



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: dmorrison@cityofsebastopol.org

APPROVED MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
 CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
 MINUTES OF July 19, 2017

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

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:

The notice of the meeting was posted on July 13, 2017.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Board Member Langberg called the meeting to order at 5:17 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present:	Lars Langberg, Chair Christine Level, Board Member Lynn Deedler, Board Member Gregory Beale, Board Member
Absent:	Ted Luthin, Chair (excused) Cary Bush, Board Member (excused)
Staff:	Dana Morrison, Assistant Planner Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 07, 2017

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

Chair Langberg seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg and Board Members Level and Beale
 NOES: None
 ABSTAIN: Board Member Deedler

4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST: There were none.

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

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST: There were none.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR: There were none.

8. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. MINOR SIGN REVIEW WITH SIGN AMENDMENT: This is a Minor Sign Review application, requesting approval to amend an approved sign program for 100 Brown Street. On December 15, 2004 the Design Review Board approved a sign program for the building. This is a request to amend the sign program to allow for the installation of business identification signs on the building face, rather than just on the awnings; and to allow for the approval of signs which are designed by the individual business owners, rather than in conformance with the prescribed sign program. The applicant is requesting that the entire sign program be removed from the building to allow for each tenant to be subject to the general sign ordinance, sign area, standards based on their business frontage lengths.

Assistant Planner Morrison presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of staff.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- This is clearly a multi-tenant building and should be treated as such.
- Most tenants want draw.
- Tenants come and go.
- We need to frame in and describe a specific area, the same way we do for other multi-tenant buildings.
- This shouldn't be hodgepodge.

Chair Langberg asked Board Member Deedler to stick to questions of staff at this time.

The Board asked additional questions of staff.

Chair Langberg asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

The applicant, Tyler Menne, gave a brief presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Menne.

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

Hearing none, Chair Langberg closed the public comment period and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

The Board asked additional questions of staff.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- This is an excellent opportunity for signage.
- Sebastopol has a number of multi-tenant buildings in town and each one is given a billboard-type space, which has specific parameters for signage including a breakdown per tenant.
- That same thing should be followed here.
- On the side of the building that faces the intersection, he would like to see a specific area predetermined and designated for signage with a per tenant breakdown.
- Would like there to be a specific frame for each tenant.
- Supports the language in our Zoning Ordinance which allows for 100 square feet for multi-tenant buildings.

Chair Langberg commented:

- This is nothing new, there are multi-tenant buildings with signage all over the place.
- It is not up to the Board to design the signs.
- It is the Board's job to come up with the parameters for what type and size of size could be allowed.

Board Member Level commented:

- Generally, the program that staff came up with meets and satisfies the needs of the current tenants.
- Supports the program that staff came up with.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- Understands why staff created the program that they did, however, the Board can make the current tenants happy by creating a framework for the future, as they do for all multi-tenant buildings.

Board Member Level responded:

- Reiterated her support for the framework that was created by staff.
- Agreed that the framework is vague on the placement of the signs on the frontage.

The Board asked clarifying questions.

Board Member Level commented that the program is reasonable.

Chair Langberg commented:

- The proposed amendment is very specific in how it satisfies the current tenants.
- Understands concern regarding specificity given that tenants will change in the future.
- This building is on a prominent site in our downtown.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Menne.

Mr. Menne responded and made clarifying comments.

The Board asked additional questions of staff.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- For consistency with the Zoning Ordinance, the Board should approve 100 square feet of signage for multi-tenant buildings.
- The layout of the signs should not be designed by the Board.
- Given the history of this building, he would like to see the exact layout and positioning of the signs on the building, prior to approval.

Board Member Level expressed a concern with further delaying the applicant's request for signage.

Board Member Deedler commented that he'd be fine with the applicant putting his sign up until a Master Sign Program is created and approved.

Board Member Beale asked a clarifying question and commented:

- Because of the delays, he would like to find a way to satisfy the applicants request so he can put up his signs.

- This issue with the other tenants, and the building as whole, has been going on before this tenant came in.

Board Member Level commented that the Board could allow the applicant to install his sign on the wall which faces the intersection, without committing to an exact placement in relation to other signs in the future.

The Board concurred.

The Board asked clarifying questions.

For the multi-tenant sign, Board Member Deedler made a motion to approve installation of the current sign on the wall facing the intersection, with the following:

- Before any other signs are submitted for that face, a Master Sign Program indicating what is intended shall be submitted and approved by the Board.

Board Member Beale seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg and Board Members Level, Deedler and Beale

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Board Member Deedler commented:

- The placement of the proposed wall sign, being at the corner, is inappropriately located.
- Any other tenant would love to have signage in that prominent location.
- All similar signs should be located next to the door or window of the tenant space.

Staff asked a clarifying questions of Board Member Deedler.

Board Member Deedler amended his motion to include:

- Business location identification wall signs shall be located next to the door or window of the tenant space.
- Specifically, Mr. Menne's 16 square foot identification wall sign shall be located adjacent to the main entrance to the business.

Chair Langberg seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Menne commented:

- Moving the sign next to the entry door to his business will not be adequate enough given the landscaping around the property.
- As is, people cannot see the door to his business let alone a sign that would possibly be located there.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- The sign is visually awkward as proposed.

Chair Langberg commented that the Board could limit the size of the sign.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Menne.

Board Member Beale commented:

- The placement of the sign, compared to window height and awning, feels odd.

- The size of it, compared to the space of the wall, also feels odd.
- Questioned the effectiveness of reducing the sign size.
- With regards to massing, the proposed sign is too large for that corner.

Mr. Menne commented:

- The previous tenant, Matchless Tattoo, had their much larger sign directly above the awning and it was attached to the wall.

Board Member Beale asked staff if that was approved.

Staff responded that it had not been approved.

Board Member Beale commented:

- Placement next to the door is less critical than it being size appropriate.
- Understood the reasoning behind the request.
- His issue was more with the scale of the sign.

Mr. Menne commented:

- The proposed sign does meet regular City standards with regards to its size.
- Changing the location, from what he has requested, will change everything as far as what they can accomplish for his business.

Chair Langberg asked if Mr. Menne would be amenable to reducing the size of the sign to line up with the head of the window and is centered within the wall space.

Mr. Menne stated that he had already tried that exact location and the sign was blocked by the landscaping.

Board Member Level commented that she had no issue with approving the sign for placement in the location as requested by Mr. Menne. She agreed that moving the sign near the door would not be visible.

Board Member Beale asked if members would be amenable to raising the sign higher than where the applicant proposed it. Suggested raising the sign to align the top of it with the top of the awning as it would feel more intentional.

Chair Langberg commented:

- Board Member Beal's suggestion could work.
- Would like for the sign to be a little bit narrower.

Board Member Deedler commented that it will look awkward either way and felt that the sign was too big for that location.

Mr. Menne approached the Board with an image of his tenant space from Google Maps.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Menne.

Chair Langberg commented:

- The landscape can be trimmed back.
- As a consistent sign idea, putting a wall sign by the entry door as a program for the building, is a perfectly reasonable suggestion.
- From the image Mr. Menne passed along, a sign between the entry door and window would be very visible to passersby.

Board Member Beale commented:

- This picture was taken at a level higher than that of an average automobile.

Board Member Level asked how the rest of the Board felt about raising the sign up to match the top of the awning, and narrowing it to have more of a reveal on each side.

Chair Langberg and Board Member Beale expressed being in support of that.

The Board asked questions of staff.

Board Member Level asked if Board Member Deedler would be willing to further amend his amended motion to include:

- The business location identification wall signs shall be located next to the door or window of the tenant with one exception.
- Mr. Menne is allowed to raise the sign up to match the top of the awning with a 6" reveal on either side.

Board Member Deedler declined to further amend his motion as stated by Board Member Level.

The Board asked procedural questions of staff.

Staff read back the motion as amended by Board Member Deedler.

Chair Langberg asked for a vote on the amended motion as stated by Board Member Deedler.

AYES: Board Member Deedler
NOES: Chair Langberg and Board Members Level and Beale
ABSTAIN: None

The motion failed.

Board Member Level made the following motion:

- For the multi-tenant sign; installation of the current sign on the wall facing the intersection is approved, however, before any other signs are submitted for that face, a Master Sign Program indicating what is intended shall be submitted and approved by the Board.
- Business location identification signs shall be location next to the door or window of the tenant space with the following exception:
 - Mr. Menne's 16 square foot identification shall be installed as follows:
 - The top of the sign shall be aligned with the top of the awning with a 6" reveal on either side.

Board Member Beale seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg and Board Members Level and Beale
NOES: Board Member Deedler
ABSTAIN: None

B. MINOR SIGN REVIEW WITH SIGN AMENDMENT: This is a Minor Sign Review application submitted by the Sebastopol Community Cultural Center requesting

approval to install one large wall sign and one area identification sign at their facility located at 390 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA.

Assistant Planner Morrison presented the staff report.

The Board had no questions for staff.

Chair Langberg asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

The applicant, Diana Rich, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Ms. Rich.

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

Hearing none, Chair Langberg closed the public comment period and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Board Member Deedler commented:

- Likes the sign.
- The sign is entirely appropriate.

The Board asked questions of staff and additional questions of the applicant.

Board Member Level commented:

- The sign conforms to our sign ordinance exception criteria, as indicated in the staff report, and is approvable.

Chair Langberg commented:

- Likes the boldness of the sign.
- The sign is simple and it works.

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

Board Member Beale seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg and Board Members Level, Deedler and Beale
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

Ms. Rich commented:

- Thanked the Board for all of their efforts.
- Loved the discussion regarding Mr. Menne's application and appreciated the recognition of community while needing to follow the rules.

The Board thanked Ms. Rich for her comments.

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS: None

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

11. ADJOURNMENT: Board Member Langberg adjourned the meeting of the Design Review Board at 6:40 p.m. to the next Design Review Board meeting to be held

August 02, 2017 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue,
Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Dana Morrison
Assistant Planner