



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 JUNE 15, 2016

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

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:

The notice of the meeting was posted on June 09, 2016.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Luthin called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Ted Luthin, Chair
Cary Bush, Vice Chair
Lynn Deedler, Board Member
Christine Level, Board Member

Absent: Alexis Persinger, Board Member (excused)

Staff: Jonathan Atkinson, Assistant Planner
Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician
Becky Duckles, City Arborist

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 18, 2016 and June 01, 2016

Vice Chair Bush made a motion to approve the minutes of May 18, 2016 as submitted.

Board Member Level seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Bush, and Board Member Level

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Board Member Deedler

Board Members Deedler and Level amended the minutes of June 01, 2016

Vice Chair Bush made a motion to approve the minutes of June 01, 2016 as amended.

Board Member Deedler seconded the motion.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Board Member Level

- 4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATES:** There were none.
- 5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:** There were none.
- 6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** There were none.
- 7. CONSENT CALENDER:** There were none.
- 8. REGULAR AGENDA:**

- A. DESIGN REVIEW – Mixed-Use Development (Project 2016-30) –** This is an application, submitted by Katherine Austin, requesting approval for a mixed-use development at 7631 Healdsburg Avenue.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of staff.

The applicant, Katherine Austin, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

Landscape Architect, Parker Smith, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Ms. Austin and Mr. Smith.

Chair Luthin asked to hear from Ms. Duckles on moving the single-family residence forward 3 feet.

Ms. Duckles gave a presentation and was available for questions.

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.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- Glad that rolling-style bike racks are not being proposed.
- Expressed being really impressed with this application overall.
- This is one of the most thorough, well thought out applications he had seen in a decade.
- Pleased with the sensitivity with which the owners are using the property.
- Really likes the plan overall.
- Between the commercial building and the single-family residence, too much 'Edgecomb Gray' is being proposed.
- Because the single-family residence is tucked back, 'Chelsea Gray' may be a better color choice because it would help it recede, environmentally.
- Expressed having no issue with the uphill side being without a fence and commented that it looked a lot nicer being open, as proposed.
- Expressed having no issue with the garage encroaching three feet into the rear-yard setback.

Board Member Level commented:

- Appreciates the juxtaposition of the two building types.
- Expressed having no issue with there being no fence in the back and commented that she liked the landscaping there.
- Really lush landscaping would make this project even better.
- Cautioned the use of a light color on these buildings as they are in a high traffic environment and soot buildup will show up really quickly.
- Colors can have a huge impact on human experience and emotion.
- Would like for the residence and the commercial building to be painted different colors.
- Likes the juxtaposition of colors used for the project next to Sebastopol Blue that Ms. Austin did.
- While she would not condition a change in colors, she urged the applicant to consider one.
- This is a great project.
- Really likes this project.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Thanked the applicants for bringing this application forward.
- Acknowledged and appreciated the amount of work, effort, and money that has gone into this project.
- This project seems like a very safe example of what has been done in Sebastopol already.
- Looking for technology and innovation for this mixed-use site.
- This is a safe project.
- No cause for denial.
- The commercial building reads more like a duplex building.
- The planter beds are quite tight.
- This project almost reads like two separate lots.
- The project should read as more of a unit.
- The biggest asset is the large Valley Oak that is being retained.
- The color scheme is timeless.
- This project does not have room to mitigate rainwater roof catchment and runoff.
- Looking for technological advances that are seen in today's modern architecture.
- Not seeing a push-pull play on materials.
- The planting is well thought out but could stand to be simplified some.
- Simplifying the landscape could save on maintenance as well.
- Likes pushing natives and low water use plants.

Board Member Deedler asked Vice Chair Bush to expound on his comments on the landscape plan.

Vice Chair Bush responded:

- This is a foundation-planting plan and there is a lot of layering within the planting areas.
- Complimented the use of certain plants.
- Spoke on future maintenance.

Mr. Smith and Ms. Austin responded to Vice Chair Bush's comments.

Board Member Deedler referred to Board Member Level's comments about wanting a more intensive landscape and commented:

- The Valley Oak is proposed to have bark under it.

- The Valley Oaks on his property have lots of things growing underneath them.
- Plantings under the Valley Oak would be a lot more interesting than just bark.

Vice Chair Bush responded:

- Placing bark under the Valley Oak was the safest thing to do for the health of the tree.
- A true garden develops over time.
- Gardens can be quite difficult to develop.
- The planting plan is thoughtful.
- Not intending to criticize Ms. Austin's client's program.
- This project will be a lovely asset to the corner of Healdsburg Avenue and Murphy Avenue.
- Has been the applicant in this type of situation before.
- Comments are not personal.
- Appreciates what the applicant has put forth.

Board Member Level asked Vice Chair Bush to elaborate on what he meant by calling this a 'safe' project.

Vice Chair Bush responded:

- This is traditional architecture.
- Foundation plantings are the American landscape.
- This project is very much what has already been done.
- Modern architecture is a push-pull play on materials.
- Modern architecture is not the program chosen by the applicant.

Board Member Level commented:

- We have created such an onerous environment, in terms of all of the systems that we have mandated on the building, that it is almost impossible to move away from what Vice Chair Bush is calling 'safe'.
- These mandates are throwing creativity out the door and are also extremely expensive.
- People are getting boxed in.
- We, as a society, need to think about what we are doing in terms of all of these mandates.
- Would love to see really, super creative buildings everywhere.

Vice Chair Bush responded:

- This project meets the elements and is worthy of approval in terms of the Design Review Board's role.

Board Member Level commented that landscaping and color choice are golden opportunities.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Land planning looks at site development a lot.
- The applicant has addressed site development quite well.

Assistant Planner Atkinson made a few clarifying comments on conditions as listed in the staff report.

Ms. Austin commented that Conditions 38 and 40 are in conflict.

Assistant Planner Atkinson commented that Condition 6. 'The Planning Director shall interpret applicable requirements in the event of any redundancy or conflict in conditions of approval' gives the Planning Director discretion in the event of a conflict.

Chair Luthin commented:

- The comments expressed thus far have been great.
- Expressed feeling similarly to Board Member Deedler.
- Shared some of the same thoughts as Vice Chair Bush.
- When he first saw the proposal, he thought it was for an apartment building with a single-family residence next to it.
- Expected a denser proposal.
- This is a thoughtful proposal.
- Likes the way the project dances around the tree.
- Nice to save the heritage tree.
- Would love to see every project push the boundary of technology and innovation.
- Sometimes a nice, simple, traditional building is good too.
- There is a lot to like with this proposal.
- Likes the color scheme as proposed.
- Expressed being open to a change in colors if that is the consensus of the Board.
- Happy with vegetation being installed, instead of a fence, for screening.
- This is a great application.

Board Member Deedler made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the following:

- Subject to approval by the Planning Director, the applicant has the option to make the house in the rear a darker color.
- Subject to approval by the Planning Director, the applicant has the option of installing a solid wood six (6) foot tall fence, wall, or vegetation for purposes of screening along the rear (southern) and side (eastern) property boundaries.
- The Board is comfortable with recommending approval of a 17' space between the garage and the rear property line to the Commission, should the applicant choose to apply for a variance.
- The Board is amendable to moving the single-family residence forward 3 feet.

Vice Chair Bush seconded the motion.

Board Member Level reiterated her comments about the color scheme.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

- B. SIGN REVIEW – Whole Foods Market (Project 2016-37)** – This is an application submitted by Whole Foods Market, requesting approval to legalize a sign that was installed without a Sign Permit for Whole Body and Whole Foods Market at 6910 McKinley Street.

This application was continued to the meeting of July 06, 2016.

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS: There were none.

11. REPORTS FROM THE BOARD/STAFF: There were none.

12. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting of the Design Review Board at 5:47 p.m. to the next Design Review Board meeting to be held July 06, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Jonathan Atkinson
Assistant Planner