. Upper level material changes that are not visible, so instead, we'd like to see alternating facades or tiered facades or unified facades. Occasionally someone might come in with something that's surprising to us, and that's great, but these are the common mistakes that we see. Again, there's no way of anticipating everything, but these are some of the common ones.

Commissioner Scott: Evan, one of the points that I think we're all aware of is a hundred yards to the north of this property is the largest construction material supplier in Northern California in terms of rock and various building materials. So, there is certainly a lot of resource available to builders.

Chair Fiddaman: As long as you put the rock down low, not up high.

Evan: Right. So, the previous page, which is page 113, deals with... just so people understand, like stucco, wood, rock, stone, brick, etc, and how these materials... sort of good relationships and bad relationships.

Commissioner Huether: Mr. Chair? If I may.

Chair Fiddaman: Sorry. Go ahead.

Commissioner Huether: Well, just a quick comment on quality. On one of the field trips we went, I can't remember, the second one maybe it was. And they were already scraping, right, remember? And, I mean, it had only been there a couple of years, or so and I just couldn't believe it. So, it just kind of underline the point about quality and materials. So, I really appreciate that you've put so much thought into that. Actually, I appreciate all the work that you're doing. I don't mean to sound like a big critic or anything like that.

So, to Arthur's point when he was on page 92 there, and you know, so what's going to happen is these projects, piece by piece is going to come, presumably, to city staff. Rick, you'll still be here, I'm sure. You're still a young boy. So, I'd like to direct a question to city staff, to Rick in particular. So, how is that going to work? Are you going to some sort of matrix? Are you going to assign it to a planner and they're going to go through and, you know, all of these things that we've been asking about to, you know, ensure quality and prevent crummy stuff? How are you going to... can you just talk a little bit about that process since it's not going to come in front of the planning commission because no builder, developer, architect in their right mind is going to deviate from these things because they're not going to want to go to the commission, so it's completely out of our hands. Which is not necessarily a bad thing assuming that your staff is, you know, eating their vitamins and everything.

Rick Tooker: Absolutely. You know, the question is difficult to answer because....

Commissioner Huether: That's why I asked it.

Rick Tooker: ...this is a process of evolution. But, I think the shalls are easy. We deal with those in the real world now. The challenge is going to be the design guidelines because, as this is written, the design guidelines are not obligatory. We basically say in the introduction that where there's a guideline a should, rather a shall, that a builder will have to explain why they can't meet the guideline but we won't have any authority over sayings 'Well, that's not good enough, there needs to be a reason.'

Commissioner Huether: So, excuse me. So, if there was a should and they decided they didn't want to, you can't convert the should to the shall.

Rick Tooker: That's essentially how this is set up. And the way our system works, as you know from reviewing hundreds of them over the years, the design guidelines are a collection of shoulds. But, if you look at a document that over a series of different component parts, whether they're fenestration detailing, whether they're the use of materials, whether they're the form and scale, if there's too many shoulds that aren't happening, well then we bundle that as 'this is a problem'. And so, we'll have to kind of work through that as we review this and future iterations until we get to a conclusion because the shoulds are collectively important. Sure, it could be one element of the should that isn't met, but everything else is largely in sync with the style, whatever, pick one of any. But, that's a concern to us as well. And that's why we have a process to go through where we'll be talking about this in the coming weeks.

Commissioner Huether: Does it even require, I don't know, retraining? Or additional training? I mean, I don't know, because typically we're not using form-based, right?

Rick Tooker: It's an operational question you're asking, too. And, you know, we're still a small town, you know, I guess. I mean, our city staff is five when it comes to the planners who, you know, manage different project. There are different ways, operationally, to set his up. Do you set it up with a team leader, or expert, who has a small series of folks who really, largely become the Napa Pipe planners? Do you use a town planner... or a town architect? Which is something that we've discussed, and the county has certainly talked about going in that direction.

Keep in mind that the plan is that every residential unit is issued a permit by the county. So, that means that essentially every exercise of reviewing a project against the design guidelines, whether they're the shalls or the shoulds, will be determined up front, really, largely by county staff. They're going to turn to us to say, you know, is this consistent as well. But, where the city's role really kicks in is going to be in the non-residential, unless things change between now and the end of the process, which I largely doubt will happen.

Commissioner Huether: So, the county is going to be doing the review to make sure that these applicants are conforming to the form-based code design guidelines. Did I understand that right?

Larry Florin: Yeah, as far as process is concerned, and I know we're getting ahead of ourselves a little here because we've got a whole series, yeah, a whole series of agreements coming to you in the future, but one of the components of what will be the development agreement and various county and city agreements is that the non-residential portions, presuming there's a vote and a positive to annex, would annex to the city. The residential, this has been an important component, is that the county needs to be able to issue permits for the actual construction of these residential, in order to fulfill one of our basic premises and principles. And so, yeah, we would in fact be doing the final sign off.

We haven't discussed specifics but I think we anticipate it being an inclusive process. Maybe not dissimilar from the way that, you know, we send something to the fire department to ensure that, you know, the fire department signs off on a permit before we get it. The city would be in the loop for sure. But yeah, given the policing authority as the laws are written now, we'd have to have the final sign-off, yeah.

Commissioner Huether: Yeah, I realize that there's still lots of work ahead over there and over there, you know, all over the place.

Larry Florin: Yeah.

Commissioner Huether: To get my brain around, I think you said, control. And so, you know, ceding a lot of it. So, you know, at the very least we want to influence how this book gets written. And then I'm just kind of curious, well, who's minding the store? And who's going to make sure that the values and the things we're talking about here, since we're not going to be very involved in it, who is? And are they qualified to do it? And what's the process and that's sort of thing. And I know there's going to be subsequent joint meetings, and separate meetings, and meeting meetings, so I'm sure we'll get to it soon enough. But, I think that it's important to bring that up in the context of this meeting. Thank you.

Evan: And, if I might add, the form-based code is pretty easy to apply because it's pretty definitive. It's this lawn coverage. It's this size of this. It's this size of that. These are standards. You do a checklist, pretty easy. The guidelines are a little bit more complicated. As Rick said, the 'shalls' are easy but the guidelines are interpretive. But I do want to...

Commissioner Huether: Where does the devil live?

Evan: On my shoulder.

Commissioner Huether: In the details.

Evan: Oh. I want to turn your attention to the last paragraph on page 12.

Commissioner Huether: Page what?

Evan: 12. It says, "Guidelines promote the goals of the project, but are voluntary. A project may not be denied for failure to comply with voluntary conditions. The term 'should' does not create a mandatory condition, but does demonstrate intent. An applicant who does not comply with a 'should' condition must be prepared to explain why compliance is problematic."

So, even though you are not requiring the shoulds, you are asking applicants to explain why they can't do a 'should'. So, it does put some ownership on the applicant and it makes it a little bit more challenging to ignore the shoulds.

Chair Fiddaman: And, I would have to say... I've been trying to multitask here and listen to everybody and, at the same time, read through some of the matrix that you've done. And they are very very specific. It's not a straightjacket, but it does impose a lot of requirements on people in terms of how they design these buildings.

Okay. Somebody on the left end there.

UNNAMED: I have a question. So, maybe playing a little bit off of what Commissioner Huether said. And Evan, you mentioned us putting out our bad architect hat, and I hope I avoid that at all costs. But, it might be interesting to maybe see a sample checklist. And maybe in one of our meetings if you two bring a couple sample projects and we're sitting here with the code and we have our checklists. And, maybe for our own benefit and edification, to look at a project and maybe come to a consensus based on the code in front of us, that this meets the standard and this doesn't meet the standard. And maybe it gives us a level of comfort that, you know, we're going to put on our 'good planner hats,' and we're going to be able to sit here with this code and know that, you know, that whoever's going to be reviewing this is going to be able, through the standards, to come to a similar conclusion. And I would find that actually, kind of, a fascinating exercise if there's time to work that in somewhere.

Evan: We're open to it. Maybe I should go further into the presentation. (Laughs from the room.) Just a thought.

Chair Fiddaman: Is this you, Terry? Or...

Commissioner Scott: It's me. Yeah. We're kind of talking about an area of here that is fairly expansive. And, unfortunately, it drives me back to something that I, very frankly, would like to utilize in Napa Pipe. And that is a design review committee that had expertise in architecture, engineering, landscaping, etc. And we, as a county, don't have that. I don't know if you have one in the city or not. But, it would be nice to have some professionals in each of those specific fields that could give us the benefit of their experience and so forth in trying to put together a, you know, a high... fine-tuning, if you will, a development plan. And also, I would think it would be helpful to the developer to have that material going into it, and being able to work with those folks as well.

Commissioner Phillips: It's Terry's yearly pitch for a design review committee.

UNNAMED: By god, Terry's going to get his committee. See's an opportunity.

Commissioner Scott: Well, yeah, yeah. Well, and in the absence of one, you may become our design review committee of two.

Evan: We would welcome the honor. I was the design review committee for the new town that I designed in Massachusetts. I was the design review committee for five years. And, you know, it was great because I wrote the guidelines and was able to work with each of the builders to help them really realize the potential of their projects, vis-a-vis the guidelines. We'd be happy to do it for you.

Commissioner Scott: Well, this is a unique... I think we all realize, and one of the reasons we're all here, and we've been here in the past and we'll be here in the future, is this a unique opportunity for this county. I don't think... It's never before appeared and it will probably never again appear. The location is very singular. It's simply not available anywhere else in this county. It's simply a one-time opportunity and that's why we're taking it so seriously. There are... we haven't had to practice on anything else. This is it. It's a one-time deal. The good news is we'll do it in phases, and so we can improve on it in each phase. But we'd also like to do a good job on the additional ones.

Chair Fiddaman: So Evan, did you have more prepared presentation? Or is this question and answer...

Evan: Yeah, I've got, like, 60 more slides I can show you. But, why don't I sort of go through them? I'll go through them relatively quickly because we're sort of been flipping back and forth. But, I think it's important for you to kind of, sort of see some breadth of some of the things that the guidelines get into. It's up to you. I know you all read 240 pages, but if you want me to refresh your memory on stuff.

Chair Fiddaman: You know, I'd say, you know, hit the high points of what you would like to at this point. And I'm sure that will probably generate some more questions along the way.

Evan: I hope so. Okay, so, we were talking about Farmhouse. Craftsman. Bay Area Modern, which is one of favorite styles of architecture of all time because it could be so many things. And then Farm Industrial. And then, lastly, Loft Industrial. So, each of these has a bunch of photos. And again, I want to stress - when you read it it's really telling people how to do it, not that they have to do it. It's just going to say that if you're going to do it, do it right.

In the guidelines themselves, or residential guidelines, there are five big categories of guidelines within each. There are a set of shalls and shoulds. And the shalls, as we mentioned, are summarized at the beginning of each of the chapters. And they talk about, for example, form and orientation, how buildings meet the street, where the primary frontage is. The secondary frontage, if you remember that diagram I showed you, like, an hour ago, about the arrows, those were dictating the orientation and frontage. And then we start to illustrate, as much as possible, we tried illustrate every shall and should that needs to be illustrated. Some of them are so obvious that we didn't waste our time illustrating them. But, we used photos and we used diagrams. So, for example, the one on the top is just a very simple idea about continuous ridgelines, not making them too long because they start to look really weird. Or, the one on the middle left is about how you make corners more prominent, and it's just suggesting ways of doing it.

And, as much as possible, we try do these diagrams to be non-architectural. We're not trying to say this is what it should look like. We're trying to say these are techniques for meeting these objectives. So, you know, occasionally we have to get a little more architectural. But you'll notice it's pretty darn generic, right? So, here we're talking about projections and patterns and rhythms. And here we're talking about how you modulate facades. Or, this one that... I can't read it because I'm not wearing my glasses... Oh, that's the don't simulate buildings... separate buildings idea.

Frontage and setbacks deal with how buildings.. when then meet the street, what happens on that ground floor. Things like entries and what happens in a setback. Arches, projections, things like that.

So, we start to get to things like how do you do a projection? How do you do a bay window? How do bay windows fit along the composition of a facade. For example, how you do... this is starting to get at, if it's is the primary frontage street and this is the secondary frontage street, how parking relates to that overall set of relationships.

The top one is kind of interesting. There's this question about, along a street, how do you regulate how far a building can be set back from the property line? You don't want it to be too far, because then you get gap teeth, but if everything's at the property line, it can be a little relentless, too. But you don't want it to be, like, going like this and everything being different. So, we came up with this concept of the first building on the block sets the the datum. And that there can be five foot variation against that datum. So,

we get some variety but we also have some control. So, you get the sense that these are some thing the things that we're trying to do. And that we recognize front setbacks are different from corner conditions. So, we allow people to do certain things on corners that we might not allow on a front setback.

Chair Fiddaman: Evan, is that five foot variation from the datum, is that a shall, or...?

Eleanor: It's a shall.

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

Evan: So, if the first building is five foot from the property line, you could have a building inside the property line or you could have a building ten feet back from the property line. But you couldn't have a building fifteen feet back from the property line because that would be beyond the five foot datum, so we try to prevent the gap teeth.

And then this just starts to give examples about entries, and how do we mark entries with overhangs and eaves and stoops and stairs and things like that. Again, wherever possible we try to use photos to illustrate ideas without trying to illustrate architecture, per say. Although we make a point of trying not to show, in a photo, something that we wouldn't want to see built. So, if there is a photo, for example, and you go, 'Oh God that thing's hideous. We wouldn't want to see that built,' let us know and we'll try to change the photo.

Eleanor: Just to clarify where I think your question came from, which is that the diagram that is illustrating the standard doesn't use should or shall, but all of the diagrams relate to a written standard. So that diagram, the standard for it is on the previous page and it has the shall. And we don't have any diagrams that don't relate to a written standard. So, we can also create compliance across the document so that the diagram also uses the should or shall terminology.

Chair Fiddaman: I think that would be a good idea, myself.

Commissioner Huether: Could you go back one image? So, I'd take you up on your offer to change out images on that bottom one there. I don't know, I'm just saying.

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, I didn't love that one either.

Evan: You don't like that David Baker project?

Commissioner Huether: Not... well, not enough to say something.

Evan: It's a loft industrial.

Eleanor: Yeah.

Commissioner Huether: Well...

Evan: Point taken. What's interesting about this project is without trying to do... you remember this one on the upper right where they try to make everything look like a bunch separate buildings, even though

we know it's not, this one articulates the building into a series of masses but it's unabashedly saying it's one building, and that's okay. And we're able to get that modulation along the block. But, point well taken.

Commissioner Huether: It's going down a hill too, right?

Evan: That does help.

Commission Huether: Yeah, right. We don't have any hills here.

Evan: What this one does, which I think is pretty interesting, is it actually reads as separate masses, right? But you know it's all one building, because, in fact, they're very very similar to each other. There's some slight material changes, some color changes. But again, it's not doing a bunch of gymnastics, trying to get everything looking so different. And, you'll notice, there's a guideline that we're talking about certain things changing along a block. Like, that you have to change certain elements, but not all of them.

Eleanor: It's very clear that these buildings are part of a family, yet they're not clones.

Evan: This is really interesting. Where, the two bad examples...

Eleanor: Which we all saw.

Evan: Yes, we all saw these. But we're talking, what's really bad about them is that they're really plainer. There's not depth, right? There's no sense of wall thickness because there's no window reveals, or in and out, or anything like that. So we give examples. The one on the left is better than the two on the right. And, in fact, the two on the right could not be built per the guidelines that we've written.

Then we get into architectural details and we talk about a minimum percentage of glazing. We talk about mandating window reveals. And, you know, it's funny. I've spent a lot of time, and way too much time than I'd like, arguing with developers about window reveals. Because, you know, it's a lot cheaper not to do reveals. But it's also, in the long term, makes for less attractive facades because you don't get that play of light and shadow and depth, right? It also, from a quality perspective, one of the biggest problems that you have with stucco and things like that is water issues. And when you make, the reason why, historically and vernacularly, windows were inset beyond the construction typology, was that it helped to keep the water away from the window, logically enough. And I know that production home builders can do window reveals. It's not that hard. They just don't want to.

And, the other thing I know is sometimes, and we tried to write is so that they couldn't do this, but one way they try to do is they do a flush window in their stucco wall, and then they do a 1 x 2 frame around it that pops out. And that looks, maybe, even worse. So, we tried to write a guideline to prevent that.

The other thing, because nowadays under Title 24, etc., you've got to do double pane windows. So, we all know are window bullions are fake no matter what, right? Because you've got a double pane window in between it. We don't do it the way we used to where we set the window into the bullion. There are two ways of doing it. You can do applied so at least it's giving you the sense that it might be real. Or, you can stick it between the two windows, which never looks real. So, we actually are going a bit that, because again it gets to this idea of quality.

So, here's our little thing about recess. And we get into things like balconies and overhangs. Outdoor space and the quality of outdoor space. And we went through this, this whole thing about materials, which I'll skip.

Parking and service is a huge issue, and I think we saw that everywhere we went on our tour, for example. And, one of the things we try to do is get some reveal on the garage door and not have prominent garage doors facing the streets, things like that. So, we give good examples and bad examples. We don't two door garages, like, the double doors. It's not a very friendly thing. I'd rather have two single doors next to each other, for example. We even get into questions of landscaping in the parking and the relationship of parking to the units, etc.

Going to retail, we talk about the frontages, the entries, the minimum amount of transparency, the types of materials that are appropriate, and again, some ideas about how to use them. How we might use awnings and marquees. You'd be surprised how many mistakes people make with awnings. Like, vinyl awnings with backlit signs. Like, who does that sort of thing? So, we try to write some things to prevent some of those really bad mistakes.

Then signage. What is appropriate signage? What's the right size? What's it oriented to? How does it work with the overall design of the building? And then lighting, integral to the design of the building.

This is an important section...

Chair Fiddaman: One of my questions has been how do we get the best looking Costco in the country? And does it have to have a red band around it?

Evan: Well, if the phone calls I've had with them are to be believed, I think the answer's yes. I mean, they've been pretty adamant about what flexibility they have and what flexibility they haven't. We tried to be responsive to that, but actually write guidelines that are maybe a little bit more tight than what they typically would do. Trying to raise it up. I mean, fortunately we're dealing with Costco, not Walmart.

Commissioner Phillips: That's a blessing.

Evan: What?

Commissioner Phillips: Nothing.

Evan: This section is kind of a standalone section because the Costco site, the large form retail site, is not... we don't have a form-based code for it. It's kind of a singular section on the site and on the document so that Costco itself is only subject to this one chapter.

Part of why we did that is, for example, in parking lots, in landscaping also on the site, we are far more restrictive and descriptive. So, we are very much like, "You have to do this. We want this. We want this landscape and we want this parking. We want this stormwater treatment, blah blah blah." And it's a lot of things that are far beyond what Costco would do. So, instead of bringing everything to the Costco level, we said let's make Costco be a separate thing and let's hold everything else to this different standard.

So, this chapter is the only chapter that applies Costco. It's something to keep in mind when you read the chapter. And we've done everything we can to try to raise that level of quality. I will say they've been very responsive. We've had a lot of very good conversations with them and I've been very encouraged by that.

Commissioner Phillips: But shouldn't we set standards? I mean, that, to me, seems very odd that we would set a specific set of standards that were different than what we would expect if somebody else went in there. To me, there's a little bit of dissonance there.

Evan: It's a good question. If, for some reason Costco went under, and Walmart came here. This set of standards would be ten times tighter than anything Walmart would ever want to do. So, you've raised the bar for a typical... Even Target. This is way more than what a Target would do. So, I mean, fortunately you have the best of the bunch interested in your site. The most willing to do... they are the most willing to do sustainable parking, sustainable landscape, active frontage, good signage, interesting materials, good facades, etc. So the guidelines that we wrote are working with them, but if anybody else came in this would be, like, above and beyond anything they'd ever to do. So, in a sense, you've set a higher bar because you're working with someone who is willing to set that higher bar.

Commissioner Phillips: Yeah, but you've had to lower the bar from what you normally would have...

Evan: Yeah. Because it's such a special beast, right? The parking is so special there. Like, what we can do on a 20 car lot is a lot different than what we're going to do in a 300 car lot. So, we wanted to make sure that we will had these super high standards for the 20 car lot, recognizing that some of those things, a lot of those things we'd never be able to pull off in a 300 car lot because you'd lose so much parking efficiency that you'd need a lot twice as big just to do some of those things that you'd want to do. And you'd have a problem with Costco, for example, if you wanted to do permeable pavement, which will get destroyed by their semi trucks coming in. So, instead of not requiring permeable pavement on the 20 car lot, we just made it separate. It's a balance.

So, we spent a lot of time dealing with form and orientation for Costco. You're talking about, for example, how do you conceal a really big flat roof? How do you make a prominent entry? You'll notice prominent entries are not something that big retail stores typically do in this way, but Costco, fortunately, does. We've also spent a lot of time thinking about materials and thinking about how we encourage them to use materials that are appropriate to the site. Things that we found on site or things that suggest a type of character of the site. We even spent a lot of with them thinking about how you take a big long walk and getting it, to starting to read, in smaller pieces, right?

Commissioner Phillips: You put a red stripe on it.

Evan: Yeah, exactly. And even now we can start to create some more public sense of the front door, so it's not just a bunch of shopping carts. I'll read through them.

Commissioner Scott: Evan, I guess I didn't really have a question on that, but it was more of a comment. I'm sure that Costco's aware that, you know, despite their standards of red lines around the building and so forth, that even without that, this is going to be, possibly, the most visible building in our entire county. And it's only... it's the only building that will be visible from our primary thoroughfare, Highway 29, in both directions. And that's relatively unusual. And, of course, it's a very centralized site as well as both an

entry and a departure from the county. And so, I think that whatever standards we can hold them to, we should stretch.

Commissioner Huether: If I could. Which would include signage.

Evan: Yeah, so we, like, we wrote things about not having backlit or moving or neon signage and things like that, to try to keep it more subdued, so that you don't end up with that, sort of, big plastic thing with the little light behind it. It's not allowed, as per the guidelines.

So we also have guidelines for offices. There are, I think, two or three sites on the northern part of the site that are for commercial. And so we have, talk about simple things about offices, recognizing that these are not big and large office building, these are small little boutiquey office buildings, right? Frontages and entries. How the facade is composed. The materials and details. There's also a whole section about, that in fact, the office is going to have to provide all of its parking on its lot. There's a way to combine parking. So, otherwise, if every office building had to provide it's own parking on it's lot, then you'd end up with a very small building and a very big parking lot, which is not very friendly. If we can aggregate the parking, we can create better conditions.

Chair Fiddaman: So, I was going to ask that. Is that why you've anticipated a parking garage? And is there a location specified for that? Or would it just be up to the market to determine how that would relate to different office buildings?

Evan: No. We have not specified a location.

Rick Tooker: We were just talking on that briefly on the side. A development plan issue is going to be draw that out. Because that's a question we had at the city had, about the parking garage. When does it trigger? Because it doesn't necessarily have to be a part of this if each of the land uses properly provide parking. But, if it is triggered, where ought it be triggered? I think, in the early proposal, there were multiple locations. And so we'll work that out in the development plan. And then as that come back to the commission you'll be able to integrate that with the design.

Chair Fiddaman: Yeah, I started to get curious when I saw all that in there because none of this applies to the sixty or seventy acres that's set aside with industrial zoning. Is that correct?

Eleanor: Right.

Chair Fiddaman: That would all be dealt with later, right?

Larry Florin: Another development plan question. Because, yeah, that area that's the nineteen acres, that's left to be, what do you call it, in the county study area. And then the area to the north of the Costco are areas that are open and we're currently discussing how best to handle those. Certainly the area that's the... was once an option for the school site? We think that will be, actually, outside of the Napa Pipe site. But that particular area, if it's left open and there are not design guidelines to manage it, then the question is will design review be triggered if it's in city jurisdiction? Or, ought we to apply those guidelines now to address that site? So, there are still a lot questions that we need to work through.

Evan: So, we also have guidelines for service parking. Which is, as I mentioned, is more stringent than what would be in the Costco site. And guidelines for parking garages, if there are parking garages. And, you know, there are many many beautiful parking garages out there. There are also many many really ugly ones. We tried to encourage towards the beautiful side.

The landscape section is voluminous and very detailed. It's really intent there is that, in fact, the landscape, as we've talked about, is a defining element of this region, of this area, and will be a defining element of this site. And it's really important that public realm landscape and the private realm landscape are in dialogue with each other, if you will. So, these guidelines for the landscape are very detailed about balance and materials and plants and locations and things like that. And that was intentional because there's such a strong landscape vision for this site. And, you know, setback areas contribute to that story.

Chair Fiddaman: Is requiring two foot minimum boxed trees a reasonable requirement in this day and age? I mean, I noticed, somewhere in there...

Evan: 24 inch.

Chair Fiddaman: The smallest trees that are allowed are two foot boxed, and some of them are three foot boxed, I think, in front yards.

Evan: You know, a 24 inch box is not a very big tree, you know? I my... our general experiences, the bigger box, the better chance it has to live. So, the issue is because a 36 inch box is a pretty darn expensive tree. A 24 inch box, not as bad. And, you know, when you start to get smaller than that they're pretty darn spindly, and it's really hard for them to take, particularly in this climate. But that's our experience.

Eleanor: Just to elaborate on that a little bit. All of the streets in the public realm have a significant planting plan that's related to street trees. And so, a lot of the restrictions in front setbacks regarding trees are because there's an idea that within front setbacks in the residential, the street trees and the trees in the front setback are trying to compete. And so, side setback... And, i'm speaking on behalf of Oland at this point, that trees in side setback and rear setbacks have more latitude. But those with front setbacks are smaller, because there is a significantly large street tree along the sidewalk.

Chair Fiddaman: I agree, you know, two foot or three foot trees are better. Another question?

Commissioner Huether: Yes, please. Can you go back one? So, this is as good of a time as any because it looks like you're getting down to the bottom of your list. We have landscape and streetscapes and all that. And, I already know the answer. So, there's probably no should or shalls about any kind of art component? Public art of any kind?

Chair Fiddaman: Hubcaps on every garage.

Commissioner Huether: Yeah, right. I wouldn't recommend it. I mean it's, you know, disappointing, but not surprising. But, don't know if I should be look at you or looking at this table. But, as you know, the city has a public art ordinance. And, not that the county are art haters, but they don't have an art ordinance. And, for all these wonderful things that we're talking about and quality of life and good architecture and landscape... And, you know, we're trying to create an incredible community that we're all going to be very

proud of having had something to do with. I'm, again, not surprised, but disappointed that there isn't any kind of public art program of any kind. That I've read anywhere, anyways.

Rick Tooker: Let me respond just respond, at least on the city staff's part. Because we do have that ordinance. And, the ordinance, coincidentally, for the county folks, is for nonresidential development. So, in our comments on the development plan, which on... in the public realm, we've absolutely established that there ought to be at least some presentation in the plan itself of where the art will be. We can't decide at this early stage what the art will be, right?

Commissioner Huether: Oh, of course not.

Rick Tooker: So, we have put that in there. It will also be a development agreement issue.

In terms of the private realm, if you will. The area that's on the lots or the parcels. Because we don't have a residential art policy we haven't pressed that issue. But we do for the non-residential.

Commissioner Huether: Okay, so, it would be at least great if you could have a shall. Well, not shall, excuse me... well, yeah, great. Should, or maybe it would be a 'great idea' category. I know there's probably no roundabouts and whatnot, but there's certainly gateways and that sort of thing that would just kind of reinforce the idea of neighborhood.

And I know that the city's public art ordinance is not tied to residential in any way. But, I'm not sure who was saying it earlier, but this is a one shot, kind of... we're never going to see a project of this magnitude ever again. So, I think that kind of, the typical way we do things, and we're not doing it the typical way that we do things. We might want to look at that a little bit different. And, Larry, did you want to say something for the county on how much you love art?

Larry Florin: Thank you for your input, Commissioner Huether.

Commissioner Huether: I'll get to you later, Larry.

Larry Florin: No, seriously. Duly noted. This, I think, will be appropriate in the development agreement. It's not currently in the term sheet that we're using as the guidelines for the development agreement, but it's certainly noted and something we'll have to discuss with the developer.

Commissioner Huether: That would be great, thanks.

Commissioner Scott: I was just going to add that public art, any public art that we provide, to some degree, should be consistent with what is there. In terms of that, oh... the crane and the artifacts and the steel structures that remain, and so forth. That, in itself, gives at least a hint. And I think that we could enhance that.

Commissioner Huether: Amen. Thank you.

Chair Fiddaman: Was it Matt? or Tom?

Tom: Thank you. Evan, could you elaborate a little bit on landscape? And I'll give you some questions that I have. These are not going to be very... real expensive units. And, somebody's going to come up with a landscape plan. And a lot of times you see it where it's extremely boring. We've always asked for extrascaping. You know, low water maintenance plants. But a lot of times in the kinds of developments they'll have this plant and this plant and this plant. And there will be one person that lays the plants out in a configuration. And then there are a couple of guys that are planting the plants. And there's a guy doing the sprinkler system. And one guy picks up the plant and moves it over here to put his drip irrigation in. And the guy that's planting the plant sees the plant there and plants it right there. And I can show you examples of that in Napa where that's happened, and it's awful. So, what are you going to do so that doesn't happen.

Commissioner Phillips: We need to do landscape maintenance and design review now.

Evan: Yeah, exactly.

Tom: And enforcement.

Chair Fiddaman: Let's start with, well, contractors with triple digit IQ's.

Evan: I'm not sure how to answer that. I mean, we try to write the guidelines to tell people how to do it. And the best practice for how to install the tree, you'll even see, like, tree staking diagrams and things like that. But, like, those sort of mistakes that people make in carrying out design, which are, in a sense, mistakes in construction administration.

You stumped me, I'm not sure how to deal with that.

Larry Florin: I can tell you how it's supposed to work. And it doesn't always work this way. Depending on the scale, it's changeable. But, ideally, when a project is approved and the plan check occurs, the building permit's issued and the inspections occur. Along the way, when you have a rhythm of windows that's consistent with the design guidelines, and, for whatever reason, they're framed differently. Ideally, you want your inspectors to come back to a project planner and say, "Hey, there was a change in the field. Before I complete my correction notice, let me know if this is one of those dealbreakers that's inconsistent with the plan." And, maybe that means we call the town architect and we say, 'help.'

Ultimately, when you get to the end of the project you're supposed to do the same thing. You're supposed to take the plans out, that includes the landscaping plan, a lighting plan, the architectural drawings, and you're supposed to walk around the elevations and you're supposed to look at the site plan to make certain that that kind of thing doesn't happen. It works often, but it often... Or, I should say, it works often but occasionally there will be bumps in the road.

Tom: Excuse me, Chair. This is going to be done on a very low budget. You know, we're painting a really pretty picture right now. But reality is, they're going to get the cheapest landscaper they can get. They're going to get the cheapest plants they can get. And, you know, you were just talking about how this was going to enhance the project. And so I think it's important that this is addressed.

Evan: I agree. I mean, we've set very high standards for the landscape. And we've worked very very close with Keith's landscape architect, who wrote the bulk of the landscape section. And the idea was to

have the same high standards for the private landscape that are being established for the public landscape. Obviously, implementation is a key part of that.

Chair Fiddaman: Mr. Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: Thank you, Chair. When we had the tour that Keith conducted on the site I was excited as he pointed out all the material, all the raw material, sitting on the site. And that it's supposed to be reused in the landscape. In, you know, and hardscape, and maybe, treatment details along walkways. That sort of thing. And, possibly, that sort of bridges, you know, the gap of art and maybe using some of the raw material that's on site to do the artwork, and also to work it into, you know, the overall hardscape and the landscape. And I think it's going to be very exciting. And, you know, my plug is to make sure that, you know, we have that material. So, let's make sure that gets worked into, you know, the overall project.

Chair Fiddaman: Alright, I guess I would ask... I mean, it's almost 7:15. I think we've done a yeoman's job here, frankly, myself. I mean, there's been a lot of interest. And, frankly, I think you've done a yeoman's job in terms of presenting this, I mean. (Claps).

You know, I mean, we have lots of questions and issues to deal with. But from my own experiences this would be, by far, the kind of best planned and regulated kind of project I've ever seen. So, I'm quite impressed with it. I think it's going to have some tweaks to be done to it. I think we all need to spend some time analyzing the matrix of real requirements. The shalls, as opposed to the, you know, we'd like you to do this. But... We've got some other closing comments here, but I'm sensing myself that we're probably at a point where we could give it up for this evening. Commissioner Scott.

Commissioner Scott: Yeah. I just want to address the landscaping issue. I understand that contracting goes, as Commissioner Huether mentioned. You tend to go to the least expensive...

Commissioner Huether: That was Tom.

Commissioner Scott: Or Tom, in this case, Yeah.

Commissioner Huether: I usually buy them at Costco.

Commissioner Scott: Neighborhood discount, yeah. But, in terms of landscaping. One thing that I think... is that important. Since this thing is going to take place in phases. The market rate housing in the later phases is going to be more or less attractive based on the landscaping and the development of the amenities to this, you know. to the overall walkable community that we're trying to create. So, it's really in the developer's best interest to do a better job with the landscaping early on because it's going to be more attractive to potential buyers in the future. And since we have got several phases of future buyers coming along, I think that that's something that will be helpful in the process.

Chair Fiddaman: At the risk of extending this meeting a little bit. This is not a public hearing, but normally as a courtesy, we invite anybody in the audience who has something to say about what we've talked about here tonight, to do that. So, if somebody would like to address our two commissions, feel welcome. I see no one. I think, are we at a point where... Evan.

Evan: I just want to make a quick summary, which is it's been a real pleasure working on this so far and I really take all of your comments to heart. I think the more questions we have and the more critical we are at this stage, it ensures us that we'll get a better document. And so keep those questions coming. Keep those comments coming. Obviously, I want to do this in perpetuity, but we do want to make sure we get a good document. And I also want to say that working with Keith and his team and Costco and the city and the county, it's been a real collegial and collaborative process. And that doesn't often happen. So, it's been really great. We could not have developed 240 pages if we weren't all working together. Now, if we've developed the right 240 pages? And that's what we'll spend the next however many months, short time, trying to do. So, thank you. And thank you for your kind words. We really appreciate it.

Eleanor: Yeah, thank you very much.

Chair Fiddaman: Thank you.

UNNAMED: Well, 240 pages is typically the appendices of most Napa Pipe documents that we had to look at. So, this is refreshing, yeah.

Chair Fiddaman: So, we will adjourn the Napa County Planning Commission.

Chair Russa: Can I get a motion to adjourn the Napa City Planning Commission? Second? Thank you.