



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: [dmorrison@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:dmorrison@cityofsebastopol.org)

**APPROVED MINUTES**

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF October 17, 2018

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

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on October 11, 2018.

- 1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Luthin called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.
- 2. **ROLL CALL:**
  - Present:** Cary Bush, Vice Chair  
Lars Langberg, Board Member  
Gregory Beale, Board Member  
Ron Hari, Board Member
  - Absent:** Ted Luthin, Chair (excused)  
Christine Level, Board Member (excused)
  - Staff:** Dana Morrison, Assistant Planner  
Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician
- 3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** There were none.
- 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:** Chair Luthin was absent due to a proximity conflict with item 8A.
- 7. **CONSENT CALENDAR:** There were none.
- 8. **REGULAR AGENDA:**
  - A. **DESIGN REVIEW:** This is an application requesting a Design Review Amendment for approval of the HVAC and Roof Plan and Lighting Plan for the Hotel Sebastopol, located at 6828/6826/6824 Depot Street and 215/225 Brown Street. On December 07, 2016, the Design Review Board approved the overall design of the proposed Hotel Sebastopol. The aforementioned items were deferred for later review at that

time. The applicant will be returning at a later date for Design Review approval of the solar/carport structures proposed for the adjacent parking lot.

Assistant Planner Morrison presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of Assistant Planner Morrison.

Vice Chair Bush asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Brett Jones gave a brief presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Jones and Paolo Petrone.

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

Hearing none, Vice Chair Bush closed the public hearing and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Board Member Beale suggested that the Board go through the recommended conditions of approval line by line.

The Board concurred.

If it is the consensus of the Board, Assistant Planner Morrison suggested that Condition of Approval 1. b) be modified as follows; "L1 light fixtures *are acceptable but shall be removed from all street trees in the project angled in such a way to not cause any light spill onto Petaluma Avenue. The L1 straps shall be maintained and adjusted by the property owner or tenant as to not cause harm or restrict normal tree growth.* Any L1 fixtures proposed for other trees shall not be aimed at any open sky areas, and shall be maintained in such a way as to not cause harm or restrict ~~tree~~ normal *tree* growth."

The Board asked clarifying questions of Assistant Planner Morrison and expressed support for condition 1. b) as modified.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

Board Member Beale commented:

- "1. a) The roof of the trellis (including solar) shall not exceed 50 feet in height from grade." seems reasonable.
- Supports the modification to condition 1. b) as stated by Assistant Planner Morrison.
- "1. c) L4 fixtures shall be aimed such that the light lands only on fixed horizontal or vertical surfaces, and shall not be aimed at any open sky areas." makes sense to him.
- "1. d) L6 fixtures shall be aimed such that, should the light permeate through the trees canopy, the light would fall only on fixed horizontal or vertical surfaces of the subject property, and shall not be aimed such that any light pollutes the sky above the roof of the structures." makes sense to him as well.
- "1. e) L7 fixtures shall only be used in a downcast application (aimed below horizontal of mounting) to prevent light pollution." sounds fine.
- "1. f) L8 fixtures shall only be used in a downcast application, and shall be aimed such that light would fall only on fixed horizontal or vertical surfaces of the subject property, and shall not extend beyond any roof parapet." is okay.

- "1. g) L12 fixture shall be replaced with a fixture that includes a 90 degree cutoff. Fixture selection shall be submitted for staff review and approval prior to installation." and asked for Board Member feedback on this condition.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- The L12 fixture is a nice light and provides a nice effect.
- Would vote to strike condition 1. g).

The Board concurred with striking condition 1. g).

Board Member Beale comments continued:

- "1. h) L14 fixtures shall have a 90 degree cutoff." and asked for Board Member feedback on this condition.

After some discussion, the Board agreed to strike condition 1. h).

Board Member Beale comments continued:

- "1. i) L15 fixtures shall include a lens or light shield such that light would fall only on fixed horizontal or vertical surfaces of the subject property." and asked for Board Member feedback on this condition.

After some discussion, the Board agreed to strike condition 1. i).

Board Member Beale comments continued:

- "1. j) F39 light fixtures shall only be used in a downcast application, and shall be aimed such that light falls on fixed horizontal or vertical surfaces of the subject property."

After some discussion, the Board agreed to leave condition 1. j) as is.

Assistant Planner Morrison asked for Board input on light fixture F37.

The Board had no comments or concerns on light fixture F37.

Board Member Langberg commented that condition 1. k) has to do with the finishes of the fixtures.

Mr. Jones interjected that the finishes would be black.

The Board agreed to leave condition 1. k) as is.

Vice Chair Bush asked for general comments from the Board.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- Studied this submittal closely.
- This is a very dynamic lighting plan.
- Expressed being familiar with many of the fixtures presented, all of which are good and solid.
- The fixtures have been carefully placed to accent the architecture.
- This is a great project and this lighting plan will accentuate it even more.
- Other than the comments that he made on a couple of the conditions, the lighting plan seems acceptable.
- The HVAC is a no brainer.

- Initial impression of the trellis is that it is too industrial in nature and may be uncomfortable to sit under.
  - Examples of their past work are open and airy.
  - Mr. Jones' response to his concerns regarding the trellis and area underneath it makes a lot of sense.
  - A lot of people are excited about the rooftop trellis.
  - Shading for the trellis is appropriate and good.

Board Member Beale commented:

- In general, likes the changes that were made to the trellis.
- Seconds most of what Board Member Langberg said.
- Appreciates how consistent the applicant has been in providing plenty of detailed information, and in how conscientious the applicant has been throughout the entire process.
- Needs to understand the limitations in terms of the dark sky language in the General Plan when looking to modify some of the conditions.
- Everything about the project has been very thought through.
- The town will benefit from all of this.
- Thanked the applicant for such thoughtful work.

Board Member Hari commented:

- Deferred to the rest of the Board on lighting.
- Likes how the trellis was lightened up.
  - The prior iteration looked more structural.
  - The latest iteration looks more visitor friendly.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Echoes sentiments from the Board.
- This is a comprehensive lighting plan.
- Appreciates the comprehensive details that the applicant brought to the Board.
  - These details are important, and the lighting plan is thoughtful.
- Lighting plans can be really hard.
- It is important to consider the feel as well as safety.
- The balancing of these components in such an artful way is exciting.
- All of professionals have come together to ensure that the space will be enjoyed as it is intended to be.

Board Member Beale commented:

- Looking at this project as how can we make it relate more to the town as it right now is backwards thinking.
- The applicant is very purposeful in how they're thinking about the future.
- Can see this project influence how other projects may be thought about.
- Hopes that this project will help move Sebastopol forward.
- The detail, technology, and thought going into this project are all good things.
- Hopes that the surrounding properties will follow suit.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Board Member Beale makes a good point.
- Overall, light fixture F37 pushes the envelope and has a fun quality to it.
- Lighting has a fun quality.

The Commission discussed the conditions further.

With no further comments, Assistant Planner Morrison summarized the Board's response as follows:

- Condition of Approval 1. a) shall remain.
- Condition of Approval 1. b) shall be modified as follows; "L1 light fixtures *are acceptable but shall be removed from all street trees in the project angled in such a way to not cause any light spill onto Petaluma Avenue. The L1 straps shall be maintained and adjusted by the property owner or tenant as to not cause harm or restrict normal tree growth.* Any L1 fixtures proposed for other trees shall not be aimed at any open sky areas, and shall be maintained in such a way as to not cause harm or restrict ~~tree~~ normal tree growth."
- Condition of Approval 1. c), 1. d), 1. e), and 1. f) shall remain as is.
- Condition of Approval 1. g), 1. h), and 1. i) shall be stricken.
- Condition of Approval 1. j), and 1. k) shall remain.
- The Board did not feel the need to add a condition for lighting fixture F37.

Board Member Langberg made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the modified conditions as read back by Assistant Planner Morrison.

Board Member Beale seconded the motion.

AYES: Vice Chair Bush, Board Member Beale, Board Member Langberg, and Board Member Hari  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Chair Luthin and Board Member Level

**9. DISCUSSION ITEMS:** There were none.

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

**11. ADJOURNMENT:** Vice Chair Bush adjourned the meeting at 5:56 p.m. The regularly scheduled Tree Board/Design Review Board meeting of November 07, 2018 has been canceled. The next **specialy scheduled** Tree Board/Design Review Board meeting will take place on November 14, 2018 at 4:00 P.M., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Dana Morrison  
Assistant Planner