



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: ksvanstrom@cityofsebastopol.org

UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

TREE/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
 CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
 MINUTES OF November 18, 2020
 4:00 P.M.

The notice of the meeting was posted on November 12, 2020.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Luthin called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M. and read a procedural statement.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present:	Ted Luthin, Chair Lars Langberg, Vice Chair Christine Level, Board Member (arrived at 4:35) Ron Hari, Board Member
Absent:	Cary Bush, Board Member (excused) Gregory Beale, Board Member (excused)
Staff:	Alan Montes, Associate Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 04, 202

Vice Chair Langberg made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

Board Member Hari seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Langberg, and Board Member Hari

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Board Members Bush, Level and Beale

4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST:

Associate Planner Montes updated the Board on the following:

- Three temporary parklets have been installed downtown.
- Application deadline for openings on the Design Review Board.
- The Woodmark project will be discussed during a special meeting which will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 11/19 at 3 p.m.

5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC REGARDING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Kyle Falbo

Sebastopol claims to be a pedestrian and bicycle centric community. In fact, the word bicycle is mentioned in a total of 106 times within the document of the General Plan. As I continue to research a proposed housing development on Bodega Avenue, a road that is critical in need of both maintenance, repair, and upgrade to accommodate both pedestrian and vehicular traffic, I find municipal code 17.110.30 the schedule of off street parking space requirements. I am unaware of when this municipal code was last updated, but as it currently is written, it does not seem to reflect our community values of non-vehicular focused housing that resonates within the General Plan. The proposed Bodega Avenue development consists of 84 units and based on this municipal code will require 150 parking spaces. 150 parking spaces does not suggest housing that is either pedestrian or bicycle focused. Across the country municipalities are recognizing that existing parking requirements that promote one vehicle per person are a self-fulfilling prophecy. With the changing dynamics and the de-emphasis in vehicle centric housing, it is likely time to change the municipal code to one that accurately reflects our values as a community. Our municipal code should reflect our priorities. It is my hope that this body can seek for revision of this code. Any development on a transit line or bicycle network should by default have a reduced amount of required parking spaces. I would like to then switch gears and direct your attention to my virtual backgrounds that I am currently displaying. Speaking of bicycle networks, it is my hope that Bodega Avenue will soon see bicycle lanes that are effective and safe. I would like to take a brief moment to show these three slides that represent first the current layout of Bodega Avenue with lane sizes, and lack of any bicycle lanes. The second one shows a scenario in which bicycle lanes could be squeezed into the existing roadway, however, likely not as inviting to bicyclists based on current traffic conditions. A third scenario is when it promotes the use of bicycle and pedestrians by actively segregating this transportation away from the vehicular traffic. I encourage this body to explore the use of protected bicycle lanes whenever possible, moving forward.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Luthin closed public comment.

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Board Member Bush and Board Member Beale were absent due to a conflict with item 7A.

7. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. DESIGN REVIEW – 6950 Burnett Street, The Livery – Project #2020-10 –

This is a Design Review application, requesting approval to modify an existing commercial structure at the corner of Burnett and South Main Street. The existing two-story, mixed use building is proposed to be completely renovated (interior and exterior). The first level is proposed to house a food hall / marketplace with shared seating including an indoor-outdoor covered porch. The second level is proposed to be one or more standalone tenants, potentially restaurant(s) and/or retail/offices. The roof level is proposed to be developed as an outdoor patio / roof deck with beverage services and access to menus from restaurants on lower levels. An elevator/stair tower is planned for access to all levels. (Note, Use Permits, if any, that may be required for uses will be reviewed as separate applications.) This item first came before the Board on May 06, 2020.

Associate Planner Montes presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of Associate Planner Montes.

Ted Luthin, Chair

This is not Preliminary Review, this is a Design Review application, correct?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

Correct.

Ted Luthin, Chair

You just mentioned that the signage and landscape was in this package for future reference, the Board is not being asked to act on those items, correct?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

Correct, I think at the last meeting there were some requests by the Board to see the fuller picture to have a more complete understanding of this project. The applicant has not fully finished those details yet but wanted to at least let the Board see how those elements are being incorporated into the design.

Ted Luthin, Chair

The Board can take those components and provide preliminary feedback on them at this point to see how that might shape up as it moves forward.

Alan Montes

Absolutely.

With no further questions of staff, Chair Luthin invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Introduced the project team and gave a presentation.

Chair Luthin asked for questions of the applicant from the Board.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I have a variety of questions. In your brief you talked about a former very successful business on this site. Is that The Livery or is there something more current you are referring to? I do not think of that building as having a successful feel to it in the almost 20 years I have been here.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

I do not I do not remember saying that specific thing. I had used the word successful in the sense of us in relationship to keeping the height within your adjustments that are allowed. As far as The Livery, The Livery was just an inspiration from long ago, the original photo we found. I am sorry if I spoke inappropriately there, I was not referring to any kind of business that was specifically successful. Although, our building, of course, will be very successful.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Of course, we would expect nothing less. There are references to beverage services on the upper floor that serve the food services down below. Will there be bars upstairs or will it be beverage storage?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

We do not expect to have a lot of bars, but we think there would be a beverage service of some sort on the second floor. On the top floor, we anticipate that an area will be kind of

like a banquet hall that's part of a restaurant, when restaurants have large rooms, this would be it, it just happens to be upstairs.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I am just trying to understand some of the language you are using throughout the building programmatically. Then you have a coworking space you are proposing upstairs, would I sign up for a certain number of hours a month and go in there and plug in? Or is it for someone to just walk in with their cup of coffee and sit down and work? What is your sense of that?

Jennifer Klein, Applicant

The coworking space would be a variety of options, it'll be anywhere from a monthly membership where there's dedicated desks for people to show up every day and work as an office, there will also be day passes so that somebody who buys food at the food hall can go up and use the coworking space for a couple of hours. It will be a variation from day passes to monthly passes to maybe even permanent.

Member of the applicant team

The food related vendors throughout the building would also be using that as their office space. The outdoor areas would be open to the public, someone could get a cup of coffee downstairs, and then come up to the outdoor patio on the second floor or the third floor during the day.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Is it completely public space, like could I walk in there and not buy anything from your food vendors and go up to a deck just to enjoy the view?

Member of the applicant team

As of right now, yes. That is the current plan, we want it to be accessible for the community.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Awesome. I have a couple architectural questions. Between your gridlines three and four, it is very clear on the rendering, instead of an opening with a garage door, there is just a very blank gray wall. Behind that is a tenant space, I think, but you are just choosing to make that a kind of blank wall in the design.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

On the south elevation we have got two doors and then we have got a space that is the tenant space behind. Your question is why is that?

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

You are just treating that as a as a blank painted wall for the South?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

That is correct. Part of what is behind that wall is a fire extinguisher closet. And part of that is for tenant space five, for that fifth little stable as we are calling them.

Our elevations show that that is the potential place for some signage that is going to go there, some logos and information about who the tenants are. That is one of the few locations where we have a space like that, on our other elevations you will see where we are locating other signage components. We will absolutely utilize that for signage.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I see that now, thank you. You gave us a nice pizza box of material samples. There is a perforated metal sample, which is called out as the railings, but all the railings in the drawings and the renderings just look like horizontal rods or bars.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

We have got two railings; we have got a steel tube railing and we have got some railing which this mesh will be used as part of it. You'll see on the elevations, and on the 3D drawing, you'll see where there's a lot of this grill everywhere, it is part of the top on the parapets, we're using the grill on the stairways. On the stairways, we have got that perforated metal as well as the as the tube steel. Around the south deck on the third level, it is mainly the tube steel. It is a mix.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Okay. Great. The big barn roof, the elevator in this corner here that's got the cedar cladding on the west side, that's your elevator volume, and you are saying that you need the height of this roof to fit the elevator tower in there and still get your expressive roof above that?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Yes, that is correct.

Ron Hari, Board Member

Vice Chair Langberg asked one of my questions. The blank wall on the front is going to be addressed with something to make it look more interesting, yes?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Absolutely. It is going to look great.

Ron Hari, Board Member

On the other end of the building, in the corner next to the UPS building, does that have anything to do with you there?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

That building is part of this property, the only thing we're going to do, and I apologize, we're not showing the windows, the windows and the door will stay exactly the same on the UPS building, we will paint it to match the colors and work with this and we are going to update the awning. They will be a tenant within the building.

Ron Hari, Board Member

One thing that I really like here that you are doing is incorporating the history of Sebastopol into this building. They did that a little bit with The Barlow but frankly, hardly anybody in this town has any idea why they named it The Barlow, which is part of the history, there's very little knowledge out there in town. I would really hope that besides a photograph, you can incorporate and display a little local history here. If you can dig up any other photographs or anything else of what used to be, I think that is important for Sebastopol. Another thing would be the train history, but there is nothing besides the depot about that. We do not really have much history in Sebastopol, we do, but it is not developed into anything very much except for The Barlow. You probably do not know but I own the Barlow house and virtually nobody in this town knew the Barlow's built it and I bought it from the last Barlow. It is amazing how history gets lost in a small town like this. I am really thrilled with the fact that you are incorporating a little history. I love the design, by the way. All good for me. Thank you.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Board Member Level has joined us.

Christine Level, Board Member

I am sorry that I am entering a little late. What is the gray material that I am seeing on the facades?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Up on the top level, and on the second level, the gray is stucco. Just to clarify, on the base of the brick where we have the columns, that is still the concrete and it will just be painted.

Christine Level, Board Member

That is the existing concrete?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Yes. Most of them, some of them are new to match the existing.

Christine Level, Board Member

Okay. On the upper level, the arching trellis, what is the material?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

It is a metal frame. That is part of a trellis. Just to clarify, we are showing this for you so that you understand how our landscape is going to be incorporated here. We are going to present our landscape, including that trellis, the plants, and everything that will be from it at a later date. That is a metal trellis that plants will be draped through. It will really feel like you are in and under a garden kind with plants all around you. In this image, we are just giving you a little sense that there is going to be plants and vines growing on that trellis. Through at least half the year it should be full and then during other parts of the year you will be able to see through.

Christine Level, Board Member

On this wood part of the structure, what are you trying to depict on the top there? Is that like a sheet roofing, what is that?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

On the very top, we are just putting a single ply membrane roofing on the top. We are going to have a metal flashing edge to finish off that, and then you have got your cedar fascia board, and then the large, heavy timber members that are underneath it. All the fascia and the metal, all of that is going to be cedar, and then we have got your cedar siding. What is showing up there is a single ply membrane that is going to be up on top. We will also have solar panels on top.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

You have two layers of the roof there, is that part of this whole trying to get under the height thing?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

That is correct. We do not have the volume inside in that enclosed area. On the third we have dropped the entire roof, so the ceiling is flat inside. That keeps us under that 15%. We've kept the edges up so that we still kind of create this floating roof and the angle that we feel is extremely important to this design, but we've kept it flat and then that kind of creates the parapet around the mechanical space.

Christine Level, Board Member

This roof up here looks like it is sloping from the back. Is it flat in there, what is going on? It looks like it is sloping from that high point down to a low point and then that other part, it is kind of hard to follow exactly what is happening there.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

I do not know if it is just an illusion, or an optical illusion. The area that you are referencing that is inside is basically flat, but there is going to have to be a small slope just for drainage. There is going to be at least a quarter inch per foot, so water doesn't stand. But in all practical purposes, it is flat, and all that area is under the 40 feet requirement.

Christine Level, Board Member

It appears to have quite a bit of slope from the depiction.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

There is not, it is flat.

Christine Level, Board Member

Above the Livery, what is that? Is that an awning?

Ted Luthin, Chair

That is a trellis that will cover that area, and those are solar panels. This trellis is part of our landscape package and we would love to have your comments on it. The landscape package will be presented along with the exterior lighting and the signage package at a later date. We have just shown it all here so that you really get a sense of how this building is going to come together. That is just a metal frame, and it will have solar panels on top, and that will give us protection below for additional seating and for comfort.

Member of the applicant team

We are looking at the Lumos solar panels that are kind of see through, they are a lovely solar panel.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Yes, it is a transparent panel, it is not the typical one that you would see up on top of a roof, it won't be the same one that's on top of this roof on the top. It is different.

Christine Level, Board Member

These two trellises are not part of this design review? Are you saying that you are submitting them later?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

Yes, this is essentially a reference drawing. The applicant is going to submit the landscape plan, lighting details, and the signage as a separate deferred submittal. These are references to show the bigger picture currently. Those different submittals will return to the Board later.

Christine Level, Board Member

It is just that they seem like a substantial part of the facade elevation on that corner to not be considered part of the review today, in my view.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

As far as we are concerned, we feel that the building stands on its own without these. We also feel like these are very complimentary of the building and work with this building.

These are how we want these to look but we have had them as part of the landscape package.

Ron Hari, Board Member

We were looking at an elevation from up above, so they are very prominent on this elevation, looking at it from the street you are not going to see hardly any of that. I do not think it is that relevant compared to the elevation we were looking at there in my opinion, anyway. Yeah.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Luthin asked for Board deliberation.

Ron Hari, Board Member

What a great improvement. Wherever the inspiration came from, I like this building a lot. I really have no criticism whatsoever on this thing. I think it is a great improvement. I do not know what else I could say. I like it. I like the fact that you are trying to incorporate a little Sebastopol history into this. I am not real crazy over the charcoal gray color, but I was not before, and that is okay with me if you think it works okay. I cannot criticize this at all, I like it.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I still think that this is an exciting program, just the sense of what could be happening in this space. Once we are allowed to go into a space like this again, I think it will be really lively, there will be a lot going on. The different public spaces are nice inside, and especially outside up above. Adding the music venue idea is exciting. Adding a workspace and having another way for people to be in there, I think is great. I think the alley section with the stair is just much more inviting than it was before and that feels nice. The mural is great, people will like that. It does not feel like a back stair that I would be scared to go in, that I would run up there and check out what is going on upstairs. I think that is great. The scale of the garage door openings works nicely, both with the kind of historic livery idea, and with the storefronts in town, down Main Street. It feels bigger than maybe those are but not over scaled. All of those are just really nice improvements, for sure. The whole question we were talking about with the corner was not meant to be like you should enter at the corner, that is not at all what I was referring to. Architecturally, urbanistically, the corner is super important on any project, on any building. There is a parking lot across one way, but the other two buildings across have a strong corner, their building is right up at the corner. To me, that is still not here. You guys gave a pretty big explanation about why you did that and yet I do not think that was a very clear, very convincing explanation. I think what you have done with the other two bigger entrance pieces is strong. I am not designing the building so that is your choice. That is fine, I think it works pretty well. I think the gray pilaster bases are a big mistake. When I see those, all I think of is the building that is there now, and I just wish you could get rid of those. If you cannot get rid of them, do not make them gray, paint them a brick color so they disappear. They are not part of the stucco up above, they are part of the column, they are part of that opening. To me, that should really soften, and it would be much, much better. This gray kind of stair tower, I think the gray stucco is okay when it is very, very recessed like you had in the picture we were looking at on the screen, as an accent behind a trellis or brick, but another view is really bizarre, it doesn't hold with the rest of the building, it doesn't have a character in and of itself. You refer to the Sonoma County water tower in one of your narratives and it just does not bring to mind that at all. Water towers, just by nature of having wood siding, have a level of detail and scale. This is a very strange looking slightly corporate thing you would see in west Santa Rosa or something and it does not fit at all with it. Maybe it just needs a lot more detail, that soffit up above is this looming big thing, I do not think that works very well at all. Those are my pros and cons. Overall, being inspired by something from the past

is a great starting point. How do you transform it, how do you abstract it, how do you bring it into today's time? I think you have done that fairly well. The big giant light fixtures do not do it at all for me. The forms, I think, you have done a nice job of bringing something from the past and bring it into today's time. The brick does it fairly well, the wood structure does it more so. I think that the kind of angled struts and all of that could even be more articulated and a little more refined. The roof issue is something we as a Board should really look at. The exceptions in the code are pretty small scale ideas. This is a big, massive roof. If you are going to do the big, massive roof, dropping that little section in the middle of the roof just to meet this code requirement makes zero sense. It is just making your building cost more, but I am not going to see that difference out there. It has no perceptual difference to the public. Does that become the precedent we do not want to set as a Board because it is over 15%? Something about that whole argument is a little specious. I appreciate very much what you guys have done, what you have put into this. I know you have a lot of different people on the team. You've brought in some really good folks to add to what you have and you are really thinking it through and trying to make it an exciting place in our town so I am very happy about that. Thank you for all your efforts.

Christine Level, Board Member

I think it is a huge improvement over the last submittal. But I think that it is enough of a change that we need to consider this, even though it is not a new submittal, kind of like a new submittal to massage it around a little bit here. I have to agree with Vice Chair Langberg about those pilasters on the ground level. I know that they are there because they are there, but the building is basically a redo, so they look like a mistake. I understand why they are there, but they do not make sense with what the new building is to me. It seems like they should get toned into the brick color, or maybe get some brick facade on them or something to blend it in because just they do not make any sense. Anybody approaching this building now, that did not know that they were there as part of that other building, it would not make any sense. Then if we go to the Main Street elevation, we are talking about this being reminiscent of something historic, but I just do not see that with that gray tower, that just doesn't make any sense to me. Was it supposed to look like a water tower, is that what I am hearing?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

It was kind of intended to look like a water tower, but I appreciate what you are saying.

Christine Level, Board Member

In the brick part of an older kind of style of a building, that's an old building that would be built like that, and then that's just standing there looking like a new modern kind of Larry Simon's buildings down on Stony Point Road, it just doesn't look like it belongs there to me. It looks like it is part of something else. I am not the designer. If we switch around to the Burnett Street elevation, I really like that entry, coming underneath the brick and going into the stairwell. I think that that is going to be very pleasant. But again, we have got this big, massive, and towering structure over the wood structure, it seems like it is too big and bulky and heavy and different. Again, it does not seem like it belongs to me. I feel that those two elements that I just described are somehow not part of the design, they are something else. Particularly that tower, at least with the wood thing, you would have the mixture of brick and wood if you are looking at buildings in a historical sense. That tower thing just reminds me of those Larry Simon buildings over on Stony Point Road, that is the first thing I thought when I saw those. I think the trellises are an essential part of the design, I completely disagree with Board Member Hari. I think that they are prominent, and you will see them. My feeling about this design, to sum it up, is I think it is a great improvement over what you had before, and I would really like to see this project be approved and move forward. I think it is going to be great for downtown. I would encourage

the applicant to look a little bit more at softening those two large elements I just described and those existing pilaster pop outs, they do not even need to be there. Could you just cut them off, jackhammer them off, get them out of there and have bricks instead? They are not serving any purpose; they were just part of the original Bob Anderson design of the building from way back when. I guess what I am saying is I really like this design, I think you guys are doing a great job, but I feel that this is completely different from what we had before and I think we should discuss maybe making some adjustments here and coming back, one more iteration of getting responses because it is not like we revised the existing building, this looks like something completely different which is also a big improvement. But again, from the corner, those two trellises are an essential part of the design, I think.

Christine Level, Board Member

I do not want them to be overlooked at this point in time either. Those are my initial thoughts on it. I really appreciate what you guys are doing and I would really love to see this project move forward and come to fruition. No question about it.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I agree with most of what Board Member Level just said. I really love what you have done with the rest of the building. I like the strong emphasis on the entries. I think that was one of my comments at the beginning. I love these big entry portals. I might think about taking signage away from the corner, and hand painting it on the brick or something like that, but I know we are not really reviewing signage at this point. I think in terms of composition, when you just look at this, this really works for me, and this little shot of a different material, I think works. I agree with Board Member Level that it would look very different if these trellis structures were not here, so I do think they are an integral part of it. I like the big wood soaring roof. I agree with Vice Chair Langberg that it seems a little silly to drop a section of it just to meet a 15% requirement for the height. I think I would rather see the big soaring roof on the interior, unless you need it for mechanical space. I do not know how we deal with that from a code standpoint, and height limit standpoint, but it does seem like we are sort of dancing around the obvious. One of the reasons I think that the big wood soaring roof is working for me is that this continuation of the material inside really helps tie that together as if this thing is something that penetrates through. The brick facade is almost a remnant of a past time, which is fine with me. I echo all the previous very positive comments, I think this this is going to be a great thing for downtown. I really like the direction it is gone. That is just sort of a glaringly blank wall right now that I think everybody pointed out, and if there's one thing I could pick to work on, it is this, because it is the piece that doesn't belong. That is my feeling in a nutshell. Yeah. Programmatically, I think it is a very exciting place, the coworking on the second floor, the open spaces, the tenants are kind of scattered around, it is very cool.

Ron Hari, Board Member

I think you guys are starting to convince me. The water tower does not fit in. Looking at it more deeply, you guys are convincing me. I think I was just so thrilled with the whole concept. I was mainly being concerned about the color at this time. Let us call that the water tower, for lack of a better word. What could be done to make that fit in with the rest of the design? Could it be just a matter of surface materials? If that were brick or wood or something else, would that be enough without changing the entire structure? What can be done with that part? Now, if you do look at the elevation of this rendering here, that is not at street level, you would not see it. You would see it from the street, but we're looking at it about probably 15-20' feet near which nobody will see so it won't be quite as obvious as that.

Ted Luthin, Chair

You will see this upper section for sure.

Ron Hari, Board Member

Yes, the lower section will be marginal. What would anybody suggest toning that down or make it fit in with the rest of this structure that will make us all happy and will not cost a ton of money?

Ted Luthin, Chair

It is very big and heavy right now. You might be able to think it out, you would kind of have to play with it to see what ends up looking good. Maybe you will make some cohesive form out of it rather than this kind of huge block. Yeah, this sort of thing might look interesting on a very contemporary building. This unusual asymmetric thing happening might be very interesting on a very different building. This building has kind of traditional rhythms to it, and then you get this this wacky thing kind of sitting there and it just looks a little odd.

Christine Level, Board Member

Maybe for the purposes of symmetry, because you have got this Burnett elevation with the big wood, maybe you come around the corner, and you have something similar? There are too many different styles. We have got three different styles going on here and they are kind of lumped together in one building. It is too much.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Yes, and it is all just getting kind of wacky right there.

Christine Level, Board Member

You've got this idea with the brick, and then you've got this wood element that's coming over, and maybe if just the wood was balanced so that the whole thing has symmetry with the wood at each end, on the two street elevations, because that's what you are going to experience.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

It is not the material, it is the scale, the scale of that element is just large, too large, and without any of the texture of the brick or the wood. It feels to me like it must recede. And by breaking down the scale of what that is, if it is a giant window there, break that down, it just has a very heavy, large scale feeling and that's out of character with the rest. I do not think just cladding and a different material is going to make that work. This is the kind of thing where it is up to the architects and the designers to figure out how to make that better, not up to the Board, per se.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I also love the historic rallying point that leads to the thematic spaces, the stables, the rafters. That is all really kind of fun stuff that I think is very experiential. I really appreciate that thinking too. That brings us to the question of where do we want to go with this, do we want to continue this and encourage some additional exploration on a number of things? The little concrete plinths, on one hand, I agree, I would love to see them go, but on the other hand, they are not killing me. If they have to stay, I can survive that.

Ron Hari, Board Member

I will agree with Chair Luthin on the concrete plinths, they do not bother me at all, I think they kind of tie it to the ground. That does not bother me, the water tower does. But I am sure not going to vote against this or suggest a major change on the bun feet if you want to call them that.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

What about this whole roof height issue? I do not know if we want staff to weigh in on that too. We say no, it is too high, it is not just a little elevator tower cupola. It is this giant roof, which to me is not actually keeping with the spirit of the code. But there is that little passage about if we like it aesthetically, or we think it is important, we could say yes. If that is where we are going, unless the architects really want to have that drop roof, it does not seem necessary, so what should we do about that?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

Director Svanstrom and I discussed this when it first came in because initially it was the full raised roof. When we were reviewing it, the section defines it as being elements. The thought was, if it is the entire roof that's going above the height limit, that's not really an element of the building when you are looking at it in terms of what the elements are, or the features. It became this question of how do we make this work within what the intent of the code is and this was the solution that the applicant had proposed and staff felt that it met the spirit of that section of the code. If they did want it to be a fully raised roof, we believe that would need a Variance through the Planning Commission. Part of the concern was that we're issuing this five to ten-foot exception for the roof and that that could create a precedent.

Christine Level, Board Member

I feel like we need to have another round with this, I think we have enough little tweaks to do on it. I think it is worth spending the extra time, because it is going to be such a substantial element in downtown, and I think it is going in a very good direction. I would personally like to see it continued one more time to work on these item areas that we have discussed.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I support a continuance as well. Is everybody else on board with that?

Ron Hari, Board Member

Yes, I am. I think what we are all having a problem with is the water tower element of the structure. Frankly, I like the bun feet myself, I would not change that. Let us see what the applicant team can do with the water tower as a second thought, without delaying this forever. I think that is the only real element here that we should postpone this for, not anything else. As far as the ceiling goes, I do not know, but let us deal strictly with the water tower.

Christine Level, Board Member

We can do more work on those plinths. Let them resubmit it with these other suggestions, or not. That is my feeling. I want to approve this project. I just feel when you are working on design, and I have worked on enough design, the more you kind of have a little bit of time to think about it and take in suggestions and stuff, you just improve it. I think it would be worth one more round to think about these things. Everything that we suggested, maybe you do not change anything else, maybe you do, but just to kind of absorb the information that we're presenting and see what you want to do with it. Let us just give it one more massaging round, so that we can approve it at the next meeting.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I was just going to say we could then review and approve the landscape package and the trellis a part of that.

Christine Level, Board Member

I think it is an important part of it, I think we need to be looking at those at the same time.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I agree.

Christine Level, Board Member

I think it is a lovely project. I think you guys did a great job.

Member of the applicant team

I think so too.

Member of the applicant team

We have already delayed this project so long, and I am curious if there is any possible way to do a conditional approval because we cannot keep going. We cannot do this anymore. It is costing us a lot of money and we were very happy to make changes but delaying more than we need to is a real hardship for us.

Ron Hari, Board Member

I agree with her here. I mean, to delay this until we get the landscape and everything else is going to cost them money and might jeopardize the entire project. We are going too far here as far as restrictions. We all like the building. The details can come later. There should be some thought with the water tower aspect but let us do not drag this out. That is not right.

Christine Level, Board Member

This is the first time; I do not know about any delays. It is been a long time since we looked at the last version, but this is the first time we are seeing this. I do not think it is a delay. We are looking at a project, we are making comments on a project we have not seen before, because this is so substantially different from the last one. As I suggested, let us give it a little bit, one more tweak so that we can approve it. I appreciate the cost of construction and the whole design process, that is what I do for a living. This is the first time I am seeing this, so I am not seeing this design review process as a delay.

Ron Hari, Board Member

I just do not want this to go on to next year, that is my concern. I am all for another meeting, I Just do not want to throw bricks and stones at this thing, this is a local project, this is not CVS deep pocket stuff. The water tower needs some help, but we cannot delay this just for small things.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

May I offer something? Is there a way that if we agree to, for instance, make the change in color on the base of these concrete pieces, let the majority of this be approved, and let the water tower come back as that element itself once updated to be presented with the landscape when it comes through? That will allow us to move forward in some areas if we separate that piece as we've kind of done with the trellises and let that be presented to you again, so it is kind of split since you guys are focusing on the water tower, let's let everything else move forward.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Associate Planner Montes, is that possible?

Alan Montes

We could do that by adding a condition of approval saying that the final details on the water tower element shall return to the Board prior to issuance of a building permit.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I do not get that, it is not lighting, it is not landscape, it is a chunk of the building. If I were the architect, if it was continued, I would walk away this and I would start finalizing my building permit package for 85% of the building or whatever it is and then I would present the last bit, and then I would put that into my package and submit it for permit. They are not going to submit for a building permit without this section of the building. It is a very different element than signage, or something like that.

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

The other thing that we could do, which will depend on the applicant's availability, is we could continue to a date certain. The next meeting is December 2 and I do not think there would be enough time to put it on that agenda with Thanksgiving the week in between. We could put it on the December 16 agenda if the applicant thinks that is enough time to make those adjustments?

Grace Meeks, Applicant

We will make them.

Member of the applicant team

Is there any reason why we cannot be on the agenda on December 2? Is that us, or on the City's end?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

It would be on staff's end due to timing requirements and the upcoming holiday.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

To get on the agenda for December 16, when would I need to get the updated design to you?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

December 9 would be the latest I could take it.

Ron Hari, Board Member

Is there any way we can have a special meeting like we are tomorrow?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

That is another possibility if it works for the Board and the applicant.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Could we do a special meeting on Wednesday, December 9 if the applicant gets the design to you by December 1?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

I think that would work.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

Yes, we will do what we can. Absolutely. That means getting you updated plans by December 1, is that right?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

Correct.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

That would be amazing, if you guys can do a special one for that, we would appreciate it. We will do everything to get that to you by then.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Board Member Level, Hari, and Vice Chair Langberg, are you up for a special meeting?

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Can we cancel the meeting on the 16th then?

Alan Montes, Associate Planner

I think that meeting is looking empty at this moment, and you guys have had a lot of special meetings these last two months. Realistically a cancellation seems likely, but I cannot promise you that.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

We can do the 9th then, that works for me.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Asked for a motion to continue this application to a date certain of December 9, which will be a special meeting of the Board.

Vice Chair Langberg made a motion to continue this application, specifically to look at the "water tower" element and anything else the applicant wants to bring forward as changes for the Board to review.

Board Member Hari seconded the motion.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Chair Luthin asked for discussion of the motion.

Christine Level, Board Member

I would also like to include in this the consideration of those pilaster bases, and the trellis elements that go with the landscaping, at least some more detail and definition about those as part of this package. We are going to talk about the water tower, the pilaster bases, and the trellis elements.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Alright, so we have essentially a friendly amendment. Are you willing to add that to your motion, Vice Chair Lars?

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

The trellises are part of a landscape package, so if the applicant wants to bring that package at that time too, I didn't want to put that in there because maybe they're not ready to as they were talking about it as a deferred submittal as it was. The column bases were a general comment from me, they can make other changes if they want, but it seemed to me that the main thing was to talk about the water tower. Board Member Level, I am happy to amend my motion if that is what you would like.

Christine Level, Board Member

I would argue that those trellis elements are a significant part of the whole structure, regardless of the landscaping. Landscaping is plant in my book. The trellises are part of the building, they are attached to the building. They are not outside of the building in a garden, or separate.

Grace Meeks, Applicant

We can bring the trellises forward on December 9.

Vice Chair Langberg amended his motion to include the plinths and the trellis elements as requested by Board Member Level.

Board Member Level seconded the amended motion.

Hearing no further discussion, the Board voted on the amended motion as follows:

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Langberg, and Board Members Hari and Level

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Board Members Bush and Beale

Ted Luthin, Chair

Thank you very much to the applicant team. We appreciate your work on this and we look forward to seeing you in three weeks.

8. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 05:28 p.m. The next specially scheduled Tree/Design Review Board meeting will be held on Thursday, November 19, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kari Svanstrom
Planning Director