



City of Sebastopol
Incorporated 1902

Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472
707-823-6167

707-823-1135 (Fax)

www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us

Email: jatkinson@cityofsebastopol.org

APPROVED MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF April 20, 2016

SEBASTOPOL CITY HALL
CONFERENCE ROOM
7120 BODEGA AVENUE
4:00 P.M.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:

The notice of the meeting was posted on April 14, 2016.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Luthin called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Ted Luthin, Chair
Lynn Deedler, Vice Chair
Bill Shortridge, Board Member
Cary Bush, Board Member

Absent: Christine Level, Board Member (excused)
Alexis Persinger, Board Member (excused)

Staff: Jonathan Atkinson, Assistant Planner
Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 16, 2016

Board Member Bush made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

Board Member Shortridge seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Deedler and Board Members Shortridge and Bush

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATES:

Assistant Planner Atkinson provided the following updates:

- The City of Sebastopol will be commissioning a public art project for placement on City property, and has issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for artists, preferably with public art experience. Following the RFQ process, up to three artists will be selected to submit proposals, then one will be selected for the project. May 16, 2016 is the

deadline to respond to the RFQ. The RFQ is available for public review on the City's website on the homepage.

The Board had no questions for staff.

5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: There were none.

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Board Member Bush recused himself from Item 8C due to a conflict.

7. CONSENT CALENDER: There were none.

8. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. MINOR SIGN REVIEW – Patterson Automotive (Project 2016-29) – This is an application, submitted by Jayme and Jennifer Patterson, requesting approval to install two signs for Patterson Automotive, an automotive repair and service shop, at 720 South Main Street.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report.

The Board had no questions for staff.

The applicants, Jayme and Jennifer Patterson, gave a presentation and were available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. and Mrs. Patterson.

During questions of the applicant, comments from the Board included:

Chair Luthin commented:

- This is a great location for an auto repair shop.
- White is the best color choice when being set against wood because the wood will go dark and the type, if thick and pinned off, will cast shadows, which will make the surface even darker.
- Aluminum would be a good material to use because it is light, easy to work with, will not rust, can be router cut in any font, and if ½" thick, they can drill and tap the back of it so it can be stud mounted.
- If ½" thick with a type thick enough, acrylic could be a good material to use as well. With a painted finish, it will last perfectly outside. It can be laser cut for any font and can be drilled and tapped for stud mounting.
- Does not recommend the use of steel.
- A thicker font will create depth.
- A nice, crisp letter against reclaimed wood will look really nice.
- Suggested using a font like 'Bookman'.
- An almost white, warm gray color would look good on the building.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- The type was being lost with the grain of the wood a little bit.
- The sign would benefit from a thicker typeface.
- Suggested using a font like 'Sans Serif'.
- The direction of the wood, vertical on the fence and horizontal on the sign, is a little jarring.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- Seconded the comment about aluminum being a good material choice.
- White on old wood looks harsh.
- Agreed that the letters should be bulked up a bit.

Board Member Bush commented:

- A trim strip on the rear yard fence could help with the conflict between the vertical boards on the fence and the horizontal boards on the sign.
- Using a darker stain on the top and bottom trim could help too.

Chair Luthin asked if members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Hearing none, Chair Luthin asked to hear from the Board on this application.

Board Member Bush commented:

- Likes the proposal.
- Expressed being happy for the applicants and an appreciation for their work.
- Fond of the signs.
- The signs seem to be in scale given what was there before.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Staff calls this a minor review, but it is not minor.
- The submittal does not reflect what will actually be installed.
- Readability of the sign is key.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- Board Member Shortridge's comments were astute.
- Expressed having no issue with the proposal.
- Suggested that the applicants contact Chair Luthin or Board Member Shortridge and ask them to take a second look when they further refine the sign because they have an eye for it.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Agrees with all of what has been said.
- Would love to see the exact proposal.
- In talking about the details, the applicant appears to be on the right track.
- Expressed having no issue with the proposal.
- Would be willing to take a second look outside of this process when the design gets further refined.

Vice Chair Deedler made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Deedler and Board Members Shortridge and Bush

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

B. MINOR DESIGN REVIEW – Single-Family Residence (Project #2016-15) – This is an application, submitted by Malcolm O’Meara and Tara Caffrey, requesting approval to develop a single-family residence at 7584 Washington Avenue.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of staff.

Richard Pate, the project architect, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Pate as well as property owners, Mr. O’Meara and Ms. Caffrey.

Chair Luthin asked if members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Hearing none, Chair Luthin brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- The white color appears to be a little too bright for this woodsy environment.
- The style of the house seems appropriate for the location.
- The residence is in a location where the owners will see it more than anyone else, and so it will not have a real impact on the community.
- Given that it will have no real impact on the community he did not want to make any judgments other than a recommendation on the color.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Nothing was jarring to him.
- Likes the proposal and thinks it works.

Board Member Bush commented:

- As someone who lives on a hill, he recognizes the value of deck space and agreed that it would be nice to have.
- The colors are appropriate and safe.
- Toning back the trim on the windows is a good idea.
- This is a fitting home that is nestled pretty well into the hillside.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Mixed on the proposal.
- Visually, this is a 3-story house on a hill, and will look massive.
- Questioned the argument of this being a 2-story residence.
- The rear elevation looks like an afterthought.
- In general, this feels like an early 1970’s hillside house in Guerneville.
- Not sure that this fits in with the neighborhood.
- The residence is set back from the street.
- The drawings are deceiving.
- Expressed feeling more comfortable with the massing after sketching it out.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Bothered by all of the different angles of the roof, particularly on the west side.

The Board agreed.

The Board asked additional questions of the applicant.

Chair Luthin commented that it sounded like the Board was generally okay with the application and asked if anyone wished to make a motion.

Vice Chair Deedler made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Deedler and Board Member Shortridge

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Board Member Bush excused himself from the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

C. MINOR DESIGN REVIEW – Sushi Tozai (Project #2016-16) – This is an application, submitted by Steven Zhao of Sushi Tozai, requesting approval to make façade improvements to an existing commercial building at 7531 Healdsburg Avenue.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report.

The Board had no questions for staff.

A representative of the applicant, Craig Boblitt, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Boblitt.

Chair Luthin asked if members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Hearing none, Chair Luthin brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- This is not compatible with the neighborhood and is therefore, not appropriate.
- White on white, especially under the sun, is harsh.
- Calmer, earthier colors are used all along Healdsburg Avenue.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Hoped that the color would be toned down some.
- This building has been white on white for so long.

Chair Deedler commented that the building has an oddball roofline and this will accentuate that.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Agreed with what had been said.
- Historically this has been white on white.
- White on white would not be his first choice.
- This lacks richness and warmth, especially for a restaurant.
- The white panels will be very hard to keep clean.
- Not sure he is ready to tell people what color they need to paint their buildings.
- Sebastopol has an eclectic mix.

- In representing the community, he would rather not dictate the color and allow some creativity.

Board Member Shortridge commented that this is a lost opportunity.

Chair Luthin agreed that this was a lost opportunity.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Agrees with Chair Luthin.
- This could have been a chance to add more color and inventive texture.
- This could have been a great improvement.
- The look of the building has always been a nuisance to him personally.
- Our guidelines do not say that what the applicant wants to do is wrong.

Chair Deedler reiterated that this is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Board Member Shortridge commented that this was a lateral move, not an improvement.

Chair Luthin agreed.

Board Member Shortridge made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Chair Luthin seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin and Board Member Shortridge

NOES: Vice Chair Deedler

ABSTAIN: None

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS: None

10. REPORTS FROM THE BOARD/STAFF: None

11. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting of the Design Review Board at 4:56 p.m. to the next Design Review Board meeting to be held May 04, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Jonathan Atkinson
Assistant Planner