



**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](http://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us)

Email: [jatkinson@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:jatkinson@cityofsebastopol.org)

**UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES**

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF April 06, 2016

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

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on March 31, 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  
Alexis Persinger, Board Member

**Absent:** Christine Level, Board Member (excused)  
Cary Bush, Board Member (excused)

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

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** March 02, 2016

Vice Chair Deedler amended the minutes.

Vice Chair Deedler made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Board Member Shortridge seconded the motion.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Board Member Persinger

**4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATES:**

Assistant Planner Atkinson provided the following updates:

- The draft Climate Action Plan 2020 is available for public review. It has been prepared in an inter-jurisdictional, collaborative process with the County, and all of the cities in Sonoma County have worked together to produce the draft. Santa Rosa was not part of

this process because they already adopted a plan. Each jurisdiction has its own policy section and will decide which policy actions they wish to adopt. The Sebastopol section is on pages 5-83. There will be a joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at the Youth Annex (425 Morris Street) at 7:00 p.m. to receive an informational presentation on the draft.

- 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 asked questions of staff.

**5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:** None

- 6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** Board Member Bush was absent due to a conflict with all three items on the agenda. Board Member Persinger recused himself from Items 8A and 8B due to a proximity conflict.

**7. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- A. 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.

Vice Chair Deedler requested that this item be taken off the Consent Calendar.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report.

The Board had no questions for staff.

The applicant was not present.

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:

- Expressed being opposed to the glossy 'snowdrift white' color of the roof.
- The applicant has already begun installation of the panels.
- This building has a white roof and white walls.
- The panels have a very flat surface and are highly reflective.
- A glaringly white roof on a white building looks out of place, is harsh to look at and has no relationship or comfort to it.
- Cannot approve this application as submitted.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Expressed having an issue with the color of the roof as well.
- Wished the applicant were here so he could ask questions of him.

- This is a great opportunity to spruce up the building and the land, especially considering what is going on around it.

Board Member Persinger commented:

- Expressed not being troubled by the white panels that have begun being installed and though they were kind of fun.
- It is odd that they appear to be installing a different color than what is indicated in the submittal.
- Tempted to approve the application as submitted.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Expressed feeling similarly to Board Member Persinger.
- Saw the colors of the panels being installed and was surprised that they appeared more white than the 'sandstone' color that was indicated in the submittal.
- Would go with something richer and more elegant if it was his building.
- The building itself is challenging.
- Questioned the Board's authority to dictate colors.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- In all fairness to the property owner, a representative should be here to answer questions before the Board acts to approve or deny this project.
- Aside from the inconsistencies that had been noted, he expressed being fine with the application.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- In response to Chair Luthin's comment, he responded that color is within the Board's purview.
- There is a certain harmony that we want in town.
- The color that is being installed is harsh and does not fit.

Chair Luthin commented:

- The building has historically been white on white and will continue to be so.
- Open to continuing this application in hopes that the applicant or his representative can attend and answer questions at a future meeting.

Board Member Persinger commented:

- The sometimes crazy, shocking and uncomfortable colors often work in Sebastopol.
- Was glad to see that the applicant was doing something other than the 'sandstone' that was shown in the application.

Board Member Shortridge commented that he did not have a problem with an all-white building. However, due to the inconsistencies between the application and what appeared to be installed, he wanted the opportunity to get clarification from the applicant or his representative.

Chair Luthin asked if anyone wished to make a motion.

Board Member Persinger made a motion to approve the installation of the 'snowdrift white' panels.

Chair Luthin seconded the motion with the comment that he would be in support of approving whatever is up on the building currently.

Board Member Persinger concurred and commented that that was the intent of his motion.

Board Member Shortridge commented that approving installation of something that was not consistent with what had been submitted in the application flies in the face of the process.

Board Member Persinger withdrew his motion.

Board Member Shortridge made a motion to continue the application to allow the Board to receive additional information from the applicant.

Vice Chair Deedler seconded the motion.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

## **8. REGULAR AGENDA:**

- A. MINOR SIGN REVIEW – Hippizzazz (Project 2016-20)** – This is an application, submitted by Alex Britton, requesting approval to install two signs for Hippizzazz, a proposed pizzeria, at 280 South Main Street.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report.

The Board had no questions for staff.

The applicant, Alex Britton, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Britton.

Chair Luthin asked to hear from the Board on this application.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- The address on the pole sign will be too small to read from the street.
- Would like to see both signs externally illuminated.
- Likes the wall sign a lot.
- The blackness of the pole sign fights the bold, clean, crisp look of the wall sign.
- Questions the readability of the pole sign, especially if externally lit.
- No issue with the size of the signs.
- Biggest issue is with the lack of harmony between the two signs.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Agreed with Board Member Shortridge.
- These two signs look like they are representing two different businesses.
- The black with the color could be striking but the color has got to get a lot of thicker to read.
- 'Hippizzazz' is a cool and clever name.
- There is real value in using the word 'pizza' from a brand standpoint.
- Expressed being okay with having the address on the pole sign and commented that it may be helpful to have, especially because the building is set back from the street quite a bit.

- No issue with the size of the signs.
- Encouraged having the signs nicely crafted because it will directly relate to the quality level of the product served.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- Seconded everything that had been said by Chair Luthin and Board Member Shortridge.
- The success of the business will directly relate to the effectiveness of the signs.
- Agreed that the black background would not illuminate and would not be readable with the thinness and weakness of the proposed red letters.
- The boldness of the red and white wall sign is simple, yet great.
- Does not have an issue with internally illuminating the pole sign since it is already set up for such illumination.
- The name of the business is a tangle.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- External illumination will help to illuminate that corner.
- Encouraged continuity with the white, simple, block look of the wall sign on the street sign.

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

Ila Benavidez-Heaster, 7777 Bodega Avenue, commented:

- Commended the applicant for trying something different and working with what they have.
- It is really important to do things differently sometimes.
- We need to create allowances for differences and be more inclusive.
- We do not want to stagnate.
- The business name is something new and it has rhythm and a cadence to it.

Len Oaks, a resident of Sebastopol, commented:

- Loves the color and the liveliness of the sign.
- Unpronounceable names generate interest.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Luthin brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Chair Luthin agreed on the interest of the name 'Hippizzazz'.

Vice Chair Deedler commented that the Board had given consistent advice but that the application should be continued with clear direction.

Chair Luthin commented that he would prefer external illumination of the pole sign but if internally illuminated, he would prefer to only see the letters illuminated; not the background.

Vice Chair Deedler agreed with Chair Luthin's comment.

Board Member Shortridge commented that he would like to see external illumination and continuity between the two signs.

Chair Luthin commented that he would support external illumination of the two signs.

Vice Chair Deedler commented that requiring external illumination of the pole sign would be onerous for such a small business.

Vice Chair Deedler made a motion to continue this application to allow the applicant to respond to comments from the Board.

Board Member Shortridge seconded the motion.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Mr. Britton asked a clarifying question of the Board.

**B. MINOR DESIGN REVIEW – Façade Improvements (Project 2016-06)** – This is an application, submitted by Peter Stanley, requesting approval to make façade improvements to an existing mixed-use building at 124 South Main Street.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report.

The Board had no questions for staff.

The applicant, Peter Stanley, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Stanley.

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:

- Delighted with everything.
- Installation of the roll-up door is really cool.
- Would like 1' added to the wall on the side of the door to give it a more comfortable feel.
- Fine with the application.

Board Member Shortridge asked an additional question of Mr. Stanley.

Board Member Shortridge commented:

- Fine with the application.
- The proposal is great.
- Exposing the brick would be cool.

Chair Luthin commented:

- This is exciting to see.
- Will be nice to have some light in the bar space.
- Likes the windows.
- Loves the roll-up door.
- Graphics in the transom window could help to resolve the issue with the position of the door.
- Expressed being okay with the door where proposed.
- The awnings could use a refresh.

The Board asked additional questions of the applicant.

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

Vice Chair Deedler seconded the motion.

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

NOES: None

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 5:20 p.m. to the next Design Review Board meeting to be held April 20, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Jonathan Atkinson  
Assistant Planner