

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item #1
Meeting Date: 12-13-07

Agenda Item Title: Application for a Use Permit to expand and remodel a residence on a hillside property, and construct a swimming pool, detached second dwelling unit, workshop, tennis court, utility shed, and garden shed.

Applicant/Owner: Robert Baumann Architect/William Jasper Jr.

Site Address/Location: 80 Second Street East (APNs 018-042-005 and 018-091-005)

Staff Contact: Rob Gjestland, Associate Planner
Staff Report Prepared: 12/5/07

PROJECT SUMMARY

Description: Application of Robert Baumann Architect for a Use Permit to expand and remodel the residence at 80 Second Street East (APNs 018-042-005 and 018-091-005), and construct a swimming pool, detached second dwelling unit, workshop, tennis court, utility shed, and garden shed.

General Plan Designation: Hillside (H)

Planning Area: Northeast Area

Zoning: **Base:** Hillside Residential (R-HS) **Overlay:** Historic (/H)

Site Characteristics: The project involves new construction on two parcels: APN 018-042-005 (80 Second Street East) is a 4.2-acre parcel on the east side of Second Street East that is currently developed with a residence, swimming pool, barn, and shed. APN 018-091-005 is an undeveloped, 2.8-acre flag lot off of Fourth Street East.

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning:

North: Single-family home & Undeveloped land outside City limits/Hillside Residential & LIA100 (County Zoning)

South: Single-family homes/Hillside Residential

East: Single-family home/Hillside Residential

West: Single-family homes and condominium complex (across Second Street East)/Hillside Residential, Rural Residential, and Medium Density Residential

Environmental Review:

☒ Categorical Exemption
☐ Negative Declaration
☐ Environmental Impact Report
☐ Not Applicable

☐ Approved/Certified
☒ No Action Required
☐ Action Required

Staff Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

The project proponent purchased 80 Second Street East (APN 018-042-005) in 2006, and is currently in escrow to purchase two neighboring parcels to the east. The majority of proposed improvements would occur on the 80 Second Street East property, where the existing residence would be expanded and new accessory structures built. However, the tennis court is proposed on APN 018-091-005, one of the neighboring properties currently in escrow. The current owner of this parcel has authorized the application, and staff is presenting all elements of the project as a single Use Permit application.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project involves improvements on two hillside properties as follows:

80 Second Street East (APN 018-042-005):

- The existing residence would be remodeled and expanded from 3,286 square feet to 4,662 square feet (including garage areas). The residence is designed as a single-story structure, but includes a 32-foot tall rotunda that includes a second-story viewing balcony. New decks/patios would be provided in the front of the home along with a pool toward the southwest corner of the residence. The residence reflects a Spanish Colonial Revival style.
- An 848-square foot second dwelling unit is proposed on the slope below the residence and driveway.
- A 1,005-square foot workshop is proposed below the residence at the location of an existing pool, which would be removed. Photovoltaic panels would be located on south-facing roof element of the structure.
- A 424-square foot utility shed is proposed behind the northeast corner of the home.
- A 384-square foot gardening shed with covered patio is proposed behind the northwest corner of the home.
- Other proposed improvements include a new well, water tank, and modifications to the alignment and slope of the existing driveway (in conjunction with a fire truck turnaround) for easier navigation and better emergency access. The existing barn and shed would be retained.

APN 018-091-005: A tennis court is proposed on this parcel that would be accessed by a footpath leading through APN 018-051-009 (95 Brazil Street) from the property at 80 Second Street East.

As noted in the project narrative, a number of "green" development building practices have been incorporated into the project, and a green building management consultant has been hired to assist with the project. In addition, the applicant is working with an arborist to ensure the preservation of as many trees as possible in conjunction with the project. Based on the site plan, it appears that a total of ten trees would be removed, however the applicant has indicated that one of the two oak trees identified for removal directly in front of the home will now likely be preserved.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY (☐ **Not Applicable to this Project**)

The property is designated Hillside Residential by the General Plan. The Hillside Residential land use designation is intended to preserve Sonoma's hillside backdrop, while allowing limited residential development in conjunction with agricultural uses. The designation allows a density of one residential unit per ten acres (excluding second units). General Plan policies that apply to the project call for the protection of important scenic vistas (Community Development Element, Policy 5.3). The visibility of the project and its impact on scenic vistas is discussed below under the "Hillside Development."

DEVELOPMENT CODE CONSISTENCY (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

Use: The property is zoned Hillside Residential (R-HS). Single-family homes, second dwelling units, and accessory structures are permitted uses in the R-HS zoning district, subject to approval of Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

Density: The maximum density allowed within the R-HS zone is one dwelling unit per ten acres. The proposal involves expansion of the existing residence located on APN 018-042-005. The proposal does not raise any issues in terms of consistency with density limitations. Staff would note that second dwelling units are excluded from density calculations.

Setbacks for the Residence: Primary structures in the R-HS zone must be setback a minimum of 30 feet from all property lines. The residence complies with this requirement; however an above-grade patio/deck on the west side of the home (identified on Sheet A1.1 as the "Proposed BBQ Area") would encroach six feet into the required 30-foot setback. The applicant is requesting an Exception from the setback standards for this aspect of the project (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The maximum FAR in the R-HS zone is 0.10 or 10% of the total lot area. The project would increase the total FAR of APN 018-042-005 from 2% to 3.4%. Pursuant to the Development Code, FAR calculations include attached garages and accessory structures over 120 square feet, but exclude porches, cellars, attics, and second units.

Lot Coverage: The maximum coverage in the R-HS zone is 15% of the total lot area. The project would increase the lot coverage of APN 018-042-005 from 2% to 4%. Pursuant to the Development Code, porches and pools are excluded from coverage calculations.

Building Height (Primary Residence): The maximum building height within the R-HS zone is 30 feet for primary structures. In addition, Section 19.40.040 of the Development Code allows for chimneys, spires, and towers to project up to eight feet above the normally allowed structure height. The proposal complies with these height limitations. The residence would have a maximum height of 28 feet measured from finish grade, and the central tower would have a maximum height of 32 feet.

Setbacks & Building Height for Accessory Structures: Detached accessory structures, including second dwelling units, can be located as close as five feet from side or rear property lines provided that they meet specific height criteria (i.e., a wall/plate height of nine feet or less and a maximum roof height of 15 feet). All of the proposed accessory structures have been designed to comply with these height and setback standards: the workshop would be setback a minimum of six feet from the east property line and 22 feet from the south property line; the second unit would be setback a minimum of 14 feet from the south property line; the utility shed would be setback a minimum of 13 feet from the east property line; the garden shed would be setback 34 feet from the west property line.

Second Dwelling Unit: A detached second dwelling unit with an area of 848 square feet is proposed on the slope below the residence, in proximity to the south property line. The structure complies with the requirements for detached second dwelling units but requires Use Permit approval because it is a new structure in the R-HS zone and, as result, is subject to the hillside development standards and guidelines (see "Hillside Development" below).

Parking: One covered parking space is required for the primary residence and an additional covered parking space is required for the detached second dwelling unit. This parking requirement would be met by the attached three-car garage.

Tennis Court: The tennis court proposed on APN 018-091-005 complies with applicable Development Code standards for outdoor recreational courts. The 12-foot tall wire fencing proposed around the court does not raise any issues in terms of fence height requirements because it is located outside of the required 30-foot rear yard setback. In addition, exterior court lighting is not proposed. While the court meets the basic standards, it is subject to the hillside development standards and guidelines which are discussed in greater detail below. In addition, staff would note that this accessory use would occupy an area that could be considered the most appropriate home site for future development of this property (see Discussion of Project Issues).

Hillside Development: The purpose of the hillside development regulations and guidelines is to preserve and protect views to and from the hillside areas within the City, to preserve significant topographical features and habitats, and to maintain the identity, character, and environmental quality of the City. All new development within the R-HS zone is subject to approval of a Use Permit. As set forth under Section 19.40.050.F of the Development Code, the Planning Commission shall evaluate applications for hillside development based on the following objectives, in addition to the normal findings for a conditional use permit:

1. *The preservation of natural topographic features and appearances by maintaining the natural topography to the greatest extent possible.*

Relatively minor changes to the alignment and slope of the existing driveway are proposed, and expansion of the residence would require some additional grading around the periphery of the existing home site. The garden shed, workshop, and tennis court are proposed in areas that are gently sloping and/or already developed, and other accessory structures on steeper slopes would be built into the hillside. It appears that the fire truck turnaround would require the most significant alteration to the existing topography. In addition, the total amount of grading for all aspects of the project could be considered substantial when considered cumulatively (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

2. *The protection of natural topographic features and appearances through limitations on successive padding and terracing of building sites and the preservation of significant ridgelines, steep slopes, natural rock outcroppings, drainage courses, prominent trees and woodlands, vernal pools, and other areas of special natural beauty.*

For the most part, the residential remodel would occur within the building pad of the existing home site, and the garden shed, workshop, and tennis court are proposed in areas that are gently sloping and/or already developed. Other accessory structures on steeper slopes would be built into the hillside. Natural features on the site, including rock outcroppings and substantial woodlands would be preserved with the exception of the nine or ten trees that would require removal.

3. *The utilization of varying setbacks, building heights, foundation designs, and compatible building forms, materials, and colors that help blend buildings into the terrain.*

Proposed exterior finish materials for all buildings consist of stucco, exposed wood framing, stone veneer, and clay tile roofing that would utilize earth-tone colors to blend into the hillside. In addition, the residence is well articulated, with several roof elements of varying height that taper down from the central rotunda. While designed on a single level (similar to the existing home), the downslope/front side of the home includes arched opening beneath the deck, along with ring walls and a multi-level stairwell that add architectural interest and further break up the mass of the south elevation. Accessory structures proposed on steeper slopes (i.e., the second unit and utility shed) would be built into the hillside to help blend with the terrain.

4. *The utilization of clustered sites and buildings on more gently sloping terrain to reduce grading alterations on steeper slopes.*

Many of the proposed improvements, including the residential remodel, garden shed, workshop, and tennis court are proposed in areas that are gently sloping and/or already developed. It appears that the second unit and the fire truck turnaround would require grading alterations on steeper slopes (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

5. *The utilization of building designs, locations, and arrangements that protect views to and from the hillside area.*

The project includes the remodel/expansion of an existing residence and construction of several new accessory structures. At present, public views of the home are limited to only a few perspectives and obscured by the significant tree canopy on the property. The remodeled home is designed as a single-story structure, similar to the existing residence, but would be slightly more visible because it is somewhat larger and includes taller elements, including the central rotunda (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below). The proposed accessory buildings are smaller, at less prominent locations, and would be substantially screened from public views by the tree canopy and/or the residence. The proposed tennis court would not be visible given its location within a clearing that is surrounded by trees. As shown on the landscape plan, tree and shrub plantings are also proposed to provide additional screening of these accessory structures.

6. *The preservation and introduction of plant materials so as to protect slopes from soil erosion and slippage and minimize the visual effects of grading and construction of hillside areas.*

An erosion control plan is normally required for hillside development which will address measures for reseeding and stabilizing disturbed soil areas. The applicant indicates that native or drought tolerant grasses, reseeding, and/or ground covers would be provided for newly graded slopes.

7. *The utilization of street designs and improvements that minimize grading alterations and harmonize with the natural contours of the hillsides.*

Relatively minor changes to the alignment and slope of the existing driveway are proposed with the intent of providing easier navigation and better emergency access. However, as noted above, the fire truck turnaround will require a substantial alteration to the existing topography (refer to "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

Design Review: The City Council recently expanded the design review requirements for projects in the Historic Overlay zone. As a result, the project will be subject to subsequent review by the Design Review Commission (DRC). In this case, the Planning Commission is responsible for reviewing and acting upon the project site plan, building massing and elevation concepts to the extent it deems necessary. Subsequent review by the Design Review Commission would be limited to elevation details, exterior materials and colors, fencing (i.e., tennis court), and any other issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission.

Frontage Improvements: The property frontage on Second Street East is not improved with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Pursuant to Chapter 12.14 of the Sonoma Municipal Code Section, frontage improvement (curb, gutter and sidewalk) are required when improvements to a property exceed \$30,000. This requirement has been included in the draft conditions of approval.

**CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER
CITY ORDINANCES/POLICIES** (☒Not Applicable to this Project)

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (☐Not Applicable to this Project)

Pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the construction of a limited number of new, small structures is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA (Class 3 – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures).

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT ISSUES

Grading & Retaining Walls: Part of the fire truck turnaround is proposed on a steeper slope that would require substantial grading alterations and use of retaining walls. As noted on the site plan (Sheet A1.1), the retaining wall on the south side of the fire truck turnaround would reach a height of up to ten feet at its corner, which is inconsistent with the guideline that specifies that retaining walls should not be higher than five feet. However, the Fire Department has indicated that with any improvement of the property a fire truck turnaround will be required, and such a facility will inherently require a significant change to the natural topography given slopes on the site and the dimensional requirements of the turnaround. The proposed configuration has been reviewed by the Fire Department and was found to be an acceptable compromise.

Staff would also note that, cumulatively, the project requires a substantial amount of grading because of the scope of the project and number of proposed improvements. Nonetheless, the fire truck turnaround and other changes to the natural topography for the various elements of the project would be screened from view by the significant tree canopy on the property. In addition, grading has been designed to balance the amount of cut and fill along with retaining walls to minimize impacts to the existing topography. For these reasons, staff feels that the proposed grading, use of retaining walls, and changes to the natural topography are reasonable.

Visibility of the Residence: As noted above, the remodeled home would be slightly more visible than the existing residence because it is somewhat larger and includes taller elements, including the central rotunda. However, public views of the homesite are limited to only a few perspectives and obscured by the significant tree canopy on the property. In considering the proposal, staff found that the residence would be most visible from vantage points to the southwest, including at the intersection of First Street East and Blue Wing Drive (depicted in the photo simulations as "View C"), and from within Depot Park where the bikepath intersects the east side of First Street West. Nonetheless, the significant woodlands and tree canopy on the site would continue to provide significant screening of the home, even with removal of the nine to ten trees as proposed. In addition, the proposed earth-tone colors and materials would help blend the home into the natural setting and offset any increased visibility when compared to the current white building color, which is more noticeable. For these reasons, staff does not feel that the project would significantly degrade public views to or from the hillside.

Tennis Court Site: The tennis court is proposed on a vacant parcel (APN 018-091-005) that has the potential to be developed with a single-family residence, based on its R-HS zoning. Future plans for residential development of the property are not known. However, the proposed tennis court would occupy a gently sloping, open meadow on the property that, in relation to the hillside development standards, would likely be considered the most appropriate location for a residence.

Upgrades for Emergency Access: In addition to the fire truck turnaround, the Fire Department has specified that the following upgrades will also be required for fire suppression and emergency access:

Setback Exception: The corner of the above-grade patio/deck on the west side of the home would encroach up to six feet into the required 30-foot setback. In staff's view, this is a negligible encroachment that would have little impact on nearby properties or residents. As a result, staff supports the Exception request. Elinor Gatto, the neighbor to the west, has submitted a letter indicating that the encroachment is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Use Permit an Exception, subject to the attached conditions of approval.

Attachments:

1. *Findings*
2. *Draft Conditions of Approval*
3. *Location map*
4. *Project Narrative*
5. *Correspondence*
6. *Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Grading Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations*

Enclosures (distributed previously):

1. *Exterior Lighting Specifications*
2. *Photo Simulations*

cc: Robert Baumann Architect
678 Broadway
Sonoma, CA 95476

Bill Jasper Jr.
237 Irving Street
San Mateo, CA 94402

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
FINDINGS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Jasper Hillside Development – 80 Second Street East

September 13, 2007

Based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the staff report, and upon consideration of all testimony received in the course of the public review, including the public review, the City of Sonoma Planning Commission finds and declares as follows:

Use Permit Approval

1. That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any Specific Plan;
2. That the proposed use is allowed with a conditional Use Permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable standards and regulations of the Development Code (except for approved Variances and Exceptions).
3. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity; and
4. The proposed use will not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.

Setback Exception Approval

1. The adjustment authorized by the Exception is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable Specific Plan, and the overall objectives of this Development Code;
2. An exception to the normal standards of the Development Code is justified by environmental features or site conditions; historic development patterns of the property or neighborhood; or the interest in promoting creativity and personal expression in site planning and development;
3. Granting the Exception will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and in the same zoning district.

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
CONDITIONS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Jasper Hillside Development – 80 Second Street East

September 13, 2007

1. A grading and drainage plan, and an erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. The erosion control measures specified in the approved plan shall be implemented during construction. Water draining offsite shall drain directly into the street with a minimum 1% grade unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer. Retaining walls (concrete or masonry) or 2:1 cut and fill slopes shall be constructed if required to compensate for grade differences onsite. The required plans shall be approved prior to the issuance of a grading permit. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Best Management Plan. Applicable erosion control measures shall be identified on the erosion control plan and shall be implemented during the construction phase of the project:
 - a. Soil stabilization techniques such as hydroseeding and short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets or wattles.
 - b. Silt fences or some kind of inlet protection at downstream storm drain inlets.
 - c. Post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities for accumulated sediment.
 - d. Post-construction clearing of all drainage structures of debris and sediment.
 - e. Post-construction best management practices shall be installed (e.g., siltation ponds, bioswales) as directed by the City Engineer).

Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works
Timing: Prior to issuance of a grading permit
2. The project shall be constructed in conformance with the approved site plan, floor plan and building elevations, except as modified by these conditions.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; Building Division; City Engineer; Public Works Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
3. All Building Division requirements shall be met. A building permit shall be required for the structures and improvements.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division
Timing: Prior to construction
4. All Fire Department requirements shall be met, including the provision of fire sprinklers within structures as deemed necessary. More extensive fire sprinkler requirements may be imposed, such as the provision of sprinklers within attic areas.

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
5. An approved all-weather emergency vehicle access road to within 150 feet of all portions of all structures shall be provided prior to beginning combustible construction.

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
6. If not currently provided, the entry gate shall be modified to provide a minimum clear width of 12 feet. In addition, some type of gate control access override shall be provided for the Fire Department for the automated entry gate, such as a Knox box.

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
7. Whatever source of water is chosen for fire suppression shall be augmented as necessary to meet the hydraulic requirements of the sprinkler system.

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

8. A 100-foot vegetation clearing (i.e., grass and dead shrubs/plants) shall be maintained around the residence.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit; Ongoing
9. A soils and geotechnical investigation and report, prepared by a licensed civil engineer, shall be required prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Recommendations identified in the report shall be incorporated into the construction plans for the project and into the building permits.
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to issuance of a grading/building permit
10. Parking and drive surfaces shall be surfaced with appropriate materials to support emergency vehicles, subject to the specifications and approval of the City Engineer, Fire Department, and Building Department.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit and/or final occupancy
11. The property frontage along Second Street East shall be improved with curb, gutter, sidewalk, unless waived by the City Council. The ultimate configuration of the frontage improvements shall be subject to the discretion of the City Engineer. The applicant shall be responsible for any necessary pavement widening and/or repair along the Second Street East frontage as required by the City Engineer.
Enforcement Responsibility: Public Works Division; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to final occupancy
12. An encroachment permit shall be required for any work within the public right of way.
Enforcement Responsibility: Public Works; Building Division
Timing: Prior to construction of frontage improvements
13. A sewer clearance shall be provided to the City of Sonoma Building Division verifying that all applicable sewer fees have been paid prior to the issuance of any building permit. **Note: Substantial fees may apply for new sewer connections and/or the use of additional ESDs from an existing sewer connection. The applicant is encouraged to check with the Sonoma County Water Agency immediately to determine whether such fees apply.**
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
14. The project shall be subject to architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), encompassing elevation details, exterior materials and colors, and tennis court fencing.
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
15. In the event that exterior lighting is proposed for tennis court in the future, it shall be subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC).
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC
Timing: Prior to installation of lighting
16. The second dwelling unit shall be subject to the following requirements and limitations:
 - a. No more than three (3) persons shall occupy the second dwelling unit at any one time.
 - b. The main or second unit on the property shall be owner-occupied.
 - c. One covered parking space shall be maintained for the second unit.*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Division
Timing: Ongoing
17. Dust control measures, subject to approval by the Building Official and the City Engineer, shall be implemented during the construction of the project. All exposed soil areas shall be watered twice daily or as required by the City's construction inspector.
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; Public Works Division
Timing: Ongoing during construction

18. The following agencies must be contacted by the applicant to determine permit or other regulatory requirements of the agency prior to issuance of a building permit, including the payment of applicable fees:

a. *Sonoma County Water Agency* [For sewer connections and modifications and interceptor requirements]

b. *Sonoma Valley Unified School District* [For school impact fees]

Enforcement Responsibility: *Building Division; Public Works Division*

Timing: *Ongoing during construction*

**-CITY OF SONOMA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
Council Chambers, 177 First Street West
December 13, 2007
MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, November 1, 2007, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, #1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California.

Chair Gallian called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Fire Station Training Room, 630 Second Street West, and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:	Present:	Chair Gallian, Comms. Yankovich, Anderson, Cook, Edwards
	Absent:	Comms. Howarth, George
	Others	Planning and Community Services Administrator Goodison, Associate Planner
	Present:	Gjestland, Assistant Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Leveille

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: none

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: It was moved by Comm. Edwards, seconded by Comm. Anderson, to approve the minutes of November 8, 2007, as amended. **The motion carried unanimously, with one abstention.**

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail concerning Item #4

ITEM #1 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to expand and remodel a residence on a hillside property, and construct a swimming pool, detached second dwelling unit, workshop, tennis court, utility shed, and garden shed at 80 Second Street East.

Applicant/Property Owner: Robert Baumann Architect/William Jasper, Jr.

Associate Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Yankovich confirmed the parcel with the tennis court is in escrow, and the two lots will not be merged.

Comm. Cook confirmed the current house has no fire wall. He confirmed with staff the rock wall most likely dates back to the early 19th century.

Comm. Edwards confirmed the current owner of the parcel for the proposed tennis court did give permission for the application to be presented.

Comm. Anderson confirmed the tennis court is a contingent to the Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Robert Baumann, Architect, stated the staff report explains the most important points, but he would like to add some of the goals of owner, which include improving the driveway, and a more functional house with gas and cable. Certain notions of green building and sustainable development are involved in the project and he noted, as he usually tries to introduce these concepts to clients, that the owner already had solid ideas regarding use of these concepts. The Green Building consultant is present for questions this evening. The amount of cubic footage for draining is not ready, but will be calculated and included in the permit-ready drawings. Mr. Baumann stated balance will be retained. He stated the owner feels given the location of the two parcels, the tennis court is in the optimum location.

Chair Gallian stated he would like to see a drawing of the tennis court lot. A discussion ensued as to the tennis court lot and Mr. Baumann stated there is space to the south-east of the tennis court that could be used for residential development. Comm. Yankovich stated the parcel could be sold and developed. A discussion ensued regarding development on this lot, and Mr. Baumann stated he believed there is room for development given the hillside designation. City Planner Goodison stated one of the drawings shows a larger perspective of the lot with the tennis court and any further development would come to the Planning Commission for review. Chair Gallian stated he toured the site and felt the view towards and from the Sebastiani property may not be favorable. Chair Gallian confirmed the fire department is satisfied with the turn-around. Mr. Baumann stated the driveway originally came up through where the guest house has been placed in the plan, which would have resulted in more trees and topography being removed. This driveway plan is a compromise in order to allow more trees to remain, but still comply with the Fire regulations. Administrative Captain Jones has reviewed the site. He stated there are provisions, including sprinklers in the attic and generators, and the current pump will be changed to an in-line pump. There will be a system designed to ensure fire suppression in case of fire and it will be an improvement to the current figuration.

Comm. Edwards confirmed the owners currently has no plans for illumination of the tennis court, but does want to retain the right to have lights in the future if he so chooses. Mr. Baumann stated if lighting was proposed, it would be subject to review by the Design Review Commission. Comm. Edwards stated lighting was a concern.

Kevin Gileran, Green Building Consultant, stated he has worked on both commercial and residential projects throughout the valley. He stated a common theme is the use of either the LEEDS program or the "Build It Green" program. Both were used in considering this particular project, placing the utmost importance on high-energy efficiency and renewable resources. The nature of the project was to look at the sustainable aspects that may be utilized, such as drip irrigation. He looks forward to working with the Civil Engineer regarding these issues, including water run-off. Chair Gallian confirmed permeable paving will utilized in the driveway, and a few other

spaces in conjunction with sediment. Chair Gallian confirmed with Mr. Baumann that the existing foundation will remain, and there will be additions to the original footprint, as well as point-loads. The geotechnical engineer has looked at the project and supports the plan. The site itself is almost all bedrock. Mr. Gileran confirmed cement will be the substance recycled the most, and the new concrete will be a fly-ash in order to reduce the impact of the new construction. There are a few other elements that will be reused, including the existing wood beneath the walls. Any materials that leave the site will be separated and either re-used or routed to where they can be recycled.

Comm. Yankovich confirmed with Mr. Gileran that there will be an electrical meter for the whole system and there will be a solar system installed. He described how the solar system saves electricity.

Chair Gallian confirmed radiant flooring is part of the plan, and Mr. Gilerman stated solar hot water will also be utilized, with the baseline hot water load being solar and a portion will be backed up with instantaneous system. A discussion ensued regarding solar heating, laws currently in effect and its efficiency.

Ilene McKenna, 142 Second Street East, has lived there for over 60 years and stated the rock wall is a great feature. She stated concern about the guest cottage and its visibility. She stated there is a path to the property and she wondered if the path would be lit.

Associate Planner Gjestland stated the cottage would be screened to the south and the east. There are additional scrub plants proposed along the property line of Ms. McKenna, as well as the existing trees on her property.

Mr. Baumann stated when the property was planned, he did not even see her house while designing the space and he doubts there will be a disruption in the view. He stated the path will be down-lit, and the driveway lights will be replaced.

Ms. McKenna stated she believes the Jaspers respect the property and has no objections to the project.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Yankovich stated he liked the project and applauded the architect. He moved to approve.

Comm. Edwards stated he was concerned about the lighting issue and stated he always looks at possible future development when evaluating projects. He recommended to Mr. Baumann to discuss all future projects with the neighbors.

It was moved by Comm. Yankovich moved to approve to the application as submitted. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #2 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for an exception to the side yard setback requirements to allow for a ±300-square foot covered deck at 310 France Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Joseph Browne

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Yankovich confirmed the existing deck is four and half, as well as proposed. He confirmed the proposed deck is covered.

Chair Gallian confirmed the photo included in the staff report is an example of what the deck will look like when completed.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Joseph Browne, applicant, stated he was available for questions and that the neighbors have been consulted and they have no objections.

Comm. Anderson stated it is a reasonable request.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

It was moved by Comm. Anderson moved to approve to the application as submitted. Comm. Edwards seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #3 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to establish a 550-square foot hair salon within a portion of a commercial building at 645 First Street West.

Applicant/Property Owner: Terry Harms/Deborah Emery & Catalina Wetzel

Associate Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

It was moved by Comm. Yankovich moved to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Cook seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #4- PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to allow an attached secondary dwelling unit within an existing single-family residence and an Exception from on-site parking requirements associated with a proposed second dwelling unit at 163 Church Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Garry Baker/Kimberly Martinson

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Gallian confirmed the Conditions of Approval will be attached to the sale of the property, and any new owner would be informed. The best case scenario is the real estate agent disclosing the condition. Staff was unaware whether the work will be completed before the lot is sold.

Comm. Edwards confirmed there is a possibility for more than three cars on the lot.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Garry Baker, applicant, stated the comments are relevant and that he was initially unaware the Use Permit had expired and would like to have it again. Currently the house is off the market, but the owner reserves the right to sell. The property was purchased with the Use permit and they would like to continue to have that option.

Comm. Anderson stated he remembers the original application, and that the approval was based on the need for work-force housing in contrast to the parking situation. The applicant was not asking for any further privilege to others currently on the street.

Comm. Edwards stated he would like to see the documentation from the previous sale and see the disclosure of the realtor. City Planner Goodison stated the COAS were available at the time.

Mr. Baker stated the drawings were presented to the owner along with the documents for sale. Chair Gallian confirmed the drawings submitted are the same as were presented to the owner.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Cook stated the first exception with the secondary unit is an internal change; there is no exterior change. He feels the parking situation was alleviated considering the density requirements of the area.

It was moved by Comm. Cook moved to approve to the application as submitted. Comm. Yankovich seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #5 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for Exceptions in order to allow the remodel/expansion of a residence at 724 Charles Van Damme Way.

Applicant/Property Owner: Lorna and Barry Sheridan

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Lorna Sheridan, applicant, stated the Real Estate agent did not make them aware of the limitations of the property and the addition seemed to be in the appropriate space, considering it allows for the preservation of a tree and is more aesthetically pleasing. She stated the neighbors have been consulted and they concur with the applicant regarding the application.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Cook stated this is a good example of how an exception should be utilized.

It was moved by Comm. Cook moved to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Yankovich seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #6 - DISCUSSION: Review of draft request for proposals for consultant assistance to implement General Plan sustainability measures.

City Planner Goodison presented staff's report.

Chair Gallian stated the draft request is what would be sent out.

Comm. Cook confirmed writing the consultants directly would be the best way to solicit assistance.

Chair Gallian confirmed this is a growing field and there are few resources available for use.

Comm. Edwards confirmed locations such as Portland and Marin County, as well as cities of the same approximate size of Sonoma, have utilized this type of plan.

Comm. Anderson clarified the definition of credentials for the consultants.

Comm. Yankovich confirmed staff goals are to prepare an inventory of applicable projects and then to move forward.

Comm. Edwards confirmed a University could be involved, such as Sonoma State University. City Planner Goodison stated they have a great deal of expertise.

Chair Gallian stated it seems more like a presentation than an engagement to action. He would like to see the process be more proactive. City Planner Goodison stated any process will require education and engagement. In reviewing the baselines, it should allow for additional possibilities. Chair Gallian stated there are many issues regarding the local economy and early input is important.

Comm. Cook confirmed there are elements that lend themselves to the implementation of a green building program. City Planner Goodison stated the requirements and targets are flexible and voluntary.

Chair Gallian confirmed Santa Rosa has an ordinance, but it is a voluntary, incentive-based program. City Planner Goodison stated City Council is in a review process concerning this, and Chair Gallian stated the City needs to be more aggressive if it is going to meet certain goals that have been discussed.

Comm. Edwards stated it will be a challenge to keep up with the builders in the area. Chair Gallian stated the first application was a great example of learning from the builders who have experience and knowledge.

Chair Gallian confirmed with City Planner Goodison that the Development Code, the General Plan, the water standards, greenhouse gas targets, and other documents are all being used as sources. Chair Gallian stated he was impressed with the planning seminar, especially the matrix regarding the General Plan and how to cross-reference these ideas. He suggested this form be used as a model for the City. City Planner Goodison stated it was a good opportunity.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Anderson confirmed the inventory of existing green policies is what staff is working on with this RFP, and there will eventually be a report that may include quantifiable objectives. The City understands certain information will be helpful, but will know more about how helpful and what the benefits will be over time.

Comm. Anderson confirmed the League of California Cities has resources in this area.

Chair Gallian stated there are numerous details and goals which could be included, such as the use of electric vehicles for policing, a heritage tree plan designation, an analysis of load usage and opportunities for solar generation. He cited an example of Berkeley, which funds installation of solar.

A discussion ensued as to the structured loan of the Berkeley program.

ISSUES UPDATE: Comm. Barnier has resigned from the Commission.

The draft EIR for 475 Denmark Street has been completed and the Public Hearing should occur in February. It will be a special meeting. Comm. Anderson recused due to proximity.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: none

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for January 10, 2007, at 6:30 p.m.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant

**City of Sonoma
Design Review Commission
Agenda Item Summary**

DRC Agenda Item: 4

Meeting Date: 1/25/08

Applicant

Robert Baumann, Architect

Project Location

80 Second Street East

Historical Significance

- ☐ Listed on National Register of Historic Places, including Sonoma Plaza district (Significant)
 - ☐ Listed on California Register of Historic Resources (Significant)
 - ☐ Listed within Local Historic Resources Survey (Potentially Significant)
 - ☐ Over 50 years old (Potentially Significant)
- Year Built: 1980

Request

Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors, and tennis court fencing associated with a residential project in the Hillside Residential zoning district.

Summary

Background: On December 13, 2007 the Planning Commission approved a Use Permit for a number of improvements on two Hillside Residential zoned properties: 80 Second Street East (APN 018-042-005), a 4.2-acre parcel on the east side of Second Street East that is currently developed with a residence, swimming pool, barn, and shed; and APN 018-091-005, an undeveloped 2.8-acre flag lot off of Fourth Street East. A recreation court was approved on the undeveloped parcel. All other improvements were approved on the adjacent property at 80 Second Street East, including the following:

- The existing residence will be remodeled and expanded from 3,286 square feet to 4,662 square feet (including garage area). The residence is designed as a single-story structure, but includes a 32-foot tall rotunda with a second-story viewing balcony. New decks/patios are provided in the front of the home along with a pool toward the southwest corner of the residence. The residence reflects a Spanish revival style.
- An 848-square foot second dwelling unit was approved on the slope below the residence and driveway.
- A 1,005-square foot workshop was approved at the location of an existing pool that will be removed. Photovoltaic panels will be located on south-facing roof element of the structure.
- A 424-square foot utility shed was approved behind the northeast corner of the home.
- A 384-square foot gardening shed with covered patio was approved behind the northwest corner of the home.
- Other approved upgrades include modification to the alignment and slope of the existing driveway (in conjunction with a fire truck turnaround) for easier navigation and better emergency access. The existing barn and shed will be retained.

In approving the Use Permit, the Planning Commission found that the project was consistent with the Hillside Development standards and guidelines. Per the conditions of approval, the project is subject to subsequent architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), limited to elevation details, exterior materials and colors, and tennis court fencing.

Building Elevations & Exterior Materials: The primary residence will be remodeled in a Spanish revival style and the new accessory buildings have been designed for compatibility with the home. Proposed exterior materials for all buildings include stucco walls, salvaged timber lintels, stone veneer, clay tile roofing and vents, wrought iron railing, and field stone retaining walls. The building elevations and exterior materials are consistent with the building elevations approved by the Planning Commission in December. Images of the proposed materials are attached for consideration and a material sample board will be presented by the applicant at the upcoming DRC meeting. In general, the design of the buildings and proposed exterior materials and finishes are consistent with architectural considerations for infill in the Historic Zone, in that the Spanish revival architecture is common in Sonoma.

Exterior Colors: As recommended by the Hillside Development Guidelines, the proposed exterior building materials and color scheme use earth tones in order to help blend into the natural landscape. A sandy stucco color would be used on the buildings. Window and door cladding are proposed as either dark brown or dark green. Local field stone would be used for retaining walls, and the proposed stone veneer is a similar but more refined local stone. The salvaged timber lintels would be

stained dark brown and the clay roof tiles vary from reddish-brown to dark brown in color.

Recreation Court Fencing: Fencing around the recreation court would have a height of three feet at midcourt and a height of 12 feet at both ends, consistent with the height approved by the Planning Commission in December. In terms of design, the fencing would be composed of vinyl coated chain link fencing supported by vinyl coated metal posts. The vinyl coating would be dark brown in color. Exterior lighting of the recreational court is not proposed at this time, and would be subject to review by the DRC if proposed in the future (per the Use Permit conditions of approval). Staff would note that the recreational court and associated fencing is at a location that would not be visible from public vantage points.

Commission Discussion

Design Review Commission Action

☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Referred to: _____ ☐ Continued to: _____

Roll Call Vote: 5 Aye 0 Nay 0 Abstain 0 Absent

DRC Conditions or Modifications

- *Approved as presented, including optional stucco color and optional window cladding colors.*

cc: Robert Baumann Architect
678 Broadway
Sonoma, CA 95476

Bill Jasper Jr.
237 Irving Street
San Mateo, CA 94402

Attachments:

1. Project Narrative
2. Images of Proposed Exterior Materials
3. Site Plan & Elevations

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
Fire Station Training Room, 630 Second Street West
January 15, 2008
DRAFT MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, January 11, 2007, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, #1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:37 p.m., Chair Cribb presiding

ROLL CALL: Present: Chair Carlson, Comms. Cribb, McDonald, Appleman, Bernard
Absent:

Staff Present: Associate Planner Gjestland

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

CORRESPONDENCE: none

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Comm. Carlson moved to approve the minutes of November 20, 2007, as submitted; Chair Cribb seconded the motion.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve the minutes of December 20, 2007, as amended; Comm. Carlson seconded the motion.

ITEM #1 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of two window signs and two illuminated window signs for Radio Shack at 201 West Napa Street, #16.

Applicant: Cathy Lewis

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Manager, stated he would remove the adhesive signs and keep the two vendor signs provided by the company. He does have banners for specific promotions which he would like to display and change out as promotions change. Comm. Carlson confirmed the hours of illumination as Monday thru Saturday, 9 a.m.-8 p.m. and Sunday from 10 a.m.-7 p.m.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Carlson stated she has no issues with the application and believes the signage is appropriate. Comms. Appleman and McDonald agreed.

Comm. Bernard moved to approve the application as amended by the applicant. Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #2 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of six window signs, two illuminated window signs, one banner sign, one wall sign, one sign face to be placed on an existing monument sign, and one A-board sign for Sonoma Phoneman at 19310 Sonoma Highway.

Applicant: Rich Contreras

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Chair Cribb confirmed with staff that the monument sign was approved several years ago. Staff stated a specific type of sign program was not discussed; rather, the primary signs would be in the gables. Chair Cribb stated the fitness center has a similar type of sign. Staff stated certain signage does not require review.

Rich Contreras, applicant, stated there are two illuminated signs, the Verizon sign and the OPEN sign. He stated the A-Frame is important, and since it has been displayed he has attracted more customers. Currently, Verizon is in discussion

with a larger company to start another Verizon service center in Sonoma, which will affect all small business phone companies in the City. The A-Board sign is visible and attracts more clients, which helps maintain the quota of customers Verizon requires. He stated the senior citizen population especially has commented on how the A-Board has alerted them to the existence of his store.

Comm. Carlson confirmed the applicant would like both the A-board and the monument sign due to the inadequate sight lines. She stated the owner could be approached about raising the monument sign and altering the landscaping. She confirmed the window signs could be removed in order to have the signs that face traffic. She stated she would like to see a permanent sign rather than a banner. Mr. Contreras stated the occupants of the facility have been after the owner for years to alter the monument sign, but to no avail.

Comm. Bernard confirmed the windows were tinted before Mr. Contreras started renting the space.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard stated she understood the needs of the applicant, and that she would rather not have the banner. She stated she is not adverse to the A-Board sign.

Comm. McDonald stated he was not opposed to the A-Board sign. He stated he would like to see a compromise involving the window signs and banners. He is not opposed the monument sign, but would like to see the arrows removed.

Comm. Appleman stated she felt the monument sign would be more visible than the A-Board sign and that she would rather not have the banner sign. She does want to help keep the business going.

Comm. Carlson stated she is opposed to the banner sign, and she suggested the applicant discuss the monument sign with the owner of the property. She stated she hates A-Board signs, and would suggest a temporary approval while other options are exhausted.

Chair Cribb stated he finds A-Board sign abhorrent, and there is already a great deal of visual clutter in that area of town. He stated he is opposed to the A-Board sign, particularly given the existence of the monument sign, and he is opposed to the banner sign. He stated a window sign would be preferable, and stated the Commission does want to support business in the community.

Comm. Bernard suggested the A-Board sign be allowed to remain until the next meeting, so that the applicant could return with a revised sign plan. Comm. Carlson agreed.

A discussion ensued regarding the location of signs, any potential financial hardship and the issues with the landlord.

Comm. McDonald stated the subsequent review should consider the sign program for the entire complex.

A discussion ensued as to the motion and what aspects could potentially be approved this evening.

Comm. Bernard motioned to continue the item, giving the applicant 60 days to return with a new sign plan. The A-board and banner sign may be displayed during this time; Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #3 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of replacement arbor associated with the General's Daughter Restaurant at 400 West Spain Street.

Applicant: Daniel Glasner

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Dan Glasner, applicant, displayed transparencies illustrating the proposal. He explained that the owner initially did not feel a new arbor would be needed, but after the last changes to the outdoor area were complete, he agreed a larger arbor was necessary. He stated the new arbor would be more attractive and match the restaurant. He described the revised

lighting plan, stating there will be approximately 25% more lights, but the lights themselves are shaded. He displayed illustrations of how the structure would look from different points on the street.

Chair Cribb confirmed Mr. Glasner would like some latitude with height. Mr. Glasner is worried certain sections may be too tall, and would like to be able to improvise a bit. Comm. McDonald confirmed Mr. Glasner would like to attach the structure to the porch, and that the rose vine was to be preserved.

Comm. Carlson commended the applicant for his work on this property.

Chair Cribb confirmed the lights along the trim have louvers and that all the lights are down lights. Mr. Glasner asked for the Commission to allow him to either use steel or wood. If steel was used, it would be in the beams.

Bill Willers, First Street West, stated he believed the structure would have to be steel in order to keep the delicate aspects of the structure. He believes this will stay more in tune with the original building.

Comm. Carlson, Comm. Appleman and Comm. Bernard all stated they like the proposal.

Comm. McDonald stated he was reluctant to approve a structure that would be attached to a potential registry of Historic Properties. He stated he would like to see the project redesigned to be a freestanding aspect. Chair Cribb echoed the concerns of Comm. McDonald. Mr. Glasner stated from the conception of the arbor this has been a concern. In designing the arbor, he did not want to add to the number of posts. He stated the roses would be in danger if additional posts were used and there would be minimal impact to the building.

Comm. McDonald stated he sees potential to have a freestanding structure with the same number of posts. His concept would diminish the seating capacity. He again expressed concern about attaching a structure to the house, and stated he felt it could potentially hurt the property in the future with regard to Historic Registry.

Elise Glasner, co-applicant, confirmed the exterior of the structure is what is considered the most when a building is considered for the historic registry. Comm. McDonald again stated that the addition of the arbor to the porch could impact this potential. He stated he felt there was a way to redesign the structure as a freestanding arbor.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

A discussion ensued regarding the arbor and its design.

Comm. Carlson motioned to approve the item as submitted; Comm. Bernard seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1.

ITEM #4 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors, and tennis court fencing associated with a residential project at 80 Second Street East.

Applicant: Robert Baumann Architect

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Robert Baumann, architect, thanked staff for the report and displayed samples of materials. There is a possibility that some will change, but it would be nothing significant.

Chair Cribb confirmed the landscaping was discussed and reviewed by the Planning Commission. Comm. Bernard confirmed the original residence was built in 1980. A discussion ensued regarding the visuals presented by Mr. Baumann.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard stated she approves of the application. The other Commissioners agreed.

Comm. Bernard motioned to approve the item as submitted; Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #5 –DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of elevation details and exterior materials associated with the remodel of a historic building at 151-155 East Napa Street.

Applicant: Byron Jones and Julie Morrison

Associate Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Byron Jones, applicant, stated he is a former resident of Sonoma and he loves the look of the town. He stated he was looking forward to working on the project.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the garage will not have structural work done, but will be painted and cleaned up.

Bill Willers, architect, made himself available for questions and stated the building needs work in order to be code compliant. The house has suffered due to lack of maintenance, and the windows will be replaced along with some of the doors. He stated the second floor will have an extension added, and confirmed the rectangle under the primary gable is the historic portion of the house. He stated the house will be white, but will contrast with a warmer body color for the house. He confirmed the windows are vinyl and single-hung and the modification of the inside of building will change the configuration of the windows. This also allows the unit to feel more spacious and gives room for deck space. He confirmed with Comm. Carlson that the building is in bad shape, and many decisions were made from an economical standpoint. In order to use something in lieu of vinyl for the windows would cause the project to be over budget. Comm. McDonald confirmed having wooden windows on the front and vinyl in the back was not discussed and the landscape plan was to remain as is. Mr. Willers stated there would be shrubs planted around the front, but there is no extra space for trees. He confirmed parking will remain as is, and is in compliance.

Mr. Jones stated he would prefer the wooden windows as well, but given the extent of the project they are not financially viable.

Seeing there were no comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Chair Cribb stated wooden windows could be installed at a later date given the needs of the project. He would rather see the project move forward, and do not see the project as being an exact historic restoration. Comm. Appleman agreed. Comm. Carlson stated she has a real problem with the windows, but would like to support the project.

Comm. McDonald commended the architect and stated he would like to see wood siding. He confirmed the roof will be a medium slate gray, asphalt shingle. Mr. Willers described the door materials throughout the structure and stated there would only be minimal outdoor lighting, with recessed lighting on the porches.

Comm. Appleman motioned to approve the item as submitted; Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

OUTSTANDING ITEMS: The next regular meeting will take place at the new meeting room at 175 First Street West.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: Comm. Carlson asked staff to follow up with the application for Big O Tires. Comm. McDonald confirmed there will be a quorum for the special meeting on January 22, 2008.

A discussion ensued concerning historic materials and changes that have occurred to historic buildings, as well as Sonoma in general, in the past few years.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m. to a regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 19, 2008.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item #7
Meeting Date: 3-13-08

Agenda Item Title: Application for a Use Permit to construct a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property.

Applicant/Owner: Jon Curry/Ron Hyman

Site Address/Location: 232 Second Street East

Staff Contact: Rob Gjestland, Senior Planner
Staff Report Prepared: 3/7/08

PROJECT SUMMARY

Description: Application of Jon Curry for a Use Permit to construct a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property at 232 Second Street East.

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Planning Area: Northeast Area

Zoning: **Base:** Rural Residential (R-R) **Overlay:** Historic (/H)

Site Characteristics: The subject property is an interior 0.5-acre parcel accessed by a private driveway off Second Street East. The property has an average slope of 13% and is currently undeveloped. Twenty-three trees are located on the parcel.

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning: **North:** Vacant parcels/Rural Residential
 South: Vacant parcels/Rural Residential
 East: Vacant parcel/Rural Residential & Hillside Residential
 West: Vacant parcels/Rural Residential

Environmental Review:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved/Certified
<input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report	<input type="checkbox"/> Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Staff Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

The subject property is one of four lots recently created as part of the Hyman Subdivision (approved by the Planning Commission in September 2006). Lots within the subdivision are accessed by a common driveway off Second Street East that terminates at a fire truck turnaround.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project involves construction of a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property. The residence would include $\pm 3,780$ square feet of living area and an attached 540-square foot garage. In general, the proposed improvements are stepped on the hillside, which has an average slope of 13%. The architecture of the residence is inspired by a historic barn located in Glen Ellen (a photo of the barn is attached for reference). Exterior materials and finishes would include rubble stone veneer, stucco, board and batten siding and corrugated metal roofing. The downhill or westernmost portion of the residence would be two stories with a height of 30-feet (this part of the structure would house a garage on the ground floor and a guest room above). The remainder of the building is one-story, decreasing to a maximum height of 20 feet on its east side. Terraces have been provided behind and in front of the home for outdoor use. The historic stone walls currently located on the property would be retained. Based on the site plan, seven of the 23 trees located on the property would be removed to accommodate the project. Additional details are provided in the attached project narrative.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

The property is designated Rural Residential by the General Plan. This designation is intended to preserve areas of lower density development within city limits, especially adjacent to hillsides and in established low-density neighborhoods. The designation allows a maximum density of 2 residential units per acre (excluding second units). General Plan policies that apply to the project call for the protection of important scenic vistas and the incorporation of natural features into project design (Community Development Element, Policy 5.3). The visibility of the project and its impact on scenic vistas and natural features is discussed below under "Hillside Development."

DEVELOPMENT CODE CONSISTENCY (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

Use: The property is zoned Rural Residential (R-R). Single-family homes and related accessory structures are permitted uses in the R-R zoning district. Development of the property is subject to approval of a Use Permit by the Planning Commission because the building site is considered a hillside area with slopes exceeding 10% (the building site has an average slope of 13%).

Density: The maximum density allowed in the R-R zone is two dwelling units per acre. The parcel is roughly one-half acre, which allows for a single-family home as proposed.

Setbacks: Primary structures in the R-R zone must be setback a minimum of 30 feet from the front and rear property lines (the west and east property lines in this case). In addition, a minimum 20-foot side yard setback is required and combined side yard setbacks must total 50 feet. The residence and swimming pool comply with the applicable setback requirements. Staff would note that eaves may extend up to three feet into a required setback (§19.40.110.C).

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The maximum FAR in the R-R zone is 0.20 or 20% of the total lot area. The project would result in a FAR of .20, the maximum allowed. Pursuant to the Development Code, FAR calculations include attached garages but exclude porches and basements.

Lot Coverage: The maximum coverage in the R-R zone is 25% of the total lot area. The project would result in a lot coverage of 18%. Pursuant to the Development Code, porches and pools are excluded from coverage calculations.

Building Height: The maximum building height within the R-R zone is 30 feet for primary structures, as measured from finished grade. The westernmost element of the residence is the tallest portion of the structure with a height of 30 feet from grade. Farther up the slope, the building decreases to a maximum height of 20 feet on its east side.

Parking: One covered parking space is required for a single-family home. The parking requirement would be met by the attached two-car garage.

Hillside Development: The purpose of the hillside development regulations and guidelines is to preserve and protect views to and from the hillside areas within the City, to preserve significant topographical features and habitats, and to maintain the identity, character, and environmental quality of the City. New development within hillside areas that have a slope of 10% or greater is subject to approval of a Use Permit by the Planning Commission. As set forth under Section 19.40.050.F of the Development Code, the Planning Commission shall evaluate applications for hillside development based on the following objectives, in addition to the normal findings for a conditional use permit:

1. *The preservation of natural topographic features and appearances by maintaining the natural topography to the greatest extent possible.*

The project utilizes split-level foundations and retaining walls to terrace the residence, pool, and outdoor use areas with the direction of the slope. In addition, access to the garage would be provided by a short driveway extension. This approach minimizes grading and maintains the natural topography to the greatest extent possible.

2. *The protection of natural topographic features and appearances through limitations on successive padding and terracing of building sites and the preservation of significant ridgelines, steep slopes, natural rock outcroppings, drainage courses, prominent trees and woodlands, vernal pools, and other areas of special natural beauty.*

The project involves construction of a single home on a residential lot and therefore does not require successive and/or terraced building sites that would normally be associated with larger developments. In addition, the property is not in proximity to a ridgeline and slopes across the site are generally consistent. Based on the development plan, seven trees within the interior of the property would be removed to accommodate the project including a privet, three fruit trees, a deodar cedar, and two live oaks. However, 70% of the trees currently located on the property would be retained and none of the trees proposed for removal were specifically identified for preservation under the Tree Preservation Plan approved for the Hyman subdivision (see "Tree Ordinance" below). Staff would also note that trees removed from the site would have to be replaced at a ratio of 2:1. Although not natural features, the attractive, historic rock walls toward the front and rear of the property would be preserved.

3. *The utilization of varying setbacks, building heights, foundation designs, and compatible building forms, materials, and colors that help blend buildings into the terrain.*

The project utilizes varying structure heights and setbacks, split-level foundations, and retaining walls to terrace improvements with the direction of the slope. Proposed exterior finish materials consist of rubble stone veneer, stucco, board and batten siding and corrugated metal roofing. With the exception of the corrugated metal roofing, these exterior finishes and materials would employ natural and earth-tone colors that would help blend into the hillside (i.e. natural stone, tan stucco, recycled wood). The only other notable inconsistency with the hillside design guidelines is the use of the gable end on the downhill (west) elevation, which is a two-story building element in this case (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

4. *The utilization of clustered sites and buildings on more gently sloping terrain to reduce grading alterations on steeper slopes.*

The buildable area of the lot is relatively compact, and slopes within the building envelope do not differ significantly (13% on average).

5. *The utilization of building designs, locations, and arrangements that protect views to and from the hillside area.*

Because the property is located at the base of a hillside, public views of the residence would be limited to vantage points close to the site. Trees on the property and in the surrounding area would further restrict public views of the proposed development. Through field visits, staff determined that portions of the home would be visible from a limited number of perspectives on the bike path to the south and on Second Street East. In general, conditions on and around the site would serve to protect views to and from the hillside area. However, the color of the corrugated metal roofing and the two-story gable end on the west elevation would increase its visibility to some extent (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

6. *The preservation and introduction of plant materials so as to protect slopes from soil erosion and slippage and minimize the visual effects of grading and construction of hillside areas.*

An erosion control plan is normally required for hillside development, which would address measures for reseeded and stabilizing disturbed soil areas (see condition of approval No. 1). In addition, a landscape plan would be required for the project, subject to review and approval by the Design Review Commission.

7. *The utilization of street designs and improvements that minimize grading alterations and harmonize with the natural contours of the hillsides.*

A common driveway with fire truck turnaround was installed as part of the required public improvements for the Hyman subdivision. Only a relatively short extension off the end of the turnaround is proposed to access the garage, which is appropriately located on the downslope side of the property near the common driveway. This site design minimizes the amount of grading necessary to access to the home.

Design Review: The City Council recently expanded design review requirements for projects in the Historic Overlay zone as well as landscape review requirements for new single-family homes. As a result, the project will be subject to subsequent review by the Design Review Commission (DRC). In this case, the Planning Commission is responsible for reviewing and acting upon the project site plan, building massing and elevation concepts to the extent it deems necessary. The Planning Commission should also make a determination on the proposed roofing material. Subsequent review by the Design Review Commission would be limited to elevation details, exterior materials and colors, fencing, landscaping (to demonstrate compliance with the City's xeriscape ordinance), and any other issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission.

CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER

CITY ORDINANCES/POLICIES (☒Not Applicable to this Project)

Tree Ordinance: An arborist report and Tree Preservation Plan were previously prepared for the Hyman subdivision. The Tree Preservation Plan is intended to guide development of lots within the subdivision, emphasizing the preservation of larger, native trees. In essence, the Tree Preservation Plan specifies which trees must be preserved and which trees can be removed without further consideration by the Tree Committee. In addition, the Tree Committee required that trees removed from the site be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 with a minimum size of 15 gallons (this requirement has been included in the draft conditions). The current proposal would require the removal of seven trees, none of which are identified for preservation under the Tree Preservation Plan. As a result, fourteen replacement trees would need to be planted on the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (☐Not Applicable to this Project)

Pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines, construction of a single-family home in a residential zone is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA (Class 3 – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures).

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT ISSUES

Visibility of the Residence: As noted above, staff identified two inconsistencies with the hillside development guidelines: the color of the roofing material and the downslope gable end. While these two elements would increase the visibility of the residence to some extent, views of the project site are quite limited due to its position at the base of the hillside and the significant screening provided by trees on and near the site. It seems to staff that of the two architectural features in question the roof material would likely have a greater visual impact. At the same time, the corrugated metal roofing is consistent with the applicant's design concept, which, in part, seeks to recreate the look and feel of a historic barn. A photograph of similar metal roofing has been included for reference. If the Planning Commission is concerned about this aspect of the project, an alternative roofing material and/or color can be required, which would be evaluated by the Design Review Commission as part of the subsequent design review. Staff would note that the applicant will be presenting a model of the proposed development at the upcoming Planning Commission meeting (photos of the model are attached).

Drainage Concerns: A neighbor to the south submitted correspondence expressing concerns about increased runoff/flooding from the proposed development. Staff would emphasize that the required drainage improvements for the four-lot subdivision included the provision of an on-site drainage detention pond so that peak flows from the site would not be increased with development of the lots.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Use Permit, subject to the attached conditions of approval.

Attachments:

1. Findings
2. Draft Conditions of Approval
3. Location map
4. Project Narrative
5. Correspondence
6. Perspective Sketches
7. Photo of Barn
8. Photos of Model
9. Photo of Similar Roofing Material
10. Site Plan, Floor Plans and Building Elevations

cc: Jon Curry
677 Oak Lane
Sonoma, CA 95476

Ron Hyman
232 Second Street East
Sonoma, CA 95476

Claudia Rannikar
300 Second Street East
Sonoma, CA 95476

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
FINDINGS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Curry Hillside Residence – 232 Second Street East

March 13, 2008

Based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the staff report, and upon consideration of all testimony received in the course of the public review, including the public review, the City of Sonoma Planning Commission finds and declares as follows:

Use Permit Approval

1. That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any Specific Plan;
2. That the proposed use is allowed with a conditional Use Permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable standards and regulations of the Development Code (except for approved Variances and Exceptions).
3. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity; and
4. The proposed use will not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
CONDITIONS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Curry Hillside Residence – 232 Second Street East

March 13, 2008

1. A grading and drainage plan, and an erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. The erosion control measures specified in the approved plan shall be implemented during construction. The required plans shall be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Best Management Plan. Applicable erosion control measures shall be identified on the erosion control plan and shall be implemented during the construction phase of the project:

- a. Soil stabilization techniques such as hydroseeding and short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets or wattles.
- b. Silt fences or some kind of inlet protection at downstream storm drain inlets.
- c. Post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities for accumulated sediment.
- d. Post-construction clearing of all drainage structures of debris and sediment.
- e. Post-construction best management practices shall be installed (e.g., siltation ponds, bioswales) as directed by the City Engineer).

Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit; Ongoing through construction

2. The project shall be constructed in conformance with the approved site plan, floor plans and building elevations, except as modified by these conditions.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; Building Division; City Engineer; Public Works Division

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

3. All Building Division requirements shall be met. A building permit shall be required for the structures and improvements.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division

Timing: Prior to construction

4. All Fire Department requirements shall be met, including the provision of fire sprinklers within structures as deemed necessary. Flow calculations shall be required to show that the hydraulic requirements of the building's fire sprinkler system would have adequate flow.

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division; City Engineer

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

5. Connection to the City water supply shall be reviewed by the City Engineer and/or Public Works Inspector. Existing or upgraded water supply and water meter shall be inspected for condition and appropriate size prior to covering.

Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works Division

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit and/or final occupancy as determined necessary

6. The project shall be subject to the Tree Preservation Plan for the Hyman Subdivision. In addition, trees removed from the site shall be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 with a minimum size of 15 gallons.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division

Timing: Ongoing; Prior to final occupancy

7. A soils and geotechnical investigation and report, prepared by a licensed civil engineer, shall be required prior to the issuance of a building permit. Recommendations identified in the report shall be incorporated into the construction plans for the project and into the building permits.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; City Engineer

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

8. Parking and drive surfaces shall be surfaced with an appropriate surface material as approved by the City Engineer and the Building Official.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit and/or final occupancy
9. A sewer clearance shall be provided to the City of Sonoma Building Division verifying that all applicable sewer fees have been paid prior to the issuance of any building permit. **Note: Substantial fees may apply for new sewer connections and/or the use of additional ESDs from an existing sewer connection. The applicant is encouraged to check with the Sonoma County Water Agency immediately to determine whether such fees apply.**
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
10. The project shall be subject to architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), encompassing elevation details, exterior materials and colors.
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
11. A landscape plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect. The plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC). The plan shall address front yard landscaping, fencing/walls, hard-scape improvements, and required tree plantings. The landscape plan shall comply with City of Sonoma's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code §14.32).
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC
Timing: Prior to final occupancy
12. Dust control measures, subject to approval by the Building Official and the City Engineer, shall be implemented during the construction of the project. All exposed soil areas shall be watered twice daily or as required by the City's construction inspector.
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; Public Works Division
Timing: Ongoing during construction
13. The following agencies must be contacted by the applicant to determine permit or other regulatory requirements of the agency prior to issuance of a building permit, including the payment of applicable fees:
 - a. Sonoma County Water Agency [For sewer connections and modifications and interceptor requirements]
 - b. Sonoma Valley Unified School District [For school impact fees]*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building Division; Public Works Division
Timing: Ongoing during construction

**-CITY OF SONOMA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
Council Chambers, 177 First Street West
March 13, 2008
MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, March 7, 2008, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, #1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California.

Chair Gallian called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 177 First Street West and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:	Present:	Chair Gallian, Anderson, George, Howarth, Edwards, Cook, Heneveld
	Absent:	Comm. Yankovich
	Others	Planning and Community Services Administrator Goodison, Senior Planner
	Present:	Gjestland, Assistant Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Leveille

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: none

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: It was moved by Comm. Edwards to approve the minutes of February 7, 2008, as amended. **The motion carried unanimously with one abstention.**

It was moved by Comm. George to approve the minutes of February 14, 2008, as amended. **The motion carried unanimously with two abstentions.**

CORRESPONDENCE: none

ITEM #1 – PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to establish a medical office within a multi-tenant building, in conjunction with an Exception to the parking standards at 710 West Napa Street, Suite 1.

Applicant/Property Owner: Rebecca Porrino, ND & Marcus Porrino, ND/Stanley & Joan Bergum

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed there are no other medical Use Permits within the building or the property. The adjoining property to the north may still contain medical use. Comm. Howarth confirmed the property would be leased.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Norm Brown, commercial property agent, stated he has rented the property on five different occasions and has never had an issue with parking. He stated the property is ADA accessible, and it would be an easy transition for the new tenants. The applicants are here to answer questions and look forward to approval.

Dr. Marcus Porrino, applicant, thanked staff and the Commission and stated he was available for questions.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Anderson stated he has looked at many medical offices while sitting on the Commission, parking exceptions have been made, and according to Staff's Report the business is structured in such a way that parking will not be an issue.

Comm. George moved to approve the application. Comm. Edwards seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #2 – PUBLIC HEARING: Application for an Exception to the front and side yard setback requirements to allow for a ±1,386-square foot combined residential addition at 164 Fourth Street East.

Applicant/Property Owner: Jamie Baer/Laura Marrero

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed with City Planner Goodison that the FAR does not require review.

Comm. Cook confirmed the building to the north would have a wall height of 11 feet and the roof slopes up eight feet, resulting in a total of 19 feet.

Comm. George asked if the Conditions of Approval could stipulate "green" standard building, including no irrigation or runoff. City Planner Goodison stated the Planning Commission has the authority to attach conditions as long as they are in accordance with the approval being sought. He stated a residential landscape review would not be required since this is an addition; however, since there is an increase in coverage, the Planning Commission could add a condition regarding runoff.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Jamie Baer, architect, stated the applicant could not make it since she is on call. She displayed a model of the proposal for the Commission and stated the footprint would be the same as the original approval. She described the changes that were made to the height and slope of the structure. The neighbors were consulted and changes have been made to the façade in order to make it more attractive for all. The overall length of the wing has been reduced, as well as the pitch.

Comm. George confirmed the original approval for the western side of building would be maintained. Comm. Howarth confirmed the new ridge height is 29'7" measured from finished grade.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. George would like to add a condition that there is a no base runoff resulting from the addition, stating there is currently a problem with sewer overflow.

Comm. Howarth moved to approve the application, provided there is a complete drainage plan review approved by the City Engineer. Comm. Edwards seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #3 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to operate a microbrewery with tap room at 750 West Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Sonoma Springs Brewing Co., LLC/Maria Lounibos

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Cook confirmed the Artisan bakery operations were occurring almost around the clock, including baking and loading very early in the morning. City Planner Goodison stated the Conditions of Approval were not adequate for the use, and the City was unable to police certain issues with the bakery use.

Chair Gallian confirmed with Senior Planner Gjestland the back trash area has been cleaned up and only a small number of deliveries would be occurring. He confirmed the addition of two employee only parking spaces and that staff considers this application a decrease in use from Artisan Bakery.

Comm. George confirmed the ingress/egress for the employee parking.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Norm Brown, agent for landlord and tenant, stated he has a long history concerning the property and described the Artisan situation. Artisan made a great deal of improvements for food and baking, flooring, a new water heater, and overall improvement of the infrastructure. All these changes make the space perfectly suited for the proposed use. The brewery would be a small-scale operation with approximately 20% retail sales, the rest being delivered off-site. He worked extensively with staff regarding the application and thanked staff for their efforts. He also worked with the ABC, the police and other public entities and none have found enough negativity to oppose the proposed use. He stated that upon receipt of the letters from residents of the adjoining property and the HOA, the staff report has been delivered to them in order for those concerned to review the report and attend the meeting, if so desired. Parking seems to be the main issue, and stated the Use Permit allows the City to police issues, whereas another retail operation could generate more traffic without the ability to police. He stated the

tasting room is an opportunity for patrons to sample beer, and purchase growlers for reuse and refill. He stated Artisan was not the best neighbor, but a great asset to the community. He discussed possible uses for the Artisan retail store. He stated he understands the complaints of the neighbors with regard to parking and traffic safety, but the proposal does not allow for over-consumption onsite, and the parking situation, while not alleviated, has been addressed. He stated approval of the application would promote the creation of a craft project in Sonoma. The tasting itself is limited in scope, and he suggested a possible review to see if there is a negative aspect to the tasting room at a later date.

Chair Gallian asked Mr. Brown about the neighbors across the street and the usage of those parking spaces. Mr. Brown stated signage needs to be utilized in order to police how the spaces are used. A discussion ensued as to the configuration of the parking lot and how the spaces are used and understood. Mr. Brown suggested there will be more activity at the brewery during the evenings and on weekends. Chair Gallian stated there was concern about the smell from the brewing process and Mr. Brown stated the odor is grain and limited in duration. Mr. Brown stated the deliveries would be small in scale, both in and out of the business.

Timothy Goepinnger, applicant, stated it was a dream for him and his wife to create beer using wine barrels, which is only done in a few breweries in North America. He stated the fumes smell like cereal and grain, and there is no burning smell, only steam vapor for about an hour to an hour-and-a-half's duration. He stated the grain is milled offsite and deliveries occur by domestic truck. He confirmed garbage would be minimal since there is no bottling and the space will be supplying reusable containers to the customers. He stated the trash would currently be on the west side of the rear of the building, but it could be moved to the concrete pad.

Comm. Edwards confirmed the parking situation and a possible furniture store in the adjoining space.

Comm. Howarth confirmed a type 23 ABC license is a small beer license for distribution and small retail. Mr. Brown stated the applicant's intent is to be a good neighbor. Comm. Heneveld confirmed a two-ounce pour would constitute a tasting and there would be approximately six-barrels at a time. He stated the kegs are metal, coated in rubber, and may all be moved by a hand truck.

Maya Craig, resident of Sonoma Park, has lived there for 20 years and stated while she is pro-business, she has concerns about this use. She expressed concern about noise and parking, stating there was a great deal of trouble with Artisan. She stated alcohol is a problem, and the gate to her property does not have a lock, so she is concerned about drunken people in her lot. She is concerned about potential sounds and smells, fans and explosions. She would like to know the experience level of the brewers. The bakery started small and grew exponentially, creating a great deal of havoc, which was only resolved after Artisan left. She stated the space is ideal for light retail.

Mary Stolte, resident of Sonoma Park, stated the concept looks like a great idea on paper, but she is very fearful of the impact. Noise, smell, parking, and she suspects the brewery would like to grow. She said she did not understand how the brewery could operate on such a small scale and survive. She stated she is concerned about special events, drinking and parties.

Vickie De Smet, wife of owner of adjoining property, stated she is opposed due to parking. After reading the report, she cannot see how the parking will work and the owner of the other building needs to come up with other options.

Gary De Smet, owner of adjoining property, distributed another letter to the Commission and stated Artisan bakery is a great business, but a brutal neighbor. He stated it was not ok, what they did. He stated no comments are personal. This property was very low intensity, and Artisan changed that. Artisan abused the location and neighbors were all glad when they left. He stated he does intend to add signage to the parking lot. He said he has turned down possible tenants in the past due to the parking situation. He stated the application included 13 bar stools and asked why they were needed since winery tasting rooms do not have built-in stools. He felt people would be hanging out longer than the application implied. He stated he was unsure whether the smells would be inoffensive and stated this promise needs to be honored. The Conditions of Approval should include something regarding citizen complaints. He stated a 4000 square feet space may be rented to a low-intensity site and perhaps

the rental price should be lowered to allow for this use. He is concerned about what the Planning Commission will create tonight, since it is obvious issues will be raised if this use is approved. He stated there will be ill will, anger and bitterness. He asked about actual production levels and stated the limits for use of the property are clearly defined.

Ellen Williams, resident of Sonoma Park, stated breweries in general are high insurance risks and she would like to know more about the micro-brew process. She stated the fumes and odor could be allergy provoking.

Shawn Paxton, brewer, stating it is a tasting room and not a brew pub; a pub would be supplying food as well. He stated there are not explosions associated with brew-making and the CO2 used is required to be wrapped in chains. The boil would occur between 10am and 12pm and it does smell like cereal. He stated he understood there are understandable fears given what occurred with the previous use, and he hoped he had alleviated some of these fears.

Chair Gallian confirmed with Mr. Paxton the tasting room will not have live entertainment, the space is not conducive to hanging out and he felt the majority of the parking would be utilized after normal business hours. The idea behind the tasting room is educational. Chair Gallian confirmed there will be four employees total, and that the concept is a boutique barrel beer, with 20% retail sales onsite. Production total is about 1000 barrels a year.

Comm. Anderson asked Mr. Paxton to describe supply deliveries. Mr. Paxton stated the infrastructure is perfect for this use, and deliveries would consist of hops and malt, about 800 pounds of grain at most (less than a palette of grain), one to two shipments a week. The yeast will be propagated in-house. He stated they do not want to disturb neighbors in the morning, and would prefer to not load shipments to go out until 10am. He stated the brewers would arrive around 7am, and biking to work is encouraged. Comm. Howarth confirmed there will be four employees total and any special events would be offsite. Comm. Heneveld confirmed the tasting will be a two-ounce sampler, with the option to taste seasonal brews and oak-barrel produced beer.

Mrs. De Smet confirmed there will be a public bathroom. Gary De Smet confirmed the Ranch House has not applied for a micro-brewery permit.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Edwards stated he could not support the application due to the parking, and described various parking situations around town.

Comm. Cook understands the concerns of Comm. Edwards, but came to a different conclusion. Artisan bakery left a sour impression on the neighbors, but he stated staff has worked hard on specific Conditions of Approval for the project. He feels the business is perfect for the community and the space is perfect for their use. He stated the community grew before the advent of the automobile, but that is one of the elements that make the town charming. Parking should not regulate the community, and the community needs to have balances and trade-offs. He stated the controls put in place for this tenant will enable the tenants to be more agreeable and pleasant.

Comm. George stated he was conflicted and agreed with Comm. Cook; however, he is concerned with West Napa Street traffic and the hours of operation, in accordance with alcohol consumption.

Comm. Anderson stated Artisan bakery definitely made a negative impression on many neighbors, but he believes the applicant has addressed many of these issues and will be an asset to the community. He stated other spaces will have to come before the Commission for use of the adjoining spaces and he stated he is looking at the application at hand, without conjecturing about what could happen and look at this project on its own merits. A six-month re-review was not in proposed COA's, but as it was offered by the applicant, and may assuage the fears of Comm. George. Chair Gallian stated it would be a good chance for the applicants to show good stewardship.

Comm. Howarth stated he loves the use and the concept, but he has a problem with the parking, and is looking at the building as a whole unit. A pure retail use would not come before the Commission and he is concerned about traffic on West Napa Street.

Comm. Heneveld stated the applicant has put together a good case for approval, and this type of production requires extreme sanitation and discretion. He is glad for the rubber kegs in order to keep noise down. He stated he is concerned about parking and consumption, but a six-month review would be an appropriate COA and a chance to make sure the use is a good fit.

Chair Gallian stated the parking has always been a concern at this location and Artisan has left a negative impression on the neighbors. Perhaps the new tenants will be able to please and surprise the neighbors of this location. He stated a six-month review on the tasting room aspect is appropriate and he encouraged the owners to go the extra mile with all the neighbors, to include signs for parking, and arrange garbage pick-up appropriately. Need to be conscientious and gracious neighbors, and make it work in a limited time frame. The space is internally perfect for the proposed use, while being externally imperfect.

It was moved by Comm. Cook moved to approve the Use Permit for the brewery, and temporarily approve the tasting room aspect of the application for a six-month period to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. **The motion carried 4-3.**

ITEM #4- PUBLIC HEARING: Application for the rezoning of a property to "Low-Density Residential" in order to allow its annexation to the City of Sonoma at 20144 Fifth Street East.

Applicant/Property Owner: Ronald and Colleen Blount

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Cook confirmed the sentiment survey was sent to the neighbors within the sphere of influence.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Dan Casabonne, representative, stated if the property is split it would be double the size of the adjoining lot and would allow for appropriate development.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Cook stated it appears to be in line with the General Plan.

Comm. George stated he was not in favor, and he does not see the benefit for the City. He said he could not make the finding set by staff regarding applicable public service and stated he believes it would be a significant increase.

Chair Gallian confirmed the County zoning is one residence per three acres, but it is in the Urban Growth Boundary and the City Limits. City Planner Goodison stated the findings states all applicable public services have the capacity to serve the area to be annexed. Development potential is relative to service capacity, the development units that could be placed on the parcel are not a significant impact in relation.

Comm. Cook confirmed with staff that this would not be infill by definition in the Growth Management Ordinance, but looking at it through the General Plan, this area is appropriate for infill development.

It was moved by Comm. Cook moved to approve the application. Comm. Howarth seconded the motion. **The motion carried 5-2.**

ITEM #5 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for Variances to front and side-yard setback requirements associated with proposed arbors at 226 East MacArthur Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: William Craig/ James and Susan Mackenzie

City Planner Goodison presented staff's report.
Comms. Howarth & Cook recused due to proximity.

Chair Gallian confirmed the location of the screening arbor and staff's recommendation to deny the application for the variances.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Bob Sherwood, resident of Third Street East, stated he would not like to see corrugated fiberglass anywhere in Sonoma, and a carport is out of character with the neighborhood.

Bill Craig, architect, stated the project would have no impact on the City of Sonoma, and asked if the Commission could find a way to approve. He stated the corrugated fiberglass roof will not be visible and allow for light.

Brad Johnson, 885 Donner Ave, stated he has no opposition to proposal.

Susan Mackenzie, applicant, stated the garage is at the back of the property and she has always wanted more convenient, covered parking.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Heneveld confirmed the architect has experience with corrugated fiberglass, and that it would be a significant gauge and quality. Comm. Anderson confirmed with the architect the same design as the existing trellis would be used and extend back to the face of the building. The intent would be to screen and visually block the front elevation. Comm. Anderson confirmed with staff the areas under consideration, the dimensions and how it infringes on the setback requirements. Comm. Anderson confirmed the Planning Commission approved the construction of the trellis as a fence height exception.

A discussion ensued as to the trellis concept and the design of the proposal. Comm. Heneveld confirmed the area designated to be covered. City Planner Goodison stated a portion of the patio and the walkway would be covered. This structure has a curved roof and creates a private screen.

Comm. George stated he understands the desires of the property owner. He appreciates staff's guidance and encouraged the property owner to work on another solution to provide covering. Comm. Edwards stated he agreed with Comm. George and staff's recommendation.

Chair Gallian stated the existing trellis already extends into the side yard area and visually would have no additional impact. He stated the Planning Commission could limit the side arbor to be more in compliance and he would like to hear more regarding the carport from other Commissioners.

Comm. Heneveld confirmed the 12-foot setback and agreed with staff. He stated he sympathizes with the applicant. A discussion ensued as to the coverage issue, the exception and variance standards, including the findings that would need to be made for approval.

Comm. George moved to support staff's recommendation to deny the application for setback Variances; approve the secondary arbor as an Exception, subject to conditions. Comm. Edwards seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #6 – PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit associated with an Exception from on-site parking requirements for a proposed second dwelling unit and a structural alteration to an existing nonconforming structure (carport) at 243 West Spain Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Jennifer Hainstock

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Anderson stated he consulted with the applicant in the past, but feels he is able to make an unbiased decision. He confirmed the detached second-unit is not a granny unit and requires a parking space.

Comm. George confirmed the difference between a second unit and a granny unit, as well as the parking standards which apply.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Jennifer Hainstock, applicant, stated her neighbors were not in opposition. She stated she would like to amend the COA's to include street parking. City Planner Goodison stated he would eliminate the first sentence of Condition #6, and stated it does not stipulate where a person should park, rather that a space needs to be maintained. She stated she would like to delete Condition #5. City Planner Goodison stated this condition could not be waived by the Planning Commission due to the Development Code requirements, which are absolute. The distinction being made is whether the space is a second unit or a duplex. Intent is to basically discourage an absentee property owner from maintaining a duplex.

A discussion ensued as to the differences between a guest house, granny unit and a second unit. Comm. George confirmed the city would enforce the COA's through being notified, and then inform the resident the second unit is not able to be rented.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

It was moved by Comm. Edwards moved to approve the application as amended. Comm. Cook seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Comm. George commented that the General Plan is inconsistent with regard to finite resources. Chair Gallian stated density calculations are not the same as ESDs and this is a benefit to assist and improve the availability of living space.

ITEM #7 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to construct a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property at 232 Second Street East.

Applicant/Property Owner: Jon Curry/Ron Hyman

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed the drainage/detention pond does take into account the lot pads.

Comm. Cook confirmed staff is approving the application as proposed, and other additions are at the discretion of the Planning Commission.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Jon Curry, applicant, stated he works with period-built properties, looking for properties with historical and contextual value. This particular design stair steps up the hill and he described the topography and how the design coincides with the land and the existing architectural elements. He stated it will create a feeling of new meets old, with slight modern elements and elements of art. He believes it will be an asset to Sonoma, and he asked the Commission for support.

Chair Gallian confirmed with Mr. Curry a corrugated tin roof will be used. Mr. Curry stated it is authentic and beautiful. The property sits at the very foot of the hillside and will not detract from views. He feels Sonoma is losing some of the old architecture and wants to bring it back using plaster and other details. He stated the roof will have a nice patina.

Comm. Edwards confirmed the drainage on the upper lots is sufficient and the retention pond works. He confirmed a dull, galvanized patina will occur to the roof in time. Chair Gallian confirmed the roof will not reflect a great deal of light. Comm. Heneveld confirmed the roof will not be treated to create the patina. Mr. Curry would rather it occur through a natural process.

Laurie Gallian, 434 Rosalie Drive, asked about tree preservation. Senior Planner Gjestland stated the Tree Committee did review the project and a tree preservation plan was generated. Larger native species will be

retained, and the Committee identified trees that would be appropriate for removal. The replacement ratio is 2-1, resulting in a total of 14 trees to be planted. None of the seven trees to be removed were listed on the preservation list.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. George confirmed the retention basin is located on the north side of the driveway and the other area described is a delineated wetland. The retention basin is a deep swale and he confirmed the drainage swale along Second Street East was previously blocked by debris. Once the area was cleaned, the issue was resolved. Comm. Heneveld asked about soil classification, which could not be confirmed at that time.

Comm. George stated his only concern is the swimming pool, otherwise he supports the project. Comm. Edwards stated support for the project. Comm. Anderson stated it is far enough down the hillside and will not have visual impact.

Comm. Anderson moved to approve the application. Comm. Heneveld seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ITEM #8 - DISCUSSION: Review of draft request for proposals for the update of the City's Housing Element.

City Planner Goodison presented staff's report.

Comm. Anderson confirmed the deadline for the proposals is June 30, 2008. Chair Gallian confirmed there have been changes in housing development law which will need to be incorporated. Comm. Edwards confirmed the mobile home park conversion and its effect on these numbers will not be known for a while, and does not affect the current numbers. Chair Gallian confirmed these will help meet the low-income requirements, but it was not specifically looked at in that manner.

Comm. George stated we live in a world of finite resources and he questioned the wisdom of ceding local control to ABAG. What would happen if the City did not have a housing element that complies with State Law? City Planner Goodison stated the City would be sued, by either a developer, or a Housing Advocacy Group, which the City would most likely lose. If the law is not followed, then local control is lost. Santa Rosa, Sebastopol and Sonoma County have all been sued locally. The number is less than what was anticipated and is fairly consistent with local policies. Comm. George stated the City is basically being held hostage in a litigious environment and being forced to expend precious, finite resources.

Chair Gallian stated a basic social standard of compliance is being offered in order to provide for those who have the least. The community is then able to design projects that are resource efficient, as well as provide for a great deal of people. It is an opportunity to act responsibly, rather than jump towards opposition. This is the base standard that the City should meet.

Comm. Cook stated it helps Sonoma to not become an exclusionary community. Comm. George said that following this policy in a world of finite resources eventually will lead to "the tragedy of the commons". Chair Gallian stated the Planning Commission should function as ideally as it can and work to strengthen the society. The commons are the strength of the community.

Chairman Gallian opened the public hearing.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair Gallian closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Anderson stated he would like to amend the City's Housing Element to include the discussion on mobile home parks. Comm. Edwards confirmed there is a good inventory of second-units, and he would like that to be verified and included.

ISSUES UPDATE: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: none

Meeting adjourned at 10:34 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for April 10, 2008, at 6:30 p.m.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant

City of Sonoma
Design Review Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DRC Agenda Item: 9

Meeting Date: 4/15/08

Applicant

Jon Curry

Project Location

232 Second Street East

Historical Significance

- ☐ Listed on National Register of Historic Places, including Sonoma Plaza district (Significant)
- ☐ Listed on California Register of Historic Resources (Significant)
- ☐ Listed within Local Historic Resources Survey (Potentially Significant)
- ☐ Over 50 years old (Potentially Significant)

Request

Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors for a new residence on a hillside property.

Summary

Background: On March 13, 2008 the Planning Commission approved a Use Permit allowing construction of a residence and swimming pool on an undeveloped 0.5-acre property off Second Street East. The approved residence includes ±3,780 square feet of living area with an attached 540-square foot garage. In general, the structure and related improvements will be stepped on the hillside, which has an average slope of 13%. The dominant aspect of the home is inspired by a historic barn located in Glen Ellen. The downhill or westernmost portion of the residence is two stories with a height of 30-feet (this part of the structure houses a garage on the ground floor and a guest room above). The remainder of the building is one-story, decreasing to a maximum height of 20 feet on its east side. Terraces have been provided behind and in front of the home for outdoor use. The historic stone walls currently located on the property will be retained.

In approving the Use Permit, the Planning Commission found that the project was consistent with the Hillside Development standards and guidelines. Per the conditions of approval, the project is subject to subsequent architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), limited to elevation details, and exterior materials and colors, with the exception of the corrugated metal roofing that was specifically approved by the Planning Commission as part of the Use Permit.

Building Elevations & Exterior Materials: As described in the project narrative, the dominant aspect of the residence is inspired by a historic barn located in Glen Ellen (see attached photo). This northerly portion of the home, which faces west toward the private drive and Second Street East, would utilize a rubble stone veneer on the lower level with rescaled board and batten siding above. The remainder of the residence would have an "Old World" stucco finish that incorporates the color and texture of the mortar used in the stone veneer. White, vinyl clad exterior doors and windows are proposed throughout with recycled wood trim on the barn portion of the home and stone sills on the stuccoed portion of the home. Although not shown on the building elevations, the applicant has indicated that the garage doors would have the appearance of sliding barn doors, also utilizing recycled wood. As previously noted, the structure will have a corrugated metal roof which was approved by the Planning Commission in their review of the Use Permit. The building elevations and exterior materials are consistent with the building elevations approved by the Planning Commission in March.

A photo of a structure has been provided that illustrates the materials and colors proposed for the project, including the rubble stone veneer, white clad windows and doors, and corrugated metal roofing. In addition, material samples and colors will be presented by the applicant at the upcoming DRC meeting, as well as detail of the garage doors.

In general, the design of the building and proposed exterior materials and finishes are consistent with architectural considerations for infill in the Historic Zone, in that the project seeks to recreate a vernacular barn structure and uses materials and finishes that are common in Sonoma, such as stone and stucco.

Exterior Colors: Pursuant to the Hillside Development standards and guidelines, projects in hillside areas should utilize building materials and colors that help blend buildings into the terrain. With exception of the corrugated metal roofing (which was previously approved by the Planning Commission as part of the Use Permit), the exterior finishes and materials employ natural and earth-tone colors to help blend into the terrain, including natural stone, tan stucco, and recycled wood.

Landscape Review: The City Council recently expanded landscape review requirements for new single-family homes. As a result, the front yard landscaping for the project will be subject to subsequent review by the Design Review Commission (DRC) to demonstrate compliance with the City's xeriscape ordinance.

Commission Discussion

Design Review Commission Action

☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Referred to: _____ ☐ Continued to: _____

Roll Call Vote: 4 Aye 0 Nay 0 Abstain 1 Absent

DRC Conditions or Modifications

Approved as presented.

cc: Jon Curry
 677 Oak Lane
 Sonoma, CA 95476

 Ron Hyman
 232 Second Street East
 Sonoma, CA 95476

Attachments:

1. Location Map
2. Project Narrative
3. Photo of Dunbar Barn
4. Photo Illustrating Proposed Materials and Colors
5. Site Plan & Elevations

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
City Council Chambers, 175 First Street West
April 15, 2008
MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, April 11, 2008, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, #1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:37 p.m., Chair Cribb presiding

ROLL CALL:
Present: Chair Cribb, Comms. Bernard, Appleman, McDonald
Absent: Comm. Carlson
Staff Present: Assistant Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Leveille

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

CORRESPONDENCE: Two items regarding Item #6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. McDonald moved to approve the minutes of January 15, 2008, as submitted; Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. Comm. Bernard moved to approve the minutes of February 19, 2008, as submitted; Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. Chair Cribb moved to continue approval of the minutes for March 15, 2008 due to lack of a quorum.

ITEM #1 -DISCUSSION ITEM: Review of Plaza banner policy and consideration of DRC role.

City Planner Goodison presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the reviews are regulated to the plaza only. Comm. Cribb confirmed the displays could be up for a maximum of sixty days, and practically this new policy would add, at most, one extra agenda item per meeting. Comm. Bernard wondered if there could be administrative review for these applications. Staff responded by saying there are administrative reviews for specific sign proposals and the DRC could consider a policy that moves in that direction. The size of the banners is set, and the length of time the banners are able to be up would be the reason for review. Comm. Bernard asked what types of banners would not be appropriate; staff stated a great deal of designs could potentially not be appropriate for banner displays. Staff stated within the canvas size there is a great deal of leeway with regard to color and content, and lapses in judgment are possible.

Comm. McDonald stated if a banner had a glaring commercial aspect or something of that nature he could be in opposition to the design. Staff confirmed the lower 20% of banner space is able to be utilized for sponsor advertisements. Comm. Cribb suggested the item could be considered as a consent item stating it could streamline the process. Comm. Appleman confirmed some banners could be grandfathered in, such as the holiday banners. Comm. Cribb stated it would be prudent to have some oversight and the already present restrictions will dictate a specific type of package.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing. Seeing there were no comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard feels the applications could be an administrative review. Comm. Cribb stated a review seems appropriate in order to have the citizens involved and stated overall the reviews would be fairly perfunctory. Staff confirmed that previously approved designs could be itemized as consent calendar item, and others could be discussed under that provision. Comm. McDonald stated his preference would be to look at those applications that go beyond the requirements of the banner policy. A discussion ensued regarding current design policies and what come before the Commission for review. City Planner Goodison stated a consent calendar review is appropriate, given the multitude of the banners throughout the year. Comm. McDonald confirmed there is a no fee for review.

ITEM #2 -CONTINUED DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of proposed roofing material associated with the construction of a new residence located within the Historic Overlay Zone at 275 West Spain Street.

Applicant: Robert and Pamala Garant

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Robert Garant, applicant, displayed a sample of the material and made himself available for questions. He stated it is supposed to simulate a slate roof, but it is lighter in weight. Comm. Cribb confirmed the color variation is part of the strip itself.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard motioned to approve the application as submitted; Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #3 –DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a wall sign for a hotel (Sonoma Valley Inn Best Western/Krug Event Center) at 567 First Street West.

Applicant: Sonoma Valley Signs (Neil Colwell)

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Neil Colwell, applicant, stated the sign is an identifier and a promotional tool which highlights the association between the two entities.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. McDonald stated he has no issues, as the sign conforms and is tasteful.

Comm. Appleman motioned to approve the application as submitted; Comm. Bernard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #4 –DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a projecting sign and three window signs for a new retail business (Haus) at 135 East Napa Street.

Applicant: Zanita Zody

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed with staff that there are two mannequins that will be an outdoor display for merchandise sold within the store. Comm. Cribb confirmed the sign has been calculated not as an ellipse, but as if it was in a rectangular border.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Joe Zody, applicant, stated he and his wife have opened the business together, and given their proximity off the plaza, would like to have more signs visible to the public.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard stated even though it is outside the requirements, she finds nothing to hinder the applications approval given the history of the space. Comm. Appleman agreed with Comm. Bernard and stated she would be in favor. Comm. McDonald stated it is an awkward retail space and he feels the signage is appropriate. Comm. Cribb agreed and stated the execution of the signs deserved merit.

Comm. Appleman moved to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Bernard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #5 –DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a wall sign and three illuminated signs for an auto center (Sonoma Truck and Auto Center) at 870 Broadway.

Applicant: Robert Bohna (Sonoma Truck & Auto Center)

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Robert Bohna, applicant, stated only one neon sign will be used to indicate when the space is open. He stated there are many signs that have been illegal for a good amount of time, and look forward to working with the Commission to bring the space into compliance.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the name of the business as Sonoma Truck and Auto Center.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. McDonald confirmed there was sign program approved by the DRC and he wondered why the current sign program was not in compliance and why it is not a code compliance issue. He stated the main sign extending beyond the fascia of Broadway looks out of character, and he has concerns as to how it relates to the architecture. Many of the text are redundant and the phone number is fairly large. The smog check sign is dominant and he feels those signs should be smaller.

Comm. Appleman stated new signage was needed at this location, but this is outside the limit. The applicant has put time and effort into the new signs, but they need to be more in compliance.

Comm. Bernard stated the applicants are so outside the boundaries she is wondering where to start the compromise.

Comm. Cribb stated the degree of variance is too large and the previously existing sign was not in compliance. As this business is located in the Broadway corridor, it should reflect Sonoma better. He would like to see the wall sign reduced and proposed the Commission give guidance to the applicant regarding scale and size and re-review at another date.

Comm. Bernard stated the wall sign should move into alignment with the building. Comm. Cribb stated the protruding end should be removed, and the name of the business should stay. The Commission does not want to hamper a businesses promotion, but no one business should have a competitive advantage due to a larger sign program.

Comm. McDonald stated the sign appears to hang off the building and needs to be centered. The Smog check sign needs a new location and the illuminated "open" sign appropriate. The "Daily rentals" sign should be retained since it is a unique feature of the business.

Comm. Cribb asked to continue the item so the applicant could return with an alternate proposal. He confirmed with the applicant that the direction given is clear and the applicant thanked the Commission stating centering the sign would require the replacement of the wood underneath and he feels it may be cost-prohibitive. A discussion ensued as to the new signage installation. Comm. Cribb suggested the section intruding onto Broadway should be removed. He stated the other signs are all free-standing and can be altered.

The Commission agreed having the main sign flush with the building is what is preferred.

Comm. Bernard moved to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #6 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a projecting sign for a furniture business (Chateau Sonoma) at 153 West Napa Street.

Applicant : Architectural Signs & Associates

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Sarah Anderson confirmed the sign projects out five feet and it will be placed in the middle of the building right above the main front sign. She stated she has some antique lighting she would like to utilize and she confirmed the DRC would be the proper forum for reviewing a future lighting plan. Chair Cribb stated up lighting is generally discouraged. The applicant described the lighting configuration with the Commission and stated it would be reviewed at a later date. She stated the sign is meant to attract shoppers from the plaza, and stated other businesses on West Napa have these projecting signs. Chair Cribb confirmed she will have signage on the new corner sign slated to be installed.

Rochelle Zatzkin, applicant, stating the projection is needed in order to alert possible patrons of the store's existence and the applicant needs to encourage potential customers.

Comm. McDonald confirmed Caltrans would not require an encroachment permit.

Chair Cribb confirmed with the applicant considered a larger wall sign on either side of the building, but after consideration she decided she preferred the projection sign.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard stated that given the location of the store, it needs additional signage, although she thinks the seven foot projection is excessive. Comm. Appleman agreed with Comm. Bernard and stated the projection sign should line up with the awning. Comm. McDonald also agreed, and stated having a sign beyond the awning would set an unnecessary precedent. He suggested it be tucked in towards the end of the building toward the C on the front sign. He stated if a wall sign or blade sign were approved the A-Board sign could be eliminated. Chair Cribb stated he echoes the statements of his fellow Commissioners and the projection is too great. He stated that using the existing awning as a plane to tie onto seems to be a good idea. The A-board suits the character of the business, and his inclination would be to give up the wall sign in lieu of the projection sign.

A discussion ensued as to the lighting proposed this evening, which will be reviewed at another time.

A discussion ensued as to the projection sign design. Comm. McDonald stated a new sign projection could be submitted for review. Comm. Cribb confirmed with the applicant it would be a significant burden to re-review at the next meeting since it is the high retail season.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve the application, given the sign has no more than a 5 ½ projection. Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #7 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a sign program for Carneros Village at 649 and 651 First Street West.

Applicant: Architectural Signs & Associates

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the height of the blade sign is seven feet to allow for clearance.

Comm. Cribb confirmed what parts of the application constitute the variance, and that each business only has one sign. The intent is to not return with application for each individual sign to be installed.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Rochelle Zatzkin, applicant, confirmed the vinyl would be matte white and stated it is a really hard building to appropriately design signage. The landlord will have to approve any combination of colors, and each space will have to comply with the designated size and color background. Chair Cribb suggested colors be dictated for the tenants. A discussion ensued as to the color specifications. Ms. Zatzkin stated duranodic is a very dark brown color.

Comm. Bernard confirmed the specifics of the sign size. A discussion ensued as to the color review and whether the Commission should review all the signs to be displayed in the complex. A discussion ensued as to the sign requirements and the review of signs by the Design Review Commission. Chair Cribb stated color and design are important issues and the space needs to have uniformity. Ms. Zatzkin stated in her experience dealing with centers a background color and size dictated and she stated she strived to stay within the six square feet required for an administrative review. Chair Cribb stated all the buildings are close together and he feels the space requires uniformity. Comm. Appleman stated if she owned a business she would like to have some aspect that stands out from the crowd, as long as each sign has a cream background and flat lettering she believes they should allow for some creativity. Ms. Zatzkin agreed stating the signs are small and some license should be allowed. Comm. McDonald stated he does not see a problem with different shapes being utilized as long as they are six square feet.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Bernard stated the bistro sign should be reviewed by the Commission. The landlord wants to get these signs in place and the map will be well utilized.

Comm. Bernard motioned to approve the application as submitted; Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-1.

ITEM #8 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a modified monument sign for Sonoma Marketplace at 201 West Napa Street.

Applicant: Whole Foods Market (Kevin Dickerson).

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Bernard confirmed the previous sign has been approved and this proposal is a modification.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Kevin Dickerson, applicant, made himself available for questions. He stated many patrons have problems finding the store. Neil Colwell, sign contractor, stated the lettering will be done in gold leaf.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Appleman motioned to approve the application as submitted; Comm. Bernard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #9 -DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors for a new residence on a hillside property at 232 Second Street West.

Applicant: Jon Curry

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Jon Curry, applicant, stated the barn on Dunbar Street in Glen Ellen has been the inspiration for the colors and materials. He stated the base of barn would be stone and plaster, board and bat would be used and the structure will have a corrugated metal roof. He wants the space to feel old world and all the existing stones on the property are to be preserved. He stated the building will melt into the natural landscape. Chair Cribb confirmed all the wood will be recycled. Mr. Curry stated a new material will be used for the eaves, but will be aged. Comm. Bernard confirmed the lot of the property that Mr. Curry is currently building and the configuration of the lots in general. He stated lot #4 is scheduled to break ground in two or three months.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Appleman motioned to approve the application as submitted; Comm. Bernard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #10 -DISCUSSION ITEM: Discuss Commission recommendations and findings information.

Assistant Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald thanked staff for formulating the report and stated his original concern was what specific language could be used to deny or accept applications. A discussion ensued as to the review process and the directions the Commission are able to take. Comm. McDonald stated he finds some clarification in staff's report. Comm. Bernard confirmed what the DRC responsibilities are after Planning Commission review.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing. Seeing there were no comments, Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

OUTSTANDING ITEMS: With respect to noticing, Comm. McDonald stated he would like a clarification of the noticing procedures and why Design Review Commission items concerning SFD are not noticed. Staff stated land-use items are the only applications that require noticing. Comm. McDonald stated given the new guidelines of the DRC he

feels public noticing should be explored. A discussion ensued concerning the parameters of DRC review and whether noticing for projects is appropriate.

Assistant Planner Atkins confirmed a clock cannot be displayed on the monitor.

Assistant Planner Atkins suggested the meeting dates for the DRC could change to Thursday. The Commission agreed they would prefer the meetings retain their current schedule.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: none

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m. to a regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 18, 2008.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item #4
Meeting Date: 11-12-09

Agenda Item Title: Application for a Use Permit to construct a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property.

Applicant/Owner: Victor Conforti Architect/Audrey and Ron Chapman

Site Address/Location: 228 Second Street East

Staff Contact: Rob Gjestland, Senior Planner
Staff Report Prepared: 11/6/09

PROJECT SUMMARY

Description: Application of Victor Conforti Architect for a Use Permit to construct a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property at 228 Second Street East.

General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (RR)

Planning Area: Northeast Area

Zoning: **Base:** Rural Residential (R-R) **Overlay:** Historic (/H)

Site Characteristics: The subject property is an interior 0.6-acre parcel accessed by a private driveway off Second Street East. The property has an average slope of 12% and contains a stone shed, a set of attached barns, and a stone-walled pool. Seven trees are located on the parcel, including a large coast live oak.

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning:

North: Vacant parcels/Rural Residential
South: Single-family home/Rural Residential
East: Vacant parcels/Rural Residential & Hillside Residential
West: Vacant parcels/Rural Residential

Environmental Review:

<input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved/Certified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration	<input type="checkbox"/> No Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report	<input type="checkbox"/> Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Staff Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

The subject property is one of four lots created as part of the Hyman Subdivision (approved by the Planning Commission in September 2006). Lots within the subdivision are accessed by a common driveway off Second Street East that terminates at a fire truck turnaround.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project involves construction of a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property that has an average slope of 12%. The residence would include $\pm 3,692$ square feet of living area and an attached 768-square foot garage. Per the project narrative, the design concept is to create a Sonoma style farmhouse. Proposed exterior materials consist of horizontal siding, rubble stone veneer, and a standing seam metal roof (proposed as dark green). The downhill or westernmost portion of the residence would be two stories with a height of 30-feet (this part of the structure would house a three-car garage on the ground floor with bedrooms above). The remainder of the building is one-story, with the exception of a central loft element. The main living area of the home is proposed as a single level, in conjunction with an elevator from the garage in order to meet the owner's programmatic requirement for wheelchair accessibility. Only one tree (a plum) would be removed to accommodate the project. All other trees on the site, including the large 35" DBH coast live oak, would be preserved. The swimming pool is proposed in an area currently occupied by a set of barns (the environmental review for the subdivision found that the barns are not historically significant and anticipated their removal). Additional details are provided in the attached project narrative.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

The property is designated Rural Residential by the General Plan. This designation is intended to preserve areas of lower density development within city limits, especially adjacent to hillsides and in established low-density neighborhoods. The designation allows a maximum density of 2 residential units per acre (excluding second units). General Plan policies that apply to the project call for the protection of important scenic vistas and the incorporation of natural features into project design (Community Development Element, Policy 5.3). The visibility of the project and its impact on scenic vistas and natural features is discussed below under "Hillside Development."

DEVELOPMENT CODE CONSISTENCY (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

Use: The property is zoned Rural Residential (R-R). Single-family homes and related accessory structures are permitted uses in the R-R zoning district. Development of the property is subject to approval of a Use Permit by the Planning Commission because the building site is considered a hillside area with slopes exceeding 10% (the building site has an average slope of 12%).

Density: The maximum density allowed in the R-R zone is two dwelling units per acre. The parcel is roughly one-half acre, which allows for a single-family home as proposed.

Setbacks: Primary structures in the R-R zone must be setback a minimum of 30 feet from the front and rear property lines (the west and east property lines in this case). In addition, a minimum 20-foot side yard setback is required and combined side yard setbacks must total 50 feet. The residence complies with the applicable setback requirements. The pool also complies with the minimum 5-foot setback for accessory structures.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The maximum FAR in the R-R zone is 0.20 or 20% of the total lot area. The project would result in a FAR of 0.17 (17%). Pursuant to the Development Code, FAR calculations include attached garages but exclude porches/decks and basements.

Lot Coverage: The maximum coverage in the R-R zone is 25% of the total lot area. The project would result in a lot coverage of 13%. Pursuant to the Development Code, porches/decks and pools are excluded from coverage calculations.

Building Height: The maximum building height within the R-R zone is 30 feet for primary structures, as measured from finished grade. The downslope (west) gable end and the central gable element measure 30 feet from grade to the roof peak. The building decreases to a height of 23.5 feet on its east side.

Parking: One covered parking space is required for a single-family home. The parking requirement would be met by the three-car garage.

Drainage: In terms of stormwater runoff, the required drainage improvements for the Hyman subdivision included the provision of an on-site detention pond so that peak flows from the site would not be increased with development of the lots.

Hillside Development: The purpose of the hillside development regulations and guidelines is to preserve and protect views to and from the hillside areas within the City, to preserve significant topographical features and habitats, and to maintain the identity, character, and environmental quality of the City. New development within hillside areas that have a slope of 10% or greater is subject to approval of a Use Permit by the Planning Commission. As set forth under Section 19.40.050.F of the Development Code, the Planning Commission shall evaluate applications for hillside development based on the following objectives, in addition to the normal findings for a conditional use permit:

1. *The preservation of natural topographic features and appearances by maintaining the natural topography to the greatest extent possible.*

As proposed, the garage/basement area would be excavated into the hillside and the existing stone retaining wall would be utilized/preserved on the downslope side of the property. Access to the garage would be provided by a driveway extension proposed on the flattest portion of the site. These aspects of the plan would minimize grading and help to maintain the natural topography.

2. *The protection of natural topographic features and appearances through limitations on successive padding and terracing of building sites and the preservation of significant ridgelines, steep slopes, natural rock outcroppings, drainage courses, prominent trees and woodlands, vernal pools, and other areas of special natural beauty.*

The project involves construction of a single home on a residential lot and therefore does not require successive and/or terraced building sites that can be associated with major subdivisions in hillside areas. In addition, the property is not in proximity to a ridgeline and slopes across the site are generally consistent (12% on average). Based on the development plan, only one small fruit tree would be removed to accommodate the project. Other trees on the site, including the large 35"DBH coast live oak, would be preserved (see "Tree Ordinance" below).

3. *The utilization of varying setbacks, building heights, foundation designs, and compatible building forms, materials, and colors that help blend buildings into the terrain.*

As part of the project, the garage and basement level would be built into the hillside and retaining walls would be used on the downslope side of the home. Proposed exterior materials consist of horizontal siding, rubble stone veneer and a standing seam metal roof. The metal roofing is proposed as dark green, while the body of the residence would employ a medium value green color to help blend into the natural environment (if approved by the Planning Commission, the colors and materials would be subject to review and approval by the Design Review Commission). Inconsistencies that were identified with respect to the hillside design guidelines are: 1) use of a gable end on the downhill (west) elevation, which is a two-story building element in this case; and 2) the main living area of the residence (3,340 square feet) is a single level rather than being split or stepped with the slope (as previously noted this is desired for wheelchair accessibility). Staff would also note that the proposed design maximizes the 30-foot height limit feet on the west elevation and also in the middle of the home where a loft is proposed (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

4. *The utilization of clustered sites and buildings on more gently sloping terrain to reduce grading alterations on steeper slopes.*

The buildable area of the lot is relatively compact, and slopes within the building envelope do not differ significantly (12% on average).

5. *The utilization of building designs, locations, and arrangements that protect views to and from the hillside area.*

Because the property is located at the base of a hillside, views of the residence would be limited to vantage points close to the site. Trees on the property and in the surrounding area, including the large 35" DBH oak on-site and row of Osage orange trees along Second Street East, would obscure public views of the proposed development. Other structures within the Hyman subdivision would also restrict views of the residence. Through field visits, staff determined that the home would be most visible from certain perspectives on Second Street East (primarily from the west and northwest) and the bike bath to the south. In general, conditions on and around the site would serve to protect views to and from the hillside area. However, the two-story gable end on the west elevation and building height would increase its visibility to some extent (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

6. *The preservation and introduction of plant materials so as to protect slopes from soil erosion and slippage and minimize the visual effects of grading and construction of hillside areas.*

An erosion control plan is normally required for hillside development, which would address measures for reseeding and stabilizing disturbed soil areas (see condition of approval No. 1). In addition, a landscape plan would be required for the project, subject to review and approval by the Design Review Commission.

7. *The utilization of street designs and improvements that minimize grading alterations and harmonize with the natural contours of the hillsides.*

A common driveway with fire truck turnaround was installed as part of the required public improvements for the Hyman subdivision. A northerly extension off the end of the turnaround is proposed to access the garage, which is appropriately located on the downslope side of the parcel. This site design minimizes the amount of grading necessary to access to the home while avoiding impacts to the large coast live oak.

Design Review: Because the property is located in the Historic Overlay zone, the project is subject to subsequent review by the Design Review Commission (Development Code §19.54.080). In this case, the Planning Commission is responsible for reviewing and acting upon the project site plan, building massing and elevation concepts to the extent it deems necessary. Subsequent review by the Design Review Commission would be limited to elevation details, exterior materials and colors, front yard landscaping (demonstrating compliance with the City's xeriscape ordinance), and any other issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission.

CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER

CITY ORDINANCES/POLICIES (☒ Not Applicable to this Project)

Tree Ordinance: An arborist report and Tree Preservation Plan were previously prepared for the Hyman subdivision. The Tree Preservation Plan is intended to guide development of lots within the subdivision, emphasizing the preservation of larger, native trees. In essence, the Tree Preservation Plan specifies which trees must be preserved and which trees can be removed without further consideration by the Tree Committee. In addition, the Tree Committee required that trees removed from the site be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 with a minimum size of 15 gallons (this requirement has been included in the draft conditions). Based on the site plan, only one plum tree would be removed which is not identified for preservation under the Tree Preservation Plan. As a result, two replacement trees would need to be planted on the site. Other trees on the site, including the large 35"DBH coast live oak, would be preserved.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

In 2006 the Planning Commission adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Hyman Subdivision, which addressed future residential development of lots within the subdivision.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT ISSUES

Visual Impacts: As noted above, staff identified two inconsistencies with the hillside development guidelines: the downslope gable end, and the main living area being a single level rather than split or stepped. It was also noted that the residence maximizes the 30-foot height limit on the west elevation and in the middle of the home. While these elements would increase the visibility of the residence, views of the project site are somewhat limited due to its position at the base of the hillside and the screening provided by trees and structural improvements on and near the site. This was a key consideration in the Planning Commission's approval of a Use Permit in 2008 for the adjacent Routhier residence (232 Second Street East), which has a two-story, downslope gable end similar to the current proposal. That aspect of the plan, as well as the corrugated metal roofing were deliberated and ultimately approved by the Planning Commission. In contrast, the current application is proposing a dark colored roofing material. Basic information on the two projects is provided in the table below for comparison:

Project	Lot Size (Acres)	Slope	Living Area (sq ft)	Garage Area (sq ft)	FAR	Coverage	Downslope Building Height	Upslope Building Height
Routhier (Built)	0.5	13%	3,780	540	0.20	18%	30'	20'
Chapman(Proposed)	0.6	12%	3,692	768	0.17	13%	30'	23.5'

As reflected by the table, the two homes are comparable in terms of volume and size although they employ different architectural forms and massing. The proposed residence would also be located in the same setting with respect to screening and visibility. Given these factors, and the Planning Commission's previous approval, staff is supportive of the proposal as a matter of consistency. However, now that a similar project has been constructed and can be considered for purposes of comparison, it is within the Planning Commission's discretion to provide direction on any aspects of the plan that may be of concern.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Use Permit, subject to the attached conditions of approval.

Attachments:

1. *Findings*
2. *Draft Conditions of Approval*
3. *Location map*
4. *Project Narrative*
5. *Photo Rendering and Site Photos*
6. *Site Plan, Floor Plans and Building Elevations*

cc: Victor Conforti Architect
755 Broadway
Sonoma, CA 95476

Ron and Audrey Chapman
1090 Castle Road
Sonoma, CA 95476

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
FINDINGS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Chapman Hillside Residence – 228 Second Street East

November 12, 2009

Based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the staff report, and upon consideration of all testimony received in the course of the public review, including the public review, the City of Sonoma Planning Commission finds and declares as follows:

Use Permit Approval

1. That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any Specific Plan;
2. That the proposed use is allowed with a conditional Use Permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable standards and regulations of the Development Code (except for approved Variances and Exceptions).
3. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity; and
4. The proposed use will not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
CONDITIONS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Chapman Hillside Residence – 228 Second Street East

November 12, 2009

1. A grading and drainage plan, and an erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. The erosion control measures specified in the approved plan shall be implemented during construction. The required plans shall be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Best Management Plan. Applicable erosion control measures shall be identified on the erosion control plan and shall be implemented during the construction phase of the project:

- a. Soil stabilization techniques such as hydroseeding and short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets or wattles.
- b. Silt fences or some kind of inlet protection at downstream storm drain inlets.
- c. Post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities for accumulated sediment.
- d. Post-construction clearing of all drainage structures of debris and sediment.
- e. Post-construction best management practices shall be installed (e.g., siltation ponds, bioswales) as directed by the City Engineer).

Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit; Ongoing through construction

2. The project shall be constructed in conformance with the approved site plan, floor plans and building elevations, except as modified by these conditions.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; Building Division; City Engineer; Public Works Division

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

3. All Building Division requirements shall be met. A building permit shall be required for the structures and improvements.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division

Timing: Prior to construction

4. All Fire Department requirements shall be met, including the provision of fire sprinklers within structures as deemed necessary. Flow calculations shall be required to show that the hydraulic requirements of the building's fire sprinkler system would have adequate flow.

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division; City Engineer

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

5. Connection to the City water supply shall be reviewed by the City Engineer and/or Public Works Inspector. Existing or upgraded water supply and water meter shall be inspected for condition and appropriate size prior to covering.

Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works Division

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit and/or final occupancy as determined necessary

6. The project shall be subject to the Tree Preservation Plan for the Hyman Subdivision. In addition, trees removed from the site shall be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 with a minimum size of 15 gallons.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division

Timing: Ongoing; Prior to final occupancy

7. A soils and geotechnical investigation and report, prepared by a licensed civil engineer, shall be required prior to the issuance of a building permit. Recommendations identified in the report shall be incorporated into the construction plans for the project and into the building permits.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; City Engineer

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

8. Parking and drive surfaces shall be surfaced with an appropriate surface material as approved by the City Engineer and the Building Official.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit and/or final occupancy
9. A sewer clearance shall be provided to the City of Sonoma Building Division verifying that all applicable sewer fees have been paid prior to the issuance of any building permit. **Note: Substantial fees may apply for new sewer connections and/or the use of additional ESDs from an existing sewer connection. The applicant is encouraged to check with the Sonoma County Water Agency immediately to determine whether such fees apply.**
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
10. The project shall be subject to architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), encompassing elevation details, exterior materials and colors.
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
11. A landscape plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect. The plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC). The plan shall address front yard landscaping, fencing/walls, hard-scape improvements, and required tree plantings. The landscape plan shall comply with City of Sonoma's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code §14.32).
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC
Timing: Prior to final occupancy
12. Dust control measures, subject to approval by the Building Official and the City Engineer, shall be implemented during the construction of the project. All exposed soil areas shall be watered twice daily or as required by the City's construction inspector.
Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; Public Works Division
Timing: Ongoing during construction
13. The following agencies must be contacted by the applicant to determine permit or other regulatory requirements of the agency prior to issuance of a building permit, including the payment of applicable fees:
 - a. Sonoma County Water Agency [For sewer connections and modifications and interceptor requirements]
 - b. Sonoma Valley Unified School District [For school impact fees]*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building Division; Public Works Division
Timing: Ongoing during construction

**-CITY OF SONOMA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
Council Chambers, 177 First Street West
November 12, 2009
MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, November 6, 2009, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California. Chair George called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL: Present: Chair George, Comms. Edwards, Heneveld, Gallian, Howarth, Felder & Roberson

Absent:

Others Planning Director Goodison, Senior Planner Gjestland, Associate Planner

Present: Atkins, Administrative Assistant Leveille

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. Edwards moved to approve the minutes of the October 8, 2009 as amended, Comm. Gallian seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE:

ITEM #1 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit Amendment to allow for indoor live amplified music at Emmy's Spaghetti Shack at 691 Broadway.

Applicant/Property Owner: Emmy Kaplan / Deuce LLC

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed the changes that staff recommended. Comm. Felder suggested a change for item #2b in the staff report. Chair George confirmed all conditions are subject to the Noise Ordinance.

Chair George opened the public hearing.

Emmy Kaplan, applicant, stated she would like to have live music inside and that the building holds sound fairly well. The staff at the restaurant has been consistently monitoring the noise level to be sure they not only stay within the Noise Ordinance, but it stays at a level that does not extend too far outside. She stated they would like to have live bands inside, and she would like this opportunity to attract more customers. Comm. Howarth confirmed the parameters of the indoor amplified music trial that occurred recently and the hours music was played.

Scott Sherman, 762 Broadway, said he finds the music loud and disturbing. He has made several calls to the police and he did not know why the Conditions of Approval were being changed before the February hearing.

Seeing there were no comments or questions from the public, Chair George closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Gallian confirmed with the number of calls that occurred concerning Emmy's Spaghetti Shack with the police department, and commented on the difference between what the police have documented versus neighbor complaints mentioned this evening. He commented on the difference in attendance and noise that could occur between winter and summer. Comm. Felder stated he sees no reason to change the restriction on amplified music outdoors, but would approve amplified music indoors in accordance with the Noise Ordinance. Comm. Gallian confirmed the Conditions of Approval. Chair George confirmed the applicant would be able to apply for outdoor music in the future. Comm. Felder confirmed the differences between the applicant's request and staff's recommendation. Chair George also confirmed staff's recommendations.

Comm. Gallian moved to approve staff's recommendations as submitted. Comm. Roberson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #2 - PUBLIC HEARING: Application for an Exception from the wall height standards to allow a nine-foot two-inch tall wall within a required front yard setback at 450 West Spain Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Michael Cook/ Ramekins Kenwood LLC

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Felder confirmed the wall measurement, and that staff recommends approval of the wall height as submitted. Comm. Edwards confirmed there is an iron fence at an adjacent property that is approximately 8 feet tall. Chair George confirmed the fence height requirements as listed in the Development Code. Comm. Heneveld confirmed the egress for cars coming into the driveway, and that staff felt this proposal would not interfere with the site line.

Chairman George opened the public hearing.

Michael Cook, applicant and landscape architect, appreciates the Planning Commission taking the time to review the application. He confirmed the property is not requesting any change to the existing Use Permit, and this application will help them to expand their business within those Conditions of Approval. He confirmed the height of the wall was chosen to constrain the noise and protect the views of the neighbors. The wall will match the building and incorporate a metal trellis. He described the wall and landscaping in further detail, and confirmed they have had community meetings with the neighbors, the majority of whom were in approval of the project. He commented that they were unaware that the neighbors wrote letters in opposition, and corrected a couple of misconceptions surrounding the project. He stated he and the owners were available for any questions and they look forward to working with the neighborhood. Comm. Howarth confirmed the CUP allows for 150 people and typically events currently range in attendance between 20-150 people. Claude Ranniker, owner, confirmed they need to change the configuration of the space in order to accommodate weddings. There is also an issue of safety, and these changes will make the backyard an oasis for intimate events. Comm. Heneveld stated he has heard several complaints regarding idling buses at this location, and he confirmed with Mr. Ranniker that he was not familiar with those complaints. He stated he would be able to accommodate those buses in the new space, and he was unclear why they were idling at the front of the property. Comm. Heneveld confirmed they are requesting 8 foot solid fence due to privacy issues. Comm. Heneveld disagreed with this decision, and Mr. Cook replied that the height was also based on the height relation to other buildings and noise.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair George closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Felder stated he also felt the fence is too high, and while he would support the application he would only do so if the wall height was reduced. Comm. Edwards stated due to the neighbor's proximity, ceremonies in that area would be visible to the neighbors, and he would support the height of the fence. There was a discussion regarding the design and height of the fence. Comm. Roberson stated he too took note on the camphor trees and the height in relation to this use, and he agreed with Comm. Edwards. Chair George stated the idea of a courtyard does have appeal, having an obsession with them when he travels to places such as Mexico. Comm. Howarth commented on the style of the structure and he agreed with Comms. Felder and Heneveld. He stated he did not want the property to look like a compound. Comm. Heneveld stated the current structure matches the neighborhood and he felt the proposal was too massive for the space. Comm. Edwards reiterated he would be in support, stating he appreciates all the work that has been done to make it attractive and a reduction in size could affect the style of the gate as presented. Comm. Roberson agreed, stating the proposal seems to be well integrated to the property and while he is sensitive to its proximity to the street, the proposal does not strike him as being imposing. Comm. Edwards stated the height will also help with traffic noise and other intrusions. Comm. Felder commended the applicants on their community outreach, and stated he thought it was a great design, however if he as parked across the street he felt it would have a compound feel. He theorized about how the project would look on the site. He stated he has trouble making the necessary findings. He likes the idea, but he would not be able to support the project as proposed and he would like the applicants to stay within the confines of the Development Code. Comm. Roberson confirmed the location of the 6 foot wall, and he stated there is a great deal of neighborhood support.

Comm. Edwards moved to approve the application as submitted, Comm. Roberson seconded the motion. The motion failed 4-2.

A discussion ensued regarding changes to the application. Comm. Edwards stated again he did not see how neglecting the views of the neighbors, and allowing more noise to exit from events would be a detriment. He also commented on how Ramekins is somewhat difficult to see from the street, and currently has great landscaping that he felt this would continue through this application. Comm. Roberson agreed, and stated given other noise issues on other properties he felt the application was appropriate. Chair George stated if he was a neighbor, he would feel as though the nature of his property had changed. Comm. Edwards continued, stating the neighbors are in approval. Comm. Roberson stated he has spent time at the property across the street, and described a few anecdotes about events and noise at the property. Chair George asked why the Planning Commission should approve something that is not in compliance with the Development Code. Comm. Heneveld commented on his vast experience installing similar gates and fences, and described an experience where a reduction is exactly what made the design work. He stated he would reduce the height by 14 inches.

Comm. Heneveld moved to approve the application given the fence is reduced by 14 inches. Comm. Edwards stated noise is still an issue and confirmed Comm. Heneveld has considered that within his motion. **Comm. Howarth seconded the motion.** Comm. Roberson confirmed the current fence height parameters, and how this motion fits within the Development Code. **The motion passed 4-2.**

ITEM #3 – PUBLIC HEARING: Application for an Exception from the fence height standards to allow an eight-foot tall fence within a required street side yard setback at 1178 Cox Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Hugo and Tiffany Knef

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed the design of the fence and the staff recommendation.

Chairman George opened the public hearing.

Tiffany and Hugo Knef, applicants, stated there are other examples of this type of fence that already exist in their immediate neighborhood. Their house is elevated and sits on a slope, and that is the reason for the additional height. Fred O'Donnell, FiGo, confirmed the situation of the property and why the additional height is required to provide privacy while not impacting the views. Tiffany Knef stated they were participants in the Cash for Grass program and they have been working on various other improvements. She stated the lawn will be significantly improved by this design. Comm. Heneveld confirmed the location of their driveway. Comm. Gallian confirmed they would like approval for their original proposal, rather than the staff recommendations. Mrs. Knef commented on the size of their existing yard and that they would like to be able to enjoy as much of it as possible.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair George closed the Public Hearing.

Bill Willers, commented on Chair George's view on the previous application in which he stated he felt applicants should stay within the confines of the Development Code, stating that there are numerous reasons the Commission should make exceptions for certain properties. Many of the codes are not applicable to specific lots, and each space needs to be reviewed individually. He described the lot, and how the fence would encourage use of the yard.

Comm. Edwards stated he supports the use of residential yards and he would be in support of the applicant's request. Comm. Felder stated he would approve the application per staff's recommendations. Comm. Heneveld agreed with Comm. Felder. Comm. Gallian stated he agreed with Comm. Edwards, but would approve with staff's recommendation. Comm. Howarth concurred. Comm. Roberson stated he empathized with the applicants since he lives on a corner lot, and there is a loss of usable yard. He commented on other fences in the neighborhood. Comm. Felder stated he also has a corner lot, and looking at this application he felt the 10 foot setback would be most appropriate.

Comm. Felder moved to approve the application subject to staff's recommendation, Comm. Heneveld seconded the motion. The motion failed 4-3. Comm. Gallian moved to approve the application as submitted, Comm. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-2.

ITEM #4 – PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to construct a residence and swimming pool on a hillside property at 228 Second Street East..

Applicant/Property Owner: Victor Conforti Architect/Audrey and Ron Chapman

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Felder confirmed the historic features on property are to be preserved. Chair George confirmed the stone wall is not on-site.

Chairman George opened the public hearing.

Vic Conforti, architect, stated the Chapman's property sits at the northern most point of the parcel and they would like to make this their permanent home. They have done an excellent job preserving the historic features and nature of the property and they are also preserving a large existing oak. He described a tunnel that exists on the property. He stated the property is somewhat constrained, and he described how the proposal will fit into the space and continue to preserve the historic quality. He displayed illustrations of the property, stated the proposed design will respect the neighborhood and maintain privacy.

Bill Willers, 873 First Street West, stated the house that sits above the property is very prominent and that when the General Plan was formed, Hillside Zoning was cited as a parcel that should be preserved and maintained. These properties need reflect the characteristics that so many consider as the visual heart of Sonoma. He stated when an application for development at the Sonoma Valley Citizens Environment Commission, they should also be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Ron Chapman, applicant, distributed photos of the original structure and how their design is reminiscent of the old hotel in design and materials. He described individual aspects of the design and how they work within this context.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair George closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Gallian stated he hoped the aspects described by Mr. Willers on 80 Second Street East will lessen as the construction comes to an end. He stated he felt the proposal at hand is consistent with the desires set forth for this zoning area and he would be in support. Comm. Edwards stated he loves the barns next door, and given the applicants work on the historic aspects and the consequent Design review, he would be in support. Comm. Howarth agreed. Comm. Felder stated he agreed with Comm. Edwards and stated while the present rendering does look a bit harsh the subsequent review is comforting.

Chair George stated he was concerned about the ecology and slope on the property. He relayed an anecdotal story about his grandfather, the banker, and a metaphor about not spending more than one has. He reiterated his views on water, stating the City does not have the available amount of water to sustain the property. He stated while many do not agree, he did not feel he could make a responsible decision to add to water use in the City limits. Comm. Edwards stated given this subdivision was approved by the Commission, and water was looked at cumulatively. A discussion ensued, and Chair George stated he still did not feel the City has the water to provide for new homes. Planning Director Goodison suggested the condition City Engineer should be taken into account. Chair George disagreed, stating a "will-serve" decision would have a negative impact. Comm. Gallian stated the Planning Commission is not the City Council, and these comments and suggestions are beyond their purview, he stated the Planning Commission is an adjudicatory body, and they are not here to make policy. He stated what Chair George is suggesting is absolutist, and a great deal of other applications also require an increase in water use. He stated these comments were not borne out of fact, and they need clarity. He stated the Planning

Commission needs to implement the policies of the City Council. Chair George stated it is a personal decision based on the Planning Commission's responsibility to make land-use decisions, and he stated the Planning Commission does not know the incremental demand of the project. Comm. Gallian commented on supply, conservation, and he stated these applicants do not need to suffer a decision that does not follow the rules of City Council. Comm. Felder stated he empathized with Chair George on his views, but he agreed with Comm. Gallian concerning their purview. Comm. Felder he stated he could not refuse a project based on these view points.

Comm. Edwards moved to approve the application given a "will-serve", and urged all applicants to consider dry wells. Comm. Roberson seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-1.

ITEM #5 – PUBLIC HEARING: Application for a Use Permit to establish a restaurant use in conjunction with an Exception from the parking standards at 524 Broadway.

Applicant/Property Owner: Thomas McGlone/Sonoma Court Shops, Inc.

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Chairman George opened the public hearing.

Thomas McGlone, applicant, stated he was available for questions. Comm. Gallian confirmed there are four spaces provided for occupants at a fee by Sonoma Court Shops. There was a discussion regarding parking at the property. Mr. McGlone stated the majority of customers arrive on foot. He confirmed they have been on-site for several weeks. Comm. Howarth confirmed access is only open on Broadway.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair George closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. Roberson stated he works near the property and stated in the evenings the parking is open and confirmed the majority of people who pass are walkers.

Comm. Roberson moved to approve the application per staff's recommendation, Comm. Gallian seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #6 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Study session on a proposal to redevelop a property with a CVS/pharmacy retail store at 977 West Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Armstrong Development Properties Inc

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Comm. Edwards was concerned about the building remaining dark after purchase. Staff stated different communities have taken varying direction with these types of projects. Comm. Howarth commented on the ingress/egress in relation to Jerry Marino's property and staff stated the applicants may be required to keep it open. Comm. Felder confirmed the location of the easement as 10 feet on both properties. Chair George confirmed the City does not control or dictate the terms of that easement.

Chairman George opened the public hearing.

William McDermott, Armstrong Development Properties, thanked the Commission for taking the time to give feedback regarding the project. He stated he was leaving business cards for those interested, and that they were viewing this evening as the beginning of a process. They look forward to working with the City and the neighbors. He stated the company does own the property occupied by the existing CVS pharmacy, and they did question if both could survive after this location opened. He stated if this project moved ahead, they would work to sell the property at 200 West Spain Street. They confirmed companies have expressed interest in the property and he described possible tenants. He commented on the possible issues concerning sound and traffic, described the studies that would be conducted on site, and how the development of the property would ensue. He discussed the wood fence, and stated they would propose a block wall to mitigate sound impact. He described some preliminary

landscaping. There would be a traffic study, and in order to comment fully on potential traffic issues, those results would need to be reviewed. Another concern is the possible 24-hour operation, and he clarified the hours of store operation and stated they would come back to the Commission regarding the additional hours only if the demand was present. Comm. Edwards confirmed the applicants have met with Mr. Marino regarding the easement, and as it exists there would be no access to Studley Street. Comm. Gallian confirmed the applicant considered doing a tenant improvement at the site, and the existing building will not suit the needs of the store. Comm. Gallian commented on the design and the perceived pre-supposition of what Sonoma is supposed to look like. He stated shifting the potential noise outside to the west side of the property would make more sense. He wanted the applicants to work with what is on site presently. Comm. Edwards stated there is a Green Building Ordinance, and confirmed a drive-thru would be subject to Use Permit review. Comm. Felder suggested enhancing the creek-side, and the applicant agreed that is a great idea. He suggested various pedestrian features, bicycles features, a gate-way to bike-path, and a customer patio. Comm. Howarth confirmed CVS has several different prototypes, and Mr. McDermott confirmed the different sizes and configurations. He confirmed this would fit into the largest configuration. Comm. Howarth stated he felt there was more than one way to construct a property and he would like to see a couple different scenarios. Mr. McDermott stated those variables could be brought to the Commission. Chair George stated he would like to see the numbers about water use/dumpsters/salvage value/and how it compares to the cost of a Tenant Improvement. Comm. Gallian confirmed that generally CVS builds new, and there is the potential to build a healthier building under the new green building requirements. Comm. Gallian advocated that consideration, and suggested they work with the building seeing it is 1200 square feet. Present. He would prefer to review creative options rather than the standard recipe. Comm. Edwards commented on the left hand turn and Mr. McDermott stated it is a difficult aspect of the project, and would need traffic report. Comm. Edwards stated the site would need modest signs, given its location is so close to the City limits. There was a discussion regarding the site and how it would benefit both Sonoma and CVS. Comm. Roberson confirmed the topology and storm water drainage on the site, and that it moves in a southwesterly direction. There will be bioswales. Chair George confirmed the applicants would be interested in pervious surfaces. Comm. Howarth confirmed the existing asphalt would be scraped clean. Chair George confirmed the applicants have actually driven the space and experienced the traffic issues of the site first hand. He stated he felt Studley Street would be a huge problem.

Denise Ziganti, 541 Gregory Circle, thanked Planning Director Goodison and stated that next to Sonoma Creek the floods water from the 100 Year Flood came up to the parking area. She felt this could be a problem. She is the President of the Sonoma Creekwood Homeowners Association, and the neighborhood is concerned about noise, especially in the summer when people keep their windows open for air. They are concerned about the sale of alcohol, drinking in the parking lot, and traffic going through the Chicken Car Wash, She confirmed the business hours, and suggested the applicants completely re-configure the intersection and allow no access to Studley Street.

Patty Daffurn, 465 East MacArthur Street, stated there were three drug stores in Sonoma in 1971 and presently there are many places one can get to without having to drive a car. She does not envision many bikers from the East Side coming to this location, or even the West Side given the location of Rite Aid. There were huge issues with Bonanza Ford, the open space was compromised, and the creek side was lessened. She is concerned about parking for both patrons and employees, and she is stated the current building is massive. This project would be a disservice to the community and the local drug stores.

Bill Willers, 873 First Street West, stated he had many issues with this application, but the primary is that this use is way too massive for the site. It is not a gateway proposal, and he stated the same when the Ford Dealership applied. He felt then that business would not be there long, and unfortunately that came to pass. He stated the first "green" step is not to allow this project to happen, especially given the drive thru aspect, as Sonoma needs to decrease automobile dependency. This application does not fit the General Plan and truly does not fit the space given its location and scale. Mr. Willers stated the current CVS acts as an anchor in an established marketplace, and if they left Sonoma Marketplace it would be a detriment for all the businesses in the space. He stressed the need to keep hubs of shopping and create a more cohesive downtown. He stated this is a tenuous proposal and the wrong use for this piece of land. It should not be used improperly again.

Gail Johnson, Niles Company, clarified that the current space occupied by CVS cannot be grocery store, and confirmed that CVS does own parcel and the parking lot in front. If they offer it up to lease it will not be easy, and

the likely candidates are a Good-Will store or a Dollar Store. She stated CVS leaving the property will destroy the dynamics of the Sonoma Marketplace.

Judith Friedman, 839 First Street West, stated Sonoma is very careful and protective of their space and there is not one thing in this proposal that is good for Sonoma. She agreed with both Ms. Johnson and Mr. Willers about the Marketplace.

Stuart Teitelbaum, owner of Homegrown Bagel Co., stated he has lived in the Valley for 40 years and he has many concerns with the proposal. Traffic is a huge issue, and as a business owner he is concerned about the effect on the Marketplace, which is a daily use center for the community. He too is concerned about possible uses for the space, or if the space is left vacant. Overall, he does not see this new CVS as an improvement of Sonoma, and he is not in support.

Seeing there were no additional comments or questions from the public, Chair George closed the Public Hearing.

Comm. George echoed many of the comments of Bill Willers, and stated the Commission should support a walkable community. He stated we are a country addicted to drugs, cars and sprawl and this is not a gateway vision of Sonoma. He is concerned about traffic issues.

Comm. Roberson stated he tried to put his immediate reaction aside, but over the course of this session the comments have only reinforced his initial reaction as this project being completely antithetical to why he loves Sonoma. He understands the corporate viewpoint, but the risk to Sonoma Marketplace is too significant, plus they City has a chance to repair the riparian aspects of the parcel. He finds the proposed design troubling and generic, and he has concerns about parking lot drainage. He is a huge biking advocate, and moved to Sonoma due to the lack of sprawl. This project is not a fitting application for a gateway property, and he wants things to thrive in this community. He stated he does not believe the proposal can be changed to a degree that he could support.

Comm. Edwards stated the Sonoma Marketplace does not have a great design, and Whole Foods has had to decrease their space. There are already a great deal of empty space in key commercial spaces downtown. He stated keeping a drug store in the center of town is important, he does not want to see a dollar store, and given Sonoma has an aging population, many of whom were Long's devotees, he would rather see this property converted to a park. He has heard a great deal of negative reaction to this proposal, and he asked CVS to take stock in what they currently have and move forward at their current location.

Comm. Heneveld agreed, stating urban sprawl is not appropriate and he cannot see this project happening in the future. Comm. Felder agreed as well. Comm. Howarth shared the comments of most of the commissioners as well as the comments of Mr. Willers. Comm. Gallian stated this project is not consistent with the General Plan, and would exacerbate the traffic issues at the intersection. Chair George again stated Sonoma is an aging community, and their current location is a good place for their business.

ISSUES UPDATE: A possible date for a special meeting on January 7th was discussed. Planning Director Goodison stated staff takes the water situation seriously, understands the needs of the community and consistently works with the City Engineer.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: Comm. Felder commented on western access to the Montini Trail.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: none

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for December 10, 2009 at 6:30 p.m.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant



City of Sonoma
Design Review Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DRC Agenda Item: 6

Meeting Date: 12/15/09

Applicant

Victor Conforti, Architect

Project Location

228 Second Street East

Historical Significance

- ☐ Listed on National Register of Historic Places, including Sonoma Plaza district (Significant)
- ☐ Listed on California Register of Historic Resources (Significant)
- ☐ Listed within Local Historic Resources Survey (Potentially Significant)
- ☐ Over 50 years old (Potentially Significant)

Request

Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors for a new residence on a hillside property.

Summary

Background: On November 12, 2009 the Planning Commission approved a Use Permit allowing construction of a residence and swimming pool on an undeveloped 0.6-acre property off Second Street East. The approved residence includes ±3,692 square feet of living area and an attached 768-square foot garage. Per the project narrative, the design concept is to create a "Sonoma Style farmhouse." The downhill or westernmost portion of the residence is two stories with a height of 30-feet (this part of the structure will house a three-car garage on the ground floor with bedrooms above). The remainder of the building is one-story, with the exception of a central loft element. Decks are provided on the north and south elevations. Only one tree (a plum) would be removed to accommodate the project. All other trees on the site, including the large 35"DBH coast live oak, would be preserved. The swimming pool is proposed in an area currently occupied by a set of barns (the environmental review for the subdivision found that the barns are not historically significant and anticipated their removal). The historic stone accessory building and stone swimming currently located on the property will be retained as required by the subdivision conditions of approval. Additional details are provided in the attached project narrative.

In approving the Use Permit, the Planning Commission found that the project was consistent with the Hillside Development standards and guidelines. Per the conditions of approval, the project is subject to subsequent architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), limited to elevation details, and exterior materials and colors.

Building Elevations & Exterior Materials: As noted in the project narrative, the home is intended to have a "farmhouse" form. The building elevations are generally consistent with those approved by the Planning Commission and reflect subsequent modifications intended to address concerns raised by an adjoining neighbor. Proposed exterior materials consist of Hardie board horizontal lap siding, areas of stone veneer, and a standing seam metal roof. Marvin clad windows are proposed throughout with Hardie board trim. As shown on the building elevations, heritage overhead garage doors would be used to give the home an older appearance. Construction details for the eaves, window trim, railings and stone veneer are attached. Material samples will be presented by the applicant at the upcoming DRC meeting.

Exterior Colors: Pursuant to the Hillside Development standards and guidelines, projects in hillside areas should utilize building materials and colors that help blend buildings into the terrain. As proposed, the roof would have a dark green color and the body of the home would be painted a medium value green color (see attached photomontage). The color of the trim, window cladding, railings, and garage doors has not been identified. Color samples will be presented by the applicant at the upcoming DRC meeting.

Landscape Review: The City Council recently expanded landscape review requirements for new single-family homes. As a result, the front yard landscaping for the project will be subject to subsequent review by the Design Review Commission (DRC) to demonstrate compliance with the City's xeriscape ordinance.

Required Findings: For projects within the Historic Overlay zone, the Design Review Commission may approve an application for architectural review, provided that the following findings can be made (§19.54.080.G):

1. The project complies with applicable policies and regulations, as set forth in this Development Code, other City ordinances, and the General Plan.
2. On balance, the project is consistent with the intent of applicable design guidelines set forth in the Development Code.
3. The project responds appropriately to the context of adjacent development, as well as existing site conditions and environmental features.
4. The project will not impair the historic character of its surroundings.
5. The project substantially preserves the qualities of any significant historic structures or other significant historic features on the site.
6. The project substantially complies with the applicable guidelines set forth in Chapter 19.42 (Historic preservation and infill in the Historic Zone).

Commission Discussion

Design Review Commission Action

☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Referred to: _____ ☐ Continued to: _____

Roll Call Vote: _____ Aye _____ Nay _____ Abstain _____ Absent

DRC Conditions or Modifications

cc: Victor Conforti Architect
755 Broadway
Sonoma, CA 95476

Ed Routhier
232 Second Street East
Sonoma, CA 95476

Ron and Audrey Chapman
1090 Castle Road
Sonoma, CA 95476

Attachments:

1. Project Narrative
2. Photomontage
3. Construction Details
4. Site Plan, Elevations & Floor Plans

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
City Hall Conference Room, 177 First Street West
December 15, 2009
MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, October 16, 2009, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 p.m., Chair Cribb presiding

ROLL CALL:
Present: Chair Cribb, Comms. Appleman, McDonald & Anderson
Absent: Comms. Carlson
Staff Present: Associate Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Leveille

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

CORRESPONDENCE: none

MINUTES: Comm. McDonald moved to approve the minutes of November 17, 2009 as amended. Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #1 – CONTINUED DESIGN REVIEW: Continued review of a trash enclosure area for a commercial property (Emmys' Spaghetti Shack) at 691 Broadway.

Applicant: Emmy Kaplan

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the parking configuration would remain the same, and the trash enclosure does not take up a parking space.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing. Seeing there were no comments, Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

This was a request of Comm. McDonald, and he was pleased with the proposal.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve the application, Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #2 – CONTINUED LANDSCAPE REVIEW: Continued review of revisions to an approved landscape plan for a new single family residence at 232 Second Street East.

Applicant: Ed Routhier

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing. Seeing there were no comments, Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Chair Cribb thought this was an improvement, and Comm. McDonald stated he was mostly in favor. He commented on the amount of trees and stated it was a good landscape plan. Comm. Anderson thought this submittal provided more clarification and the applicant is moving in a positive direction.

Comm. Appleman moved to approve the application. Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #3 – CONTINUED DESIGN REVIEW: Continued review of revisions to an approved landscape plan for a new single family residence at 140 East Napa Street.

Applicant: Arts Guild

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Susan Lindstrom and Martin Munson introduced themselves to the Commission, and displayed the design that was not completed before the previous meeting. Mr. Munson presented various examples to the Commission. Ms. Lindstrom stated they are the oldest artist cooperative in California, and this represents just a part of that artistry. Comm. McDonald confirmed the inspiration for the design with Mr. Munson, who responded they were the natural aesthetics of the material, the design of the Guild, as well as wanting to compliment the surrounding businesses and overall area of Sonoma. Ms. Lindstrom described the location of the space, and the architecture of the structure itself. She explained how the design compliments the structure.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. Appleman stated she was in favor, and said it will be a great addition to block. Comm. McDonald agreed. Comm. Anderson stated the design reflects the history of the La Haye foundry, and he felt it would be a wonderful addition to the Arts Guild.

Comm. Appleman moved to approve the application, Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #4 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of two freestanding signs for an educational garden (Community Center) at 276 East Napa Street.

Applicant: Sonoma Community Center

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Kathy Swett, Executive Director of the SCC, described the project and commented on how proud all the parties involved are for working on it. She described how it will be an educational tool for the City. Comm. Appleman confirmed the county is constructing the signs, and stated some of the signs on the Overlook Trail are inadequate. Ms. Swett stated she would provide materials for sign review.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. McDonald stated he has no issues with the signs, and he would recommend approval if the signs are weather-protected. Comm. Anderson stated he thought the plan was well thought out, and the signs are adequate.

Comm. Appleman moved to approve the application as submitted, Chair Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #5 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of design review of a new wall, landscaping, hardscape improvements, lighting, and sign review for a cooking school (Ramekins) at 450 West Spain Street.

Applicant: Michael Cook

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the location of the canopy and the wedding trellis. Comm. Anderson confirmed the aggregate sign area.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Michael Cook, landscape architect, stated the owner, manager and sign representative were all present. He thanked the Commission for their efforts, and clarified there is one monument sign and one wall sign. He stated they considered all the other signs as way-finding signs. He stated there have been several community meetings, they have received 10 letters of support and the Planning Commission has reviewed and approved the exception. He described the landscape plan in greater detail, stated turf will be removed, and that this property will be an exceptional water saver. He described the tree plan, and stated they all feel the application will be an improvement to

the space and the community. He described the metal work and stated all the plant species included in the plan are native. There will be flowers year-round. Rochelle Zatzkin, sign representative, stated the two signs along the driveway are way-finding signs, and she described where the main entrance. She illustrated the designs for the Commission, described how they are made and made herself available for questions. Chair Cribb confirmed the signs are attached directly to the wall. Mr. Cook confirmed the dimensions of the canopy, described the wedding canopy and how the utilities will work on-site.

Comm. Anderson thanked the applicant for meeting with the neighbors, stating that is a great step which helps the Commission. He stated the graphics and the materials presented help him in making the best decision possible. He agreed with the applicants regarding the way-finding signs, and he stated the reduction of the lawn area is a great asset to the community and the space. He thinks the plan complements the space and further demonstrates the quality of the business. Comm. Appleman agreed, stating it is an excellent design that is sensitive to the surrounding residential area. She did question the 24-hour lighting, and stated while she understood why the request was made, she wondered if it was truly necessary. Comm. McDonald commended the applicant with respect to the landscaping and signs. He stated he was concerned with the overall concept of the proposal, including the height of the wall, and he stated the fireplace and the wall project farther than the surrounding single-family dwellings and competes with the streetscape. He stated the result is a separation from the neighborhood. He stated the fireplace and wedding trellis are very large, and his feeling is the setback should match the structure next door. He is concerned about the front gate, and whether it will meet the ADA requirements of the Building Department. He commented on landscaping around the driveway and the camphor trees. He stated those were his main concerns, and he would like to see the fence pushed back to the 15 foot setback in order to be more compatible to the surrounding landscape. Chair Cribb echoed the comments of all Commissioners regarding materials and general concept. He is stuck between support and the comments of Comm. McDonald, stating he too is concerned about the health of the camphor trees. He is also is concerned about the wall along the driveway and he would like more space to place with landscaping. He suggested cut-outs in the wall as an alternative. He confirmed there were no issues with the capacity of the building. He felt the overall size of the closed area should be reduced. He compared the proposed ivy to Wrigley Field and stated he would be hard-pressed to approve the application as submitted. A discussion ensued regarding the wall and Comm. Appleman stated she feels that most of the wall cannot be seen from the street and the plan reinforces the privacy needed for the events that will take place on site. Comm. McDonald felt the wall separates Ramekins from the surrounding residences, and he would like the plan to be more sensitive to the other properties. He stated he was concerned about drainage, and hoped the Building and Public Works Departments would be able to mitigate excess water. Chair Cribb confirmed his experience with decomposed granite, stating it is very porous material.

Comm. Anderson confirmed the Conditions of Approval recommended by the Planning Commission, and confirmed with the applicant that the camphor trees have been studied. He clarified the setbacks that were approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. Cook stated that camphor trees are very resilient, and described how they fit in with the presented plan. Comm. Appleman confirmed the required setbacks and what the applicant has requested. There will be plantings on either side of the water trough. The Commission confirmed the ADA requirements for wheelchair access, and that other requirements of the Building Department have been discussed with them.

Chair Cribb stated additional articulation with landscaping in relation to the wall would be acceptable. Comm. McDonald stated he wanted all aspects to be pushed back to the required 15 foot setback. Comm. Appleman stated she was comfortable with setbacks that were approved by the Planning Commission and confirmed with staff those setbacks were not able to be altered by the Design Review Commission.

Rochelle Zatzkin, spoke as neighbor, stated she was in favor of the wall due to the additional noise. She added that the last few years have been very slow, and she asked the Commission to consider the new owners and how they will preserve there space.

Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public. Comm. McDonald moved to approve the application, providing the applicant include bump outs for camphor trees, the fountain and the walls include additional areas for landscaping. Chair Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1.

ITEM #6 – DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors for a new residence on a hillside property at 228 Second Street East.

Applicant: Michael Cook

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Ron Chapman, applicant, stated he and his wife have conducted a great deal of research on the property, and he illustrated photos and talked about their origin. He stated he has been working with the League of Historic Preservation regarding the property and he has spoken with the surrounding neighbors and made adjustments accordingly. Comm. McDonald confirmed the sources of the photos. He stated the materials being used are recyclable and they want a sustainable house and construction process.

Vic Conforti, architect, distributed color palettes to the Commission and stated the inspiration was derived from the owner's research. He further described the history of the parcel. He discussed the complexities of the property, including the gable design, and the existing footprints. The garage will be excavated into the hillside, and will reflect many of the buildings found on the old resort. He described the railing detail, and confirmed the heights of the plate. He described the stone columns and the porch on the south side of the building. He discussed the design of the windows, the floor plan and the overall orientation of the house within the space. He stated there will be heritage style garage doors, and the material samples were passed to the Commission. He stated it is a sustainable design, and he described the materials being used, and the colors that will be used. He went further in describing why the roof material was chosen given the surrounding properties on Second Street East and how the material will blend in with the background. He confirmed a landscape plan will be brought to the Commission for review. Comm. McDonald confirmed the deck will be subject to review by the Building Department, and the material itself is composite and fire-rated.

Comm. McDonald stated he had no particular concerns about the proposal, but he would like to see more articulation on the garage side of the structure. He suggested landscaping along the driveway could alleviate these concerns. He appreciated the application and the amount of time the applicants have spent on the proposal.

Comm. Anderson commended the applicants on approaching their neighbors, and on the immense amount of research they presented. He stated the plan represents this work to a high degree. Comm. Appleman and Chair Cribb agreed. Chair Cribb commended the applicants on using hardy board. Comm. McDonald stated he is concerned about the underbelly of the pool, and he asked the applicants to address this issue in their landscape design. There was a discussion about the landscape review, and certain aspects of design the Commissioners would like to see addressed.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve the application, Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #7 - DEMOLITION REVIEW: Consideration of a request to demolish a single-family home constructed in 1930 at 405 Fifth Street West.

Applicant: Vic Conforti

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Anderson confirmed this is a Study Session, and staff described the other components that are required for review.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Vic Conforti, architect, stated the traffic study will help a great deal, and the Green Building Ordinance will apply to this project. Comm. Anderson confirmed a deconstruction process can be used in order to recycle many of the materials. Comm. McDonald confirmed the architect would be willing to look to have an integrated sign program. Comm. Appleman confirmed they do have potential tenants, and while she would love a new project on that corner, there is a great deal of open retail space in Sonoma. Comm. McDonald commented on the drainage. Comm. Anderson stated this property was discussed during the Development Code update and was re-zoned. The proposal

is consistent with mid-urban density planning, and this is what the Planning Commission had in mind. He stated the project is headed in the right direction.

Pam Pulventri, Visitor's Bureau, asked that the demolition be photo-documented.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve the application, Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #8 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Discussion and review of a-board sign regulations.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

There was a discussion about the four feet in height versus the five feet. Chair Cribb clarified the linear frontage language.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing. Seeing there were no additional comments, Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

ITEM #9 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Discussion and review of Real Estate sign regulations.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Cathy Wade Shepard, Sotheby's, stated she was a representative of the Real Estate Community and she distributed a letter for the Commission that was the result of a community meeting. Sotheby's is in violation all around the City, and they are all concerned about these regulations. In reality, a four foot height limit is not viable seeing as real estate companies use a sign service and they are almost all 4x4 posts. She stated all signs are over the limit, and while they want to comply, they felt compelled to let the Commission know the realities of the present day.

Katherine Sebano, Century 21, described two types of signs and when they are used. She stated people are often unable to find the property, and it is better for traffic and customer purposes to allow more than two signs per property. She suggested four as an appropriate compromise. She stated having a smaller sign size will create issues, and staff will have to police signs more often. She stated the taller signs that can be seen even if cars are parked along the street. Comm. Anderson confirmed the hours for open house, and Comm. McDonald confirmed the Sunday hours for open house. A discussion ensued regarding real estate signs and hours. Comm. Anderson confirmed he too was concerned about the four feet, and Comm. Appleman stated she was concerned about additions to that size sign, such as brochure attachments. She stated the way-finding signs are not an issue for her. There was a discussion of corporate sign programs, individual real estate broker signs and the size requirements. There was a discussion regarding the location of blade and the post signs, and a discussion regarding policing, sign design, and homeowner needs. A discussion ensued regarding needs of the real estate companies. Chair Cribb stated much of the same language utilized in the free-standing section may be used here, especially the sections regarding the type of lot relative to the size of the sign. Comm. Anderson stated the Commission is working to help the sign program be more efficient and these written rules will be helpful.

OUTSTANDING ITEMS: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: none

The meeting adjourned at 9:30p.m. to the special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 19, 2010.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant



City of Sonoma
Design Review Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DRC Agenda Item: **5**

Meeting Date: **07/21/09**

Applicant

AMP Construction

Project Location

175 Fourth Street East

Historical Significance

- ☐ Listed on National Register of Historic Places, including Sonoma Plaza district (Significant)
- ☐ Listed on California Register of Historic Resources (Significant)
- ☐ Listed within Local Historic Resources Survey (Potentially Significant)
- ☐ Over 50 years old (Potentially Significant)

Request

Design review for a new single family residence and attached garage.

Summary

The architect is proposing to construct a 12,937 square foot residence. The existing residence will be demolished and is not subject to a Demolition Permit as it was built in the early 1980s and is not 50 years old.

Zoning Requirements: The standards of the Rural Hillside zone applicable to the proposal are as follows:

- **Setbacks:** The new residence meets or exceeds the normal setback requirements.
- **Coverage:** At 3.4%, site coverage is less than the 15% maximum allowed in the Rural Hillside zone.
- **Floor Area Ratio:** The project would result in an F.A.R. of .0651, which is less than the 0.10 the maximum allowed. [Note: per the Development Code, second units and the detached garages (up to 400 square feet) are not included in the calculation of F.A.R.]
- **Parking:** Four covered parking spaces are provided in the garage. This meets the requirement.
- **Height:** The two-story residence would have a maximum ridge height of 289 feet 10 inches, this meets the 30-foot height limit allowed in the zone.

In short, the project complies with the applicable requirements of the Development Code, and is not subject to Planning Commission approval.

Design Review: New single family homes located within the Historic Overlay Zone are subject to architectural review in order to assure that the new construction complies with the following: (1) the required standards, design guidelines and ordinances of the city; (2) minimize potential adverse effects on surrounding properties and the environment; (3) implement General Plan policies regarding community design; and, (4) promote the general health, safety, welfare, and economy of the residents of the City. (§19.54.080.A).

Factors to be considered: In the course of Site Design and Architectural Review, the consideration of the review authority shall include the following factors:

1. The historical significance, if any, of the site or buildings or other features on the site;
There are no historically significant features on the site.
2. Environmental features on or adjacent to the site;
Staff is not aware of any environmental features on or adjacent to the site.

3. The context of uses and architecture established by adjacent development;
The adjacent properties to the west, north, south, and east are developed with single family residences.
4. The location, design, site plan configuration, and effect of the proposed development.
The location, design, site plan configuration, and effect of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses.

In general, it is staff's conclusion that the applicant has successfully applied the applicable design guidelines in developing the plan for the replacement structure.

Building Elevations & Exterior Colors/Materials: The design of the proposed residence reflects a European neo-classical style. Sample exterior finishes will be presented at the meeting.

Required Findings: As set forth in §19.54.080.H of the Development Code, in order to approve an application for design review, the Design Review Commission must make the following findings:

1. The project complies with applicable policies and regulations, as set forth in this Development Code (except for approved Variances and Exceptions), other City ordinances, and the General Plan;
2. On balance, the project is consistent with the intent of applicable design guidelines set forth in this Development Code; and
3. The project responds appropriately to the context of adjacent development, as well as existing site conditions and environmental features.
4. The project will not impair the historic character of its surroundings; and
5. The project substantially preserves the qualities of any significant historic structures or other significant historic features on the site.

Commission Discussion

Design Review Commission Action

☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Referred to: _____ ☐ Continued to: _____

Roll Call Vote: 5 Aye 0 Nay _____ Abstain _____ Absent

DRC Conditions or Modifications

cc: Thomas Casey, Architect, AIA
21115 Scottsdale Drive
Bend, OR 97701

AMP Construction
369 B Third Street # 456
San Rafael, CA 94901-3581

Don and Nancy Sebastini
P.O. Box 1423
Sonoma, CA 95476-1423

Attachments:

1. Project Narrative
2. Photographs of existing conditions
3. Exterior color samples
4. Site Plan/Floor Plans/Elevations

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
City Hall Conference Room, 177 First Street West
July 21, 2009
MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, June 19, 2009, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:30 p.m., Chair Cribb presiding

ROLL CALL:
Present: Chair Cribb, Comms. McDonald, Anderson, Tippell & Carlson
Absent: Comms. Appleman
Staff Present: Assistant Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Leveille

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

CORRESPONDENCE: none

MINUTES: Comm. Anderson moved to approve the minutes of June 16, 2009 as amended. Chair Cribb seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve the minutes of June 23, 2009 as submitted. Chair Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #1 - CONTINUED DESIGN & SIGN REVIEW: Continued review of a new awning, new door, and signage for a commercial building (Sonoma Wine Shop) AT 412 First Street East.

Applicant: Bryan Cooper

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Meek Sheles, applicant, distributed additional materials for the Commission to review and stated they returned with the awning the Commission had recommended. She provided a sample of the awning material. She stated she, along with Mr. Cooper, had researched the location and had information on the business that was originally there. They discovered they too had a temporary awning which was removed when they wanted more light inside. She stated the businesses on the Plaza presently need help to stay in business and the Sonoma Wine Shop has been there for 30 years.

Chair Cribb confirmed how the proposed paneling would be executed and Comm. McDonald confirmed it is staged paneling. Ms. Sheles confirmed they would prefer it to be on the outside of the façade. Comm. Carlson confirmed there are no signs on the door and that the AC unit will be mounted into an inner space and vent outwards. Bryan Cooper, applicant, stated the unit does have to be at this part of the building since they have no roof access. He stated the proposal will improve the look of the space, and under this application the AC unit will not be seen from the street. Comm. Anderson confirmed the lattice will be removed, and the air conditioner will be above that space.

Comm. Tippell stated he liked the style of the proposed doors, but he was suspect as to how the façade is going to work, as it seems difficult to retain the existing façade with this proposal. He stated the drawings demonstrate an improvement, but he does think it will work. While he likes the look, he is struggling with the proposal.

Comm. Anderson stated the proposed façade is evocative of a particular period and Mr. Cooper responded stating it has to be removable, since they are tenants, but will improve the look while they occupy the space.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the bottom of the façade is different in the illustrations and the applicants stated they were looking for a recommendation regarding the stone bottom.

Chair Cribb confirmed the veneer would not cover all the existing architectural details, and Mr. Cooper described how a veneer would blend into the existing. Mr. Cooper stated he supplied documentation regarding historical architecture to the Commission in order to clarify why certain elements were chosen for submittal. He stated there was a wine shop there in the 1800's, and it was a Victorian saloon, and an awning was used at that time as well.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. Anderson stated the applicants listened and responded to the comments from the last meeting and the revised proposal is elegant. He stated he would support painting the coping stone on the bottom façade.

Comm. McDonald stated he liked the awning color and projection and he has no problem with the current façade being covered. He stated he would support the variance for the signs, given most of them are window signs and compatible with the space. He stated he is glad the fascia can go on outside, as that is preferable, and he likes its temporary nature. He has no problem with the door, but it would be his preference that the coping stone remains unpainted.

Comm. Carlson agreed with Comm. McDonald and said that an opaque façade was not a terribly welcoming design. Ms. Sheles stated they desire to have outdoor seating and have a nice, cool atmosphere on the inside for the tasting. Comm. Carlson confirmed they were not planning on covering the windows with the veneer. She confirmed the signs would be painted.

Comm. Tippell confirmed the windows are clear, and the applicant would prefer to have the veneer on the outside. He stated he would approve the variance for the signs and he felt it was a good application.

Chair Cribb said he too would be in approval of the application, however, he stated since the current façade has worked for 100 years and is a historical piece of Sonoma, he is strongly in favor of photo-documenting the original prior to the façade installation. He stated it is a lovely design if this were not a historical building.

Chair McDonald moved to approve application as submitted, allowing for the applicants to adhere panels to the outside of the façade, given they do not permanently alter the building . Photo documentation is to be completed on present structure. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #2 – CONTINUED DESIGN & SIGN REVIEW: Continued design review for a new single-family residence, detached garage, and second unit at 568 Second Street East.

Applicant: Jon Curry

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Jon Curry, applicant, stated he was available for questions and he has been working closely with owners. Chair Cribb confirmed the colors on the color board.

Comm. Carlson confirmed the front setback is approximately 25 feet.

Mr. Curry stated they wanted stone to be a rubble look made of quality materials, and the goal is to keep the front porch low and in order to preserve a rural feel and it allows for the nice low railing. There is a low-pitch roof which wraps around the house, and a closed soffit on the eaves. There is an OG gutter which poses a Greek-revival design on the crown molding for the length of the gutter. There will be one-inch trim on all windows and other numerous architectural details prevalent in Sonoma.

Comm. Tippell stated he liked the idea of the low stone front, and confirmed the proposed stone is real, but a veneer. Mr. Curry stated they are working with a French mason and using a wonderful grout to further the level of detail. He described how the stone would be installed.

Chair Cribb closed the public hearing.

Comm. Carlson stated the house will be a beautiful addition to the neighborhood. Comm. Tippell agreed stating he liked Mr. Curry's work. Comm. Anderson thanked the owners and the applicant for their diligence in returning with the details and stated he appreciates the scale of the building and colors chosen. He stated there are generous setbacks and the structure is not over-built. He is pleased with the application and would be in support.

Comm. McDonald complimented the architect and applicant on the quality of the project and agreed it will look beautiful on the street. Chair Cribb agreed and thanked the applicant for the level of detail presented and the green building plans.

Comm. Carlson moved to approve the application, Chair Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #3 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of an a-board sign for a home store (Villa Terrazza Patio & Home) at 869 Broadway.

Applicant: Villa Terrazza Patio & Home

Comm. McDonald confirmed customers are able to park in front of the building.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Mr. Robertovi, applicant, stated they have used the sign since they opened 4 years ago, but it was removed when found out it was illegal in 2008. He stated subsequent Holiday sales were very low and while they have tried numerous other forms of advertising, the A-board is the most effective source of advertising they have tried. Visitors to Sonoma are the main customers for the store, and these customers are lost without this sign. The economy has also affected the business, but lack of this has been a significant hit. The sign will not be on the sidewalk and it does not pose a hazard. He stated having the ability to alter the sign is a helpful feature. Comm. Carlson confirmed the sign is able to be altered.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. McDonald stated he has no problem with this A-board sign, given its height is appropriate given the location of the business. While he has no issues, but asked that the sign not block the visibility of the driveway. Comm. Anderson agreed, stating the sign's distance from the curb is appropriate. Comm. Tippell and Comm. Carlson agreed.

Chair Cribb stated he would vote in opposition, understanding that while the applicant may feel it is necessary, in looking at the façade, he sees other opportunities for an integrated sign. He goes by the store quite often, and there is a harmony to the space. He stated the A-board stands out too much from the main building.

Comm. Carlson moved to approve application. Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1.

ITEM #4 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of an a-board sign for a cookware store (Robin's Nest) at 116 East Napa Street.

Applicant: Robin's Nest

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

The applicant stated the refrigerator door has been out in front of the business for 20 years, and after its removal due to an abatement letter, many people thought the business was closed. She recognized the work of the DRC, and asked the Commission for approval of this unique A-board sign.

Comm. Carlson confirmed there is a hook on the door for safety issues, it has never fallen. It attaches the façade.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. Anderson stated he is particularly fond of this sign, having had this type of refrigerator growing up. He stated the sign represents the shop well and has worked for 20 years.

Comm. McDonald stated he loved this creative sign, and he congratulated the owner on its uniqueness. He stated he would approve the application. Comms. Carlson and Tippell agreed. Chair Cribb encouraged members of the audience to stay for final item stating one of the mandates of the DRC is to create an ambiance in Sonoma that reflects its history and character. He stated this sign is an exemplary example of this goal.

Comm. Anderson moved to approve application. Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The applicant stated the sign was her father's idea, and thanked the commission for honoring his memory through this approval.

ITEM #5 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of design review for a new single family residence and attached garage at 175 Fourth Street East.

Applicant: AMP Construction

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Alf Partridge of AMP Construction, and Jessica Hall with the design company introduced themselves to the Commission. Ms. Hall stated she was available questions. Chair Cribb asked her to clarify and describe the design concept. She stated the clients are an Italian family, and they want a European, neo-classical design. She stated home is simple in form, has a flat exterior, and will incorporate limestone. The proposed house is 10 feet shorter than the existing, and is set an additional 28 feet back. She stated the family wanted a porch for entertaining.

Chair Cribb confirmed the trees at back of house will be transplanted, and they are currently above ground in planters.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the topography is going slightly uphill and the house will not be seen from Second Street East. Comm. McDonald confirmed the construction staging area will be on the tennis courts, and a great deal of the materials on-site are to be re-used. The existing landscaping will be protected. Comm. Anderson confirmed the new foundation line will be pre-decked and water-proofed.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. McDonald stated typically his primary concern is compatibility with the adjoining structures and the street, but given the site is rural and secluded he does not have those concerns. The architecture is tasteful, and while it may not fit on another street, it fits this setting. He likes the building materials and while typically he would like to view architectural details, given the proximity of home he would not require that in this case. He trusts the Sebastiani's to make appropriate choices. He stated 12,000 square foot house is problematic and he would not usually support that large of a SFD. Comm. Anderson agreed and added that the family has a generational heritage of creating fine structures, and even without a great deal of detail would trust their legacy.

Comm. Carlson confirmed the structure is within the parameters of Development Code stated she has no issues. Comm. Tippell agreed. Chair Cribb stated he agreed and the Sebastiani's do have a long history with the City. He agreed with Comm. McDonald while the plan is not appropriate to other sites in Sonoma, it fits this location.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve application. Chair Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #6 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of design and sign review associated with a mobile food trailer (Taste of a Gyro) at 1001 Broadway.

Applicant: Dominic Sammarco

Comm. Anderson recused himself due to proximity. Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed the location of the trailer on the property and no part of the structure will overhang onto the adjoining property.

Chair Cribb confirmed the Planning Commission had no fire safety issues in association with this application.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Dominic Sammarco, applicant, stated he has been in Sonoma for two years and the restaurant business for 16 years. He stated he wants to accentuate the charm of Sonoma and the trailer design is similar to Sebastiani wine trolley. He is proposing a traditional Greek style and he described his sign request in greater detail. He also described the emergency access plan for the property. Chair Cribb confirmed his seating plan and Comm. Carlson confirmed the hours of operation and garbage plan. Mr. Sammarco further described his recycling and garbage plan for Comm. Carlson. Comm. Tippell confirmed the hours of operation co-inside with those of the high school and Sonoma Old School.

Rich Andriani, neighbor of Mr. Sammarco, stated the project will be an improvement to the site and all the proposed signs are necessary to the project's success. He encouraged Commission support.

Kathy Whaley, resident, stated Mr. Sammarco is very particular and pro-active and the business will be well-maintained and an asset to Sonoma. She too encouraged support.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. Tippell stated he likes application, as it is fun and different. He stated he has no issues with proposed signs and would support the application. Comm. Carlson stated the application is aesthetically pleasing as far as it goes, and lots of students congregate at fast food places. She stated she is happy with the proposed hours of operations.

Comm. McDonald stated the role of Design Review Commission is aesthetic, and as the Planning Commission was in charge of other decisions he cannot comment on specific issues. He stated there is a "missing tooth" on site and this proposal will block the store storage from the street. It is a unique and creative use and he has no problems with proposed signs. Again, he stated he could not comment on parking.

Comm. Cribb stated the Commission is limited to aesthetics, and despite other thoughts, he agreed the signs are necessary. He stated this site has proved to be problematic with adherence to the DRC conditions, but if applicant is as meticulous as stated would support the application.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve application. Chair Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #7 - SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a landscape plan for a commercial property (Emmys' Spaghetti Shack) at 691 Broadway.

Applicant: Emmy Kaplan

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald confirmed there was no Use Permit required for the site plan or restaurant use.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Mundo Murguia, the applicant's spouse, stated he was here to answer questions and the existing use is within the parameters of the Development Code. He stated he is now aware that changes to the landscape require DRC review. He wants to reduce water consumption on-site and highlight the architecture of the building rather than hide the structure. He stated the previous landscaping was somewhat cluttered. The plan for the trees in the parking lot was clarified, as well as why those species were chosen. The proposed habitat is valued by bees and hover flies, and it will provide a pollen and fruit source for them.

Comm. Carlson confirmed there are two patios and one has just a bench. He confirmed there is no designated smoking area, and most people smoke out front.

Comm. Tippell confirmed the existing gate and driveway were part of the plan for the previous owners. Mr. Murguia stated those elements were being kept to highlight the available parking, and they did not want to eliminate the parking spot. A discussion ensued as to parking on the site.

Comm. McDonald stated he has certain pet peeves with this site, including the trash enclosure with the dumpster and trash receptacles that sit in the parking lot. While the DRC cannot comment on a possible reduction in parking, he does not like the aesthetics. Mr. Murguia stated these are pre-existing from prior restaurant and he is present tonight for landscape design review.

Comm. Anderson stated the landscaping is an improvement to Andrieux Street, and the use of water-saving plants is a good solution. He stated he would be in support.

Comm. McDonald stated concern about the London plain tree, stating it should not be planted so close to the structure. He would like that to be changed. He went further in describing how the plan is inappropriate for the space. He stated while he has no problems with planting materials, the landscaping needs to create a foundation and Mr. Murguia should use a low-growing shrub. The skirt of the building is not attractive or historically accurate. He stated there is too much decomposed granite. He would like to see the patio eliminated and the driveway narrowed, and as the trash enclosure is an obnoxious nuisance and he would like to see landscaping to help hide this element.

Comm. Carlson agreed there is too much hardscape on Broadway and she thinks it is a very hard look.

Comm. Tippell agreed with Comm. Anderson, stating he is happy for the reduction in water use. He has no particular issues with tree species, but agreed there is a too much hardscape in the plan. He stated it would be his preference to remove the driveway.

Chair Cribb stated the amount of hardscape is excessive. Comm. Tippell stated though it may be problematic, perhaps the Planning Department could be approached about the driveway. Mr. Murguia stated the goal is to recreate a meadow type planting, and have a soft, bellowing look. He described why particular plants were chosen, and how they would draw the eye towards the building. The location of the London plain tree was chosen due to location of the Sweet Gum, which has to be removed due to root rot. He stated the site was previously overplanted. Comm. McDonald and Mr. Murguia discussed various types of grasses, and Mr. Murguia stated the one proposed a late pollinator, and good for insects and bees. He stated he was open to Commission suggestion regarding specific trees. Comm. McDonald suggested this property may be in the Redevelopment Area and the City may have an opportunity to improve the property. A discussion ensued regarding the trees and grass. Comm. Tippell stated he would not want to trigger a new Planning Commission review, but elimination of the driveway would be favorable. He stated the space has a pedestrian-friendly feel which he feels is lacking in the Broadway corridor. He liked that bicycling was encouraged, and would support the bike racks being at the front of the property.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. McDonald stated he has a big issue with the trash and he is sorry the Planning Commission did not address the issue. He stated he did not wish to hold up the landscaping, but allow the applicant to return with a solution to this issue. He would support the elimination of the patio and putting the bicycle parking where the driveway is presently. He would like the location of the London plain tree to be parallel to the tree at the far right of the space and eliminate the pathway on site. He stated the base plant should screen the base of the building.

Comm. McDonald moved to approve, given the following provisions.

- 1.
- 2.

Comm. Carlson seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1.

ITEM #8 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a request to demolish a single-family home constructed in 1954 at 787 Second Street East.

Applicant: Malcolm Morrison

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing.

Malcolm Morrison, applicant, introduced the owners of the property and stated he would like to echo and supplement the narrative. The current site is all garage, and he described other design concepts which were reviewed and deemed infeasible. This is a small replacement structure with good detailing. He made himself available for questions, and stated he would be happy to give progress report on site recycling and reuse.

Comm. Tippell and the applicants discussed the recycling that has been done, and confirmed there has been interest in relocating the house. The applicants have high hopes and would love to have an entity reuse the whole building rather than demolish and use the parts. Certain Sonoma and Marin deconstructors are also interested and he described what elements of they would use.

The review timeline and process for this project was clarified for the Commission.

Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

Comm. Anderson stated this is a reasonable solution for a house that was built before the inclusion of the Planning Commission. He stated the proposed setbacks are an improvement to the site, and he would support the project. Comm. McDonald stated he has no issues with the demolition, as the current house does not add to the aesthetic of the street. Prior to demolition, he would like the house to be photo-documented and those photos are to be provided to the building department. Comm. Tippell stated it is a good design solution. Chair Cribb agreed, stating he would like to see the birch siding reused. Comm. Anderson stated the applicants work with the neighbors and the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation was helpful and influential and he thanked them for their efforts.

Comm. Carlson moved to approve the application; Comm. McDonald amended the motion to include photo documentation of the project. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #9 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Discussion and review of outdoor merchandise and sign regulations.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Staff stated it seems to work best to have the Commissioners give feedback to staff, and have staff work to refine the process. They have a prototype for a reference guide of required reviews that will be provided through the City and the Chamber of Commerce. It is based on the current code and will be modified as policies are changed and/or updated. Staff stated Laurie Decker did most of the legwork and the distributed papers reflect the current City Code. A discussion ensued about how businesses get information and Comm. Carlson stated all businesses need to receive it. Comm. Carlson stated the City is missing an opportunity to ensure proper fee monies are being paid. She confirmed fees have been waived by staff, including the application for 116 East Napa earlier in the evening. Staff stated there is a current informational folder available for new business owners, and these regulations were to be added to the existing packet.

Chair Cribb stated the Commission should take each aspect of these regulations as separate topics to be discussed at future meetings, both regular and special. The Commission discussed special meetings, there scheduling and how each would noticed for the public.

Chair Cribb opened the public hearing. Chair Cribb closed the meeting to the public.

OUTSTANDING ITEMS: none

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: none

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: none

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August 18, 2009.

Approved:

Teresa Mae Leveille, Administrative Assistant

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item #3
Meeting Date: 10-13-11

Agenda Item Title: Application for a Use Permit to restore and construct an addition to an historic residence on a hillside property.

Applicant/Owner: Robert Baumann, Architect/Bill Jasper

Site Address/Location: 131 Fourth Street East

Staff Contact: Rob Gjestland, Senior Planner
Staff Report Prepared: 10/7/11

PROJECT SUMMARY

Description: Application of Robert Baumann, Architect, for a Use Permit to restore and construct an addition to an historic residence on a hillside property at 131 Fourth Street East.

General Plan Designation: Hillside (H)

Planning Area: Northeast Area

Zoning: **Base:** Hillside Residential (R-HS) **Overlay:** Historic (/H)

Site Characteristics: The subject property is a 1.65-acre parcel located on the west side of Fourth Street East near its intersection with Brazil Street. The property is currently developed with an historic Craftsman-style residence (constructed between 1907 and 1910), pump house and various landscape features, including a stone wall and two stone water features. In addition, there are several mature trees on the property, including two palms framing the entry walk. The property frontage is not improved.

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning:

North: Single-family home on large parcel/Hillside Residential
South: Single-family home on large parcel/Hillside Residential
East: Single-family homes/Rural Residential
West: Outdoor recreational court on large parcel/Hillside Residential

Environmental Review:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved/Certified
<input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report	<input type="checkbox"/> Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Staff Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

Over the past summer, following its purchase by Bill Jasper, Garavaglia Architecture conducted an historic resource evaluation of the two-story Craftsman style residence located on the subject property. The evaluation determined that the residence is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources and is therefore considered an historical resource under State law (refer to enclosed Final Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated August 2, 2011).

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Restoration & Addition to Historic Residence: The project involves renovation and restoration of the historic residence along with construction of a 2,704-square foot, two-story addition at the rear of the home, including 2,256 square feet of living area and a 448-square foot two-car garage. With removal of a previous shed addition, the proposal would increase the net living area of the residence by 1,816 square feet (from 1,777 square feet to 3,593 square feet). In general, restoration activities would return the existing structure to its original appearance through retention and reuse of original exterior materials to the greatest extent possible and in-kind replacement where materials are deteriorated beyond repair, such as the exterior wood shingles. As proposed, the original one-over-one wood windows on the front elevation would be retained and restored, while windows on the north and south elevations would be replaced. The proposed addition has been designed for compatibility with the architectural features of the historic residence in terms of form, roof heights and pitches, exterior materials, details and color. An in-depth analysis of the proposed restoration and addition in terms of architectural form, exterior materials, colors and detailing is addressed in the attached Standards Compliance Review letter prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated September 13, 2011.

Other Improvements: The project includes a number of other improvements as follows. The circular drive in front of the residence would be restored along with the existing stone wall and entry posts, and a new driveway spur would be provided to access the rear garage. In addition, stepped patios would be provided on the south side of the home including a fire pit, cistern, and pergola. Substantial landscape improvements are proposed around the house as shown on the enclosed preliminary landscape drawings. The existing stone pump house would also be preserved and reroofed. To address Fire Department requirements an emergency vehicle access (EVA) and fire-truck turnaround would be accommodated by widening the southern driveway as shown on the revised Partial Site Plan dated 10/13/11 (refer to "Discussion of Project Issues" for a more details on emergency vehicle access requirements).

The purpose of the project is to restore and upgrade the aging residence, which has been vacant and neglected for three decades. Further details can be found in the attached project narrative and accompanying materials

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY (☐ **Not Applicable to this Project**)

The property is designated Hillside Residential by the General Plan. The Hillside Residential land use designation is intended to preserve Sonoma's hillside backdrop, while allowing limited residential development in conjunction with agricultural uses. The designation allows a density of one residential unit per ten acres (excluding second units). General Plan policies that apply to the project call for the preservation of local historic structures (Community Development Element, Policy 5.8) and protection of important scenic vistas and natural resources (Community Development Element, Policy 5.3). The project would most certainly preserve and restore a local historic resource that has been vacant and deteriorating. The visibility of the project and its impact on scenic vistas and natural resources is discussed below under "Hillside Development."

DEVELOPMENT CODE CONSISTENCY (☐ **Not Applicable to this Project**) *Use:* The property is zoned Hillside Residential (R-HS). Single-family homes and residential accessory structures are permitted uses in the R-HS zoning district, subject to approval of Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

Density: The maximum density allowed within the R-HS zone is one dwelling unit per ten acres. The proposal involves the expansion of an existing residence and does not raise any issues with respect to density limitations.

Setbacks for the Residence: Primary structures in the R-HS zone must be setback a minimum of 30 feet from all property lines. The addition complies with this requirement in that it would be setback 50 feet from the south property line, 80 feet from the east/rear property line, 192 feet from the north property line, and 144 feet from the front property line.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The maximum FAR in the R-HS zone is 0.10 or 10% of the total lot area. The project would increase the total FAR of the parcel from 2.8% to 5.6%. Under the Development Code, FAR calculations include attached garages and enclosed accessory structures over 120 square feet, but exclude porches.

Lot Coverage: The maximum coverage in the R-HS zone is 15% of the total lot area. The project would increase the lot coverage from 2.8% to 3.8%. Under the Development Code, coverage calculations exclude porches.

Building Height (Primary Residence): The maximum building height in the R-HS zone is 30 feet for primary structures. In addition, Section 19.40.040 of the Development Code allows for chimneys, spires, and towers to project up to eight feet above the normally allowed structure height. The proposal complies with these height limitations. The area of addition would not exceed ± 26 feet in height measured from finish grade and the chimney would have a maximum height of ± 29 feet. Staff would note that the existing residence currently has a height of 30 feet to the roof peak.

Setbacks & Building Height for Accessory Structures: Under the Development Code, detached accessory structure can be located as close as five feet from side or rear property lines provided that they meet specific height criteria (i.e., a wall/plate height of nine feet or less and a maximum roof height of 15 feet). The existing pump house is non-conforming in that it spans the property line shared with the adjoining parcel to the south (also owned by Bill Jasper). In addition, the landscape plan shows a proposed pergola extending over this same property line. However, the owner intends to correct the current non-conformity through a lot line adjustment, which would render both the existing pump house and proposed pergola compliant with the side yard setback and height standards for accessory structures. A condition of approval has been included to this end requiring resolution of this issue prior to issuance of a building/grading permit.

Parking: One covered parking space is required for each single-family home. The parking requirement would be met by the proposed two-car garage.

Hillside Development: The purpose of the hillside development regulations and guidelines is to preserve and protect views to and from the hillside areas within the City, to preserve significant topographical features and habitats, and to maintain the identity, character, and environmental quality of the City. All new development within the R-HS zone is subject to approval of a Use Permit. As set forth under Section 19.40.050.F of the Development Code, the Planning Commission shall evaluate applications for hillside development based on the following objectives, in addition to the normal findings for a conditional use permit:

1. *The preservation of natural topographic features and appearances by maintaining the natural topography to the greatest extent possible.*

Proposed improvements occur on relatively gentle slopes ($\pm 10\%$) thus minimizing the amount of grading, and changes in grade would be addressed by a set of low, stepped retaining walls (two for the south patios and two for the front landing and drive/parking area). It is also anticipated that the amount of cut and fill for the project would be under 50 cubic yards, a relatively small amount that does not reach the threshold for a grading permit under the Municipal Code.

2. *The protection of natural topographic features and appearances through limitations on successive padding and terracing of building sites and the preservation of significant ridgelines, steep slopes, natural rock outcroppings, drainage courses, prominent trees and woodlands, vernal pools, and other areas of special natural beauty.*

The project involves construction of an addition to a single-family home and therefore does not require successive and/or terraced building sites that can be associated with major subdivisions in hillside areas. In addition, the property is not in proximity to a ridgeline and slopes are relatively gentle where improvements are proposed (10% on average). Prominent trees and the oak woodland on the property would be preserved (only four trees of relatively small stature would be removed including an olive, two acacias, and a live oak).

3. *The utilization of varying setbacks, building heights, foundation designs, and compatible building forms, materials, and colors that help blend buildings into the terrain.*

Most notably, the addition would be set back behind the existing structure and would not exceed the current height of the residence. This design approach minimizes its visibility. For compatibility with the existing historic structure, exterior materials for the addition include natural wood colored horizontal/shingle siding along with green trim, accents, and roofing. These materials and colors employ natural tones that would help blend into the environment.

4. *The utilization of clustered sites and buildings on more gently sloping terrain to reduce grading alterations on steeper slopes.*

In general, proposed improvements would occur in gently sloping areas ($\pm 10\%$) around the existing home site.

5. *The utilization of building designs, locations, and arrangements that protect views to and from the hillside area.*

The property is currently developed with a two-story residence that is already visible from the street. The design of the addition behind and subordinate to the existing structure is intended to maintain views of the hillside setting.

6. *The preservation and introduction of plant materials so as to protect slopes from soil erosion and slippage and minimize the visual effects of grading and construction of hillside areas.*

An erosion control plan is normally required for hillside development which will address measures for reseeding and stabilizing disturbed soil areas. In addition, only four trees would be removed to accommodate the project. Furthermore, substantial landscape improvements are proposed around the house to help screen and blend grading improvements and the addition (refer to enclosed preliminary landscape plans).

7. *The utilization of street designs and improvements that minimize grading alterations and harmonize with the natural contours of the hillsides.*

In general the existing circular drive would be maintained and restored with some relatively minor alterations, including re-grading the portion in front of the home to provide adjoining grass-pave parking areas, and widening the south driveway entrance to function as the required emergency vehicle access and fire truck turnaround (refer to "Discussion of Project Issues" for a more details on emergency vehicle access requirements).

Design Review: Because the property is located in the Historic Overlay zone, the project is subject to subsequent review by the Design Review Commission (Development Code §19.54.080). In this case, the Planning Commission is responsible for reviewing and acting upon the project site plan, building massing and elevation concepts to the extent it deems necessary. Subsequent review by the Design Review Commission would be limited to elevation details, exterior materials and colors, lighting, landscaping (demonstrating compliance with the City's updated water efficient landscaping ordinance), and any other issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission. Staff is recommending that the modifications suggested by the historic resource consultant be referred to the DRC for consideration (see "Discussion of Project Issues" below).

**CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER
CITY ORDINANCES/POLICIES** (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

Public Improvement Construction (Sidewalk Ordinance): Under Chapter 12.14 of the City's Municipal Code, improvements to a property that have a building permit valuation exceeding \$40,000 within any two-year period trigger the requirement for public frontage improvements, which can include drainage infrastructure, roadways, curb, gutter and sidewalk. The project will exceed this valuation threshold and the applicant is requesting a Variance from the requirement to install public sidewalk along the property frontage. The Planning Commission may grant a Variance from the requirement to install public improvements, provided that the following findings can be made:

1. *Granting the Variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property in the same zone and vicinity in which the property is located; and*
2. *Based on information provided by the City Engineer, at least one of the following:*
 - a. *Existing drainage facilities are inadequate and that installation would endanger the public welfare by reason thereof; or*
 - b. *It would be in the best interest of the City to cause all or a portion of the required work to be done on an area project basis rather than on an individual basis; or*
 - c. *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property such as size, shape, topography, location, existing improvements, or surrounding structures, and that the strict application of the requirements under this chapter would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of this chapter; or*
 - d. *The nature and extent of the dedication, improvements or both, as required in this chapter, do not bear a reasonable relationship to the proposed use or uses of the property such that the exactions required would exceed the demands or burdens upon traffic, circulation and other factors justifying public improvements.*

Circumstance 2.b and 2.c. above are most applicable in this case. The subject property is located in a Rural Residential (R-R) and Hillside Residential (R-HS) zoning district, comprised of large parcels with

a rural character. No other similarly zoned properties in the vicinity have sidewalks (on the west side of Fourth Street East where the subject property is located, sidewalk improvements terminate at the winery facility to the south). Furthermore, the Planning Commission recently approved a variance from the sidewalk improvement requirement for the adjacent properties at 175 Fourth Street East and 95 Brazil Street, as well as other nearby properties including 164 and 249 Fourth Street East. These variances were based primarily on maintaining the rural character of the neighborhood and were consistent with previous Council direction for this northerly segment of Fourth Street East.

In consideration of these factors, it is logical to approve a variance from the sidewalk requirement for the subject property. The request was forwarded to the City Engineer for comment. The City Engineer supports granting a Variance with the condition that a Deferred Improvement Agreement be required as provided for under Section 12.14.051 of the Municipal Code. This would allow the City to require sidewalk improvements in the future if circumstances or conditions were to change over the long term. Staff would note that the requirement for a Deferred Improvement Agreement has been applied consistently to all sidewalk variance requests approved by the Planning Commission over the past two years.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (☐ Not Applicable to this Project)

As previously noted, an historic resource evaluation determined that the residence is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources, which means that it is an "historical resource" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to Section 15331 of the CEQA Guidelines, rehabilitation and additions to an historical resource, may be considered categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA provided the improvements are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Class 31 — Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation). Accordingly, a subsequent evaluation was conducted to determine whether the proposal complies with the Standards (refer to attached Standards Compliance Review letter prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated September 13, 2011). The review concludes that the project as proposed is generally compliant with the Standards, and therefore qualifies for the Class 31 Categorical Exemption. Some minor modifications are suggested in the assessment to improve historical integrity as discussed under "Project Issues" below.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT ISSUES

Modifications Suggested by Historic Resource Consultant: As noted above, the Standards Compliance Review conducted by Garavaglia Architecture concludes that the proposed project is generally compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. At the same time, the assessment suggests some minor modifications to improve historical integrity, including retention of the original wood windows on the north and south elevations (the proposal includes retention of the original windows on the front façade) and new roof cladding to match the color of original roofing material. Staff recommends that these exterior material and color considerations be referred to the Design Review Commission (DRC) since the DRC typically evaluates these types of details as part of their architectural review. This direction has been included in the draft conditions of approval.

Emergency Vehicle Access Requirements: Late in review of the project, the Fire Department confirmed that emergency vehicle access into the property is required because the addition would be setback over 150' from the street. The existing circular drive was determined inadequate for emergency access due to its constrained width and the distance between the stone entry posts (± 9 feet) and the issue of emergency access was further complicated by the fact that the stone entry posts, along with the stone wall and culverts at the frontage, are prominent features of the historic property. After considering several possible solutions with the Fire Department and historic resource consultant (Garavaglia Architecture), the applicant achieved a design that meets both of their approval. This solutions provides the necessary EVA and fire truck turnaround by widening the southern vehicular entrance to 20 feet through relocation of the north pylon, adjusting the rock wall, and replacing the culvert (refer to the enclosed Partial Site Plan, Sheet A.12 dated 10/13/11). A letter from Garavaglia Architecture is attached confirming that this ap-

proach would not result in an impact to the historic resource. In addition, an email from Captain Alan Jones is attached confirming that this plan provides adequate emergency access for the Fire Department.

Lot Line Adjustment: As noted above, the pump house currently spans the south property line. Accordingly, a lot line adjustment has been required in the draft conditions to rectify this issue as part of the project. The property owner has already been considering options in this regard.

RECOMMENDATION

In general, staff feels that the project responds appropriately to the hillside development standards and is sensitive to the historic qualities of the home and property, as reflected in the Standards Compliance Review. Furthermore, the proposal restores and reinvests in a significant local historic resource that has been vacant and deteriorating over the past decades.

Staff recommends approval of the Use Permit, subject to the attached conditions of approval.

Attachments:

1. Findings
2. Draft Conditions of Approval
3. Location map
4. Project Narrative & Addendum
5. Comments on Proposed Emergency Access from Garavaglia Architecture and Captain Alan Jones
6. Standards Compliance Review prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated September 13, 2011
7. Perspective Renderings

Enclosures:

1. Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated August 2, 2011
2. Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, & Preliminary Landscape Plans

cc: Robert Baumann, Architect (via email)
729 Broadway
Sonoma, CA 95476

Bill Jasper (via email)
80 Second Street East
Sonoma, CA 95476

Sonoma League for Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 766
Sonoma, CA 95476

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
FINDINGS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Jasper Restoration/Addition – 131 Fourth Street East

October 13, 2011

Based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the staff report, and upon consideration of all testimony received in the course of the public review, including the public review, the City of Sonoma Planning Commission finds and declares as follows:

Use Permit Approval

1. That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any Specific Plan;
2. That the proposed use is allowed with a conditional Use Permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable standards and regulations of the Development Code (except for approved Variances and Exceptions).
3. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity; and
4. The proposed use will not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.

Sidewalk Variance Approval:

1. Granting the Variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property in the same zone and vicinity in which the property is located; and
2. Based on information provided by the City Engineer:
 - a. It would be in the best interest of the City to cause all or a portion of the required work to be done on an area project basis rather than on an individual basis.
 - b. There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property such as size, shape, topography, location, existing improvements, or surrounding structures, and that the strict application of the requirements under this chapter would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of this chapter.

City of Sonoma Planning Commission
CONDITIONS OF PROJECT APPROVAL
Jasper Restoration/Addition – 131 Fourth Street East

October 13, 2011

1. The project shall be constructed in conformance with the approved site plan (revised Partial Site Plan, Sheet A.12 dated 10/13/11), floor plan and building elevations, except as modified by these conditions.
Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department; City Engineer; Public Works Department
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
2. If the total amount cut and/or fill for the project exceeds 50 cubic yards then a grading and drainage plan shall be required. Documentation on the total amount of cut and fill for the project shall be provided by the applicant to the City Engineer for consideration. If a grading and drainage plan is required, it shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to the issuance of a grading permit and commencement of grading/construction activities. Retaining walls (concrete or masonry) or 2:1 cut and fill slopes shall be constructed if required to compensate for grade differences onsite. The plans shall conform to the City of Sonoma Grading Ordinance (Chapter 14.20 of the Municipal Code).
Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works Department
Timing: Prior to issuance of a grading permit
3. An erosion and sediment control plan shall be required. The required erosion control plan shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to issuance of the encroachment permit, public improvement plans, grading permit (if required), or commencement of grading activities whichever comes first. The erosion control plan shall be consistent with Sections 14.20.200-14.20.210 of the Sonoma Municipal Code and erosion control measures specified in the approved plan shall be implemented during construction prior to the first rains or October 1st. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Best Management Plan. Applicable erosion control measures shall be identified on the erosion control plan and shall be implemented throughout the construction phase of the project: soil stabilization techniques such as hydroseeding and short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets or wattles, silt fences and/or some kind of inlet protection at downstream storm drain inlets, post-construction inspection of all facilities for accumulated sediment, post-construction clearing of all drainage structures of debris and sediment, and installation of post-construction best management practices (e.g., siltation ponds, bioswales) as directed by the City Engineer
Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works Department; Stormwater Coordinator
Timing: Prior to issuance of encroachment permit, public improvement plans, and/or grading permit (if required), or commencement of grading activities whichever comes first
4. The following improvements shall be required and shown on the improvement plans and are subject to the review of the City Engineer, Planning Administrator and Fire Chief. Public improvements shall meet City standards. The improvement plans shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit..
 - a. The driveway approaches off of Fourth Street East that serve the property shall be surfaced with a City-approved surface material a minimum of 20 feet back from the edge of the asphalt roadway. Chip seal surfacing per Sonoma County's standards is an acceptable surfacing option. Gravel or other loose material is prohibited. Fire Department requirements shall also be met for the EVA encompassing the south driveway as outlined under Condition No. 4.b. and Condition 10 below.
 - b. Provision of an emergency vehicle access and fire truck turnaround by widening the southern vehicular entrance/driveway to 20 feet through relocation of the north pylon, adjusting the rock wall, and replacing the culvert as shown on the revised Partial Site Plan, Sheet A.12 dated 10/13/11. The drainage culvert under the south driveway entry shall be replaced and extended and shall have the same diameter as the existing culverts, but no less than 18-inches in diameter.
 - c. Sewer main extension and/or laterals and appurtenances, as required by the Sonoma County Water Agency to serve the site; water conservation measures installed and/or applicable mitigation fees paid as determined by the Sonoma County Water Agency.

- d. The existing water meter and connection to the City water main shall be inspected by the Water Operations Supervisor to determine whether the facilities are in good, working order and adequacy and upgraded to current standards and appropriate size as deemed necessary, with payment of applicable fees.
- e. Private underground utility services, including gas, electricity, cable TV and telephone, to the project site.
- f. Retaining walls shall not be permitted on City right-of-way.
- g. If grading and drainage plans are required, they shall be included in the improvement plans and are subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer, Planning Administrator and the Building Official.
- h. Parking and drives shall be surfaced with an all-weather surface material as approved by the Building Department.
- i. All grading, including all swales, etc., shall be performed between April 1st and October 15th of any year, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
- j. The property address numbers shall be posted on the building or property in a manner visible from the public street. Type and location of posting are subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer, Fire Chief and Planning Administrator.
- k. All necessary sidewalk, street, storm drainage, water, sewer, access and public utility easements shall be dedicated to the City of Sonoma or to other affected agencies of jurisdiction, as required.
- l. The applicant shall show proof of payment of all outstanding engineering plan check fees within thirty (30) days of notice for payment and prior to the approval of the improvement plans, whichever occurs first.

Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer, Public Works Department, Building Department, Planning Department;
Fire Department; Water Operations Supervisor; SCWA

Timing: Prior to issuance of the encroachment permit and commencement of grading

- 5. All Building Department requirements shall be met. A building permit shall be required for the residential addition and associated improvements.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Department

Timing: Prior to construction

- 6. A soils and geotechnical investigation and report, prepared by a licensed civil engineer, shall be required prior to the issuance of a building permit. Recommendations identified in the report shall be incorporated into the construction plans for the project and into the building permits.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Department

Timing: Prior to construction

- 7. A sewer clearance shall be provided to the City of Sonoma Building Division verifying that all applicable sewer fees have been paid prior to the issuance of any building permit. **Note: Substantial fees may apply for new sewer connections and/or the use of additional ESDs from an existing sewer connection. The applicant is encouraged to check with the Sonoma County Water Agency immediately to determine whether such fees apply.**

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Department

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

- 8. All Fire Department requirements shall be met, including provision of a 13D fire sprinkler system throughout the structure. Whatever source of water is chosen for fire suppression shall be augmented as necessary to meet the hydraulic requirements of the sprinkler system and flow calculations shall be required to show that the hydraulic requirements of the building's fire sprinkler system would have adequate flow

Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Department

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

9. An approved all-weather emergency vehicle access road to within 150 feet of all portions of all structures shall be provided prior to beginning combustible construction.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Department
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
10. Consistent with the revised Partial Site Plan, Sheet A.12 dated 10/13/11, the required emergency vehicle access and fire truck turnaround shall be provided by widening the southern vehicular entrance to 20 feet through relocation of the north pylon, adjusting the rock wall, and replacing the culvert. The driveway and EVA shall comply with Fire Department's standards, including requirements related to turning radius, driveway width, vertical clearance (13.5 feet), and vehicle weight loads. Documentation demonstrating compliance with these requirements shall be required. If an entry gate is installed some type of gate control access override shall be provided for the Fire Department, such as a Knox box.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department; Building Division; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit
11. A 100-foot vegetation clearing (i.e., grass and dead shrubs/plants) shall be maintained around the residence.
Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit; Ongoing
12. An encroachment permit shall be required for all work within the public right of way. The encroachment permit shall establish that it is the responsibility of the property owner to maintain all driveway culverts at the property frontage.
Enforcement Responsibility: Public Works Department; Building Department
Timing: Prior to any work/construction within the public right of way
13. As provided for under Section 12.14.051 of the Municipal Code, the property owner shall enter into a Deferred Improvement Agreement with the City. The agreement shall be subject to the approval of the City Attorney.
Enforcement Responsibility: City Attorney; City Engineer; City Manager; Planning Department
Timing: Prior to final occupancy
14. The applicant shall be required to pay for all inspections prior to the acceptance of public improvements, or within 30 days of receipt of invoice; all plan checking fees at the time of the plan checks; and any other fees charged by the City of Sonoma, the Sonoma County Water Agency or other affected agencies with reviewing authority over this project, except those fees from which any designated affordable units are specifically exempted.
Enforcement Responsibility: Public Works Dept.; Building Department; City Engineer; Affected agency
Timing: Prior to the acceptance of public improvements, or plan check, or within 30 days of receipt of invoice, as specified above
15. The property owner shall file a lot line adjustment application with the City for review and approval to address the pump house that currently spans the south property line. The lot line adjustment shall result in a conforming side yard setback between the adjusted south property line and pump house, consistent with the setback standards for detached accessory structures as set forth under Section 19.50.080.C. of the Development Code. Any other detached accessory structures proposed on the south side of the property, such as the pergola, shall similarly comply with these standards.
Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Planning Department; Building Department
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building/grading permit.
16. Any wells on the site shall be abandoned in accordance with permit requirements of the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health; or the lateral to City water shall be equipped with a back-flow prevention device as approved by the City Engineer.
Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Public Works Department; Sonoma County Environmental Health Dept.
Timing: Prior to issuance of a building/grading permit.
17. Any septic systems on the site shall be removed or closed in place, consistent with the permit requirements of the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health. Said septic system(s) shall be shown on the grading plans with details for removal.
Enforcement Responsibility: Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health; City Engineer
Timing: Prior to issuance of building/grading permit.
18. The following agencies must be contacted by the applicant to determine permit or other regulatory requirements of the agency prior to issuance of a building permit, including the payment of applicable fees:
 - a. Sonoma County Water Agency [For sewer connections and modifications and interceptor requirements, and for grading, drainage, and erosion control plans]

- b. Sonoma Valley Unified School District [For school impact fees]
- c. Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health [For abandonment of wells and/or new wells, and abandonment of septic systems]

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; Public Works Division

Timing: Ongoing during construction

19. Trees removed from the site shall be replaced on site at a ratio of 2:1.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC

Timing: Prior to occupancy

20. The project shall be subject to architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), encompassing elevation details, exterior materials and colors, lighting, and any entry gates that are over 3.5 feet in height. In addition, the DRC shall be responsible for reviewing the modifications suggested in the Standards Compliance Review prepared by Garavaglia Architecture dated September 13, 2011, including retention of the original wood windows on the north and south elevations and new roof cladding to match the color of original roofing material.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; DRC

Timing: Prior to issuance of a building permit

21. A landscape plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect. The plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC) and shall demonstrate compliance with City of Sonoma's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code §14.32). The landscape plan shall address landscaping, required tree plantings, fencing/walls, and hardscape improvements.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC

Timing: Prior to occupancy

22. Onsite lighting shall be addressed through a lighting plan, subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC). All proposed exterior lighting for the building and site shall be indicated on the lighting plan and specifications for light fixtures shall be included. The lighting shall conform to the standards and guidelines contained under Section 19.40.030 of the Development Code (Exterior Lighting). No light or glare shall be directed toward, or allowed to spill onto any offsite areas. All exterior light fixtures shall be shielded to avoid glare onto neighboring properties, and shall be the minimum necessary for site safety and security.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC

Timing: Prior to occupancy

23. Dust control measures, subject to approval by the Building Official and the City Engineer, shall be implemented during the construction of the project. All exposed soil areas shall be watered twice daily or as required by the City's construction inspector.

Enforcement Responsibility: Building Division; Public Works Division

Timing: Ongoing during construction

24. In the event that any artifacts or cultural soil deposits are unexpectedly discovered during future grading and underground excavation, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and an archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the find and make further recommendations. Artifacts that are typically found associated with prehistoric sites include humanly modified stone, shell, bone or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features include hearths, firepits, or house floor depressions whereas typical mortuary features are represented by human skeletal remains. Historic artifacts potentially include all by-products of human land use greater than 50 years of age.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Public Works Department; Building Department

Timing: Throughout project construction

25. If human remains are encountered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist shall be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated.

Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department; County Coroner

Timing: Throughout project construction

**CITY OF SONOMA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
October 13, 2011
Community Meeting Room
177 First Street West**

MINUTES

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, October 7, 2011, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, California. Chair Edwards called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West.

Roll Call:

Present: Chair Edwards, Comms. Howarth, George, Heneveld, Felder, Roberson, Tippell, Willers (Alternate)

Absent:

Others Present: Planning Director Goodison, Sr. Planner Gjestland, Associate Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Morris

Chair Edwards stated that no new items would be heard after 10:30 p.m. unless the Planning Commission so decides. Any decisions made tonight can be appealed within 15 days to the City Council. He reminded everyone to turn off cell phones and pagers. Comm. Felder led the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail was received regarding Item #1 from Erin McTaggart, Patricia J. McTaggart, and Lynn Freed

Comm. George recused due to proximity. Comm. Willers took his place.

Item #1 – Public Hearing – Six-month review of a temporary use permit allowing outdoor food truck events within the main parking lot of the Sebastiani Winery at 389 Fourth Street East.

Applicant/Property Owner: Sebastiani Winery/Foley Family Wines, Inc.

Associate Planner Atkins's presented staff's report.

Comm. Felder and Chair Edwards recalled a previous concern about vendors not displaying County Health permits and thought it was a condition of approval for issuing the temporary use

permit at that time.

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing.

Christopher Johnson, Winery Event Manager, noted that all vendors have business licenses and County health permits from either Napa or Sonoma County.

Comm. Howarth asked Mr. Johnson what he perceived were the issues of concern from the correspondence. Comm. Howarth noted that the onsite manager was initially a vendor. Mr. Johnson stated that when the event started, they relied on one of the food vendors to manage it. However, when they found that some vendors were not following the requirement to obtain a business license, the Winery took on the management of the event and since then they believe that it has operated smoothly and in compliance with the conditions. With regard to the issue of the use of generators, it is their understanding that they have complied with the Noise Ordinance standards. They are investigating the option of providing electrical service to the area where the food trucks park, which could reduce or preclude the use of generators.

Linda McGarr, Lovall Valley Road, opposed any increase in the number of food vendors. She noted that the Planning Commission made a condition that County Health permits be displayed. She feels that condition has been ignored, as has the business license condition, and she does not want the Food Truck Fridays to continue. She stated that musicians place their amplifiers near the open doors, which carries the noise outside. She has requested a City revenue report from the Finance department as to the revenue generated by the food trucks.

Erin McTaggart, discussed the management of Food Truck Friday. She expressed the view that the event managers have not done a good job in reaching out to neighbors and responding to their concerns. At a minimum, she requests restricting the emissions from the food trucks by prohibiting the use of generators. She questioned how this use could be considered "grandfather in."

Rob Kerwin, representing Lynn Freed, read her letter emphasizing the noise pervading the neighborhood as a result of the event. She wants the Planning Commission to deny the permit because of strong opposition from the neighbors.

Chair Edwards closed the public hearing.

Planning Director Goodison acknowledged that during the first three months of the event, vendors did not always obtain the necessary business licenses and health department permits. Staff was aware of this problem and worked with the applicant to correct it. Responding to Linda McGarr's request for revenue, he noted that sales tax is paid based at point of sale registration, meaning the food trucks from Napa would not pay sales tax that would benefit Sonoma. In addition, it is not possible to determine the revenue impact of the food trucks, if any, because the City receives sales reports from the State quarterly and individual vendor information is aggregated. In response to the question as to whether this use is "grandfathered in", it is not. The food truck Friday event is considered to be a winery accessory use that is subject to the review and approval of the Planning Commission.

Associate Planner Atkins noted that in the application for the 2012 season, the event would be held April through October with a review in 6 months or on October 15th.

Comm. Roberson confirmed that the decision as to whether or not to approve a second season

would not affect the upcoming October 2011 event. He is disappointed that it took so long for vendors to consistently obtain business licenses.

Comm. Howarth stated that he had been at several of the events and noted an improvement in their functioning since the Winery has taken over the management. He expressed the view that as a one-time-a-month event that is limited to six vendors, it does not seem to him that places a significant burden on the neighborhood.

Comm. Tippell noted that he too had attended several of the events and that he concurred with Comm. Howarth's assessment. Comm. Tippell added that he had not witnessed any parking problems in conjunction with the event.

Comm. Felder appreciates Linda McGarr's letters and noted that they were distributed to all Commissioners.

Comm. Henevald and Comm. Felder stated that they did not favor continuing the event because of inconsistent compliance with the initial conditions of approval.

Comm. Willers stated that he is limited in his evaluation of this item as a new member of the Planning Commission, since he did participate in the initial review. He does not feel that staff or the Planning Commission should be responsible for monitoring the event's regulations. He suggests eliminating generators to alleviate the noise and pollution concerns expressed by the neighbors.

Chair Edwards's comments that the outside event gets louder as alcohol is consumed and would like an earlier review if the next season is approved. He feels the Winery has made efforts to solve problems, but it has taken some time.

Comm. Howarth made a motion to approve a temporary use permit allowing a monthly outdoor food truck event in 2012, subject to amended conditions of approval including ending the season in September, requiring an event review no later than July 15, 2012, prohibiting of the use of generators by the food vendors, and keeping the Winery door next to the music closed. Comm. Roberson seconded. Ayes: Chair Edwards, Comms. Howarth, Roberson Tippell, Willers Noes: Comms. Henevald, Felder The motion passed 5-2

Item #2 – Public Hearing – Consideration of a modification to a Use Permit to improve and expand Sonoma Valley Hospital's South Parking Lot at the North side of vacant property between Fourth Street West and Hayes Street (APN 018-392-001 and 018-392-045).

Applicant/Property Owner: Sonoma Valley Hospital/North Valley Bank

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing.

Bob Gosset, Hayes Street, stated that following the September meeting he and other neighbors met with the applicant, Peter Hohorst, in order to identify modifications to the parking lot design that would respond to neighbor concerns about buffering.

Chair Edwards closed the public hearing.

Comm. Tippell was not in favor last time based on the lack of community outreach and is pleased that the applicant has met with the neighbors and developed changes to the plan in response to their concerns.

Comm. Roberson concurs and commends Mr. Hohorst. He wants to address modifications to bioswales and drainages and confirms the intent with Planning Director Goodison.

Comm. Henevald commented on the hardpan in the Valley and clarifies concerns with Hugh Miles the Project Engineer who discussed how the landscaping bioswale would work.

Comm. Howarth made a motion to approve the revisions to the parking lot plan, subject to conditions. Chair Edwards seconded. The motion was unanimously approved 7-0.

ITEM #3 – PUBLIC HEARING – Consideration of a Use Permit to restore and construct an addition to a historic residence on a hillside property at 131 Fourth Street East

Applicant/Property Owner: Robert Baumann, Architect/Bill Jasper

Sr. Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed with Sr. Planner Gjestland that Use Permit review is required due to the properties Hillside-Residential zoning and that a Variance from the sidewalk requirement is also part of the Planning Commission's consideration.

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing.

Robert Baumann, the project architect, introduced the property owner and development team. He requested that consideration of the replacement windows and roofing material/color be referred to the Design Review Commission.

Comm. Felder asked if there is any objection to retaining the original windows on the north and south elevations. Mr. Baumann indicated that a window assessment had been prepared and that there are inherent issues given the age and present condition of the home. He emphasized that cost is not the primary reason for replacement; that replacement windows would have dual-paned glass and better thermal performance.

Comm. Felder asked if the proposed replacement windows would match the existing. Mr. Baumann confirmed that they are proposing a custom-made window that would match existing.

Comm. Henevald commended the applicant on choosing Marvin windows and asked about the height of the back addition.

Comm. George commented on the history of Marvin Windows citing a recent article. He feels that it is a good company that makes good windows

Pat Pulverenti, on behalf of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, thanked the property owners and his associates on the superb historic resource analysis that was done for the

project.

Chair Edwards closed the public hearing.

Comm. Tippell felt that the applicant had done a good job on the design of the addition and renovation. He expressed confidence in the contractor, John Curry, and supported the project.

Comm. Tippell made a motion to approve the Use Permit and sidewalk Variance for the project as submitted. Comm. Henevald seconded. The motion was unanimously approved 7-0

ITEM #4 – PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a Temporary Use Permit to operate a drive-through coffee business in conjunction with retail motor scooter Company at 455 West Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Terry Grimm/ Innovative Properties & Development LLC

Associate Planner Atkins's presented staff's report.

Vehicle access is a concern with regards to traffic circulation patterns at Fifth St. West & West Napa Rd.

Comm. Felder expressed concern that the future operator of the business may have a more intense use.

Comm. Tippell confirms with Associate Planner Atkins that there are two driveway cuts on the parcel.

He suggests a memorandum of understanding and confirms with Planner Atkins that the scope of work can be changed.

Coffee service is offered from a vehicle.

Comm. Roberson wants clarification about queuing distances. Planning Director Goodison says an interesting point of comparison is with Hot Shots on Broadway.

Comm. Howarth confirms with Planning Director Goodison that the issue is site specific and not addressed in the Development Code.

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing.

Terry Grimm, the applicant, stated that due to changes in the economy and in the regulations that apply to scooters, the coffee business has become increasingly important. He is researching the easement that appears to be on the property but has not yet tracked it down. He has spoken with a traffic consultant who advised him that conducting a traffic study at this time would not be warranted.

Comm. George asked if the easement might be a cross-easement.

Nick Grimm, who built and operates the coffee cart, is requesting a solution to the presented problems that result from the current layout. In his view, a drive-through would be safer and more efficient.

Carissa Grimm, Co-Operator, says there is a lot of customer support for the business but that it would benefit from improved signage and a clearly defined circulation plan.

Chair Edwards closed the public hearing.

Comm. Howarth is challenged with having to make a decision since in his view not enough information has been provided. In general, he is concerned with drive-through permits.

Planning Director Goodison states that in previous discussions with the applicant they indicated that they would fund a traffic study if necessary.

Comm. Tippell may consider a temporary use permit with a future review, but he too is concerned that the site plan does not provide sufficient information to allow for a decision at this time.

Comm. Roberson confirmed with Planning Director Goodison that a use permit for a drive-through is not in place at this time as result of the previous gas station use.

Planning Director Goodison says with a gas station customers could enter and exit from any driveway and were not restricted to a particular flow pattern, In addition, the former gas station was non-conforming and because it had ceased operation for more than one year it is now considered to be abandoned.

Comm. George shares many of the concerns of Comm. Howarth and concurs with Comm. Tippell about ingress and egress and would like to evaluate it further with a more detailed site plan.

Comm. Henevald suggested simply using a layout that would not be considered a drive-through.

Comm. Felder expressed concern about a permanent use permit running with the land and stated that he would want to see any use permit for a drive-through closely tied to the current operation.

Comm. Roberson made a motion to continue the item to the November meeting. Comm. Howarth seconded. Ayes: Comm. Roberson, Felder, George, Howarth, Chair Edwards
Noes: Comm. Tippell, Henevald. The motion passed 5-2.

ITEM #5 – PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of environmental review, General Plan amendment and sphere of influence amendment, along with the pre-zoning and annexation of two parcels (APNs 127-051-105, 106) having a combined area of 59.5 acres at East of Fifth Street West and west of Norrbom Road

Applicant/Property Owner: City of Sonoma

Planning Director Goodison presented the staff report.

Comm. George confirmed with Planning Director Goodison that the financing mechanism for the trail construction is Federal Grant money.

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing.

Bill Montini encouraged the City to acquire the property.

Chair Edwards closed the public hearing.

Comm. Henevald made a motion to adopt the negative declaration and to recommend to the City Council that the General Plan amendment and Development Code amendment be approved. Chair Edwards seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved 7-0.

Issues Update: Commissioners are invited to participate in the 28th annual Sonoma State Planning Commissioners' Conference on December 3rd. Please contact Cristina to register.

A Community Workshop on the Redevelopment of the Old Fire Station Site at 32 Patten Street was held on October 8, 2011. It was well attended and very productive.

The hotel proposal on West Napa appears to be being pursued, but no application has been filed yet.

Comments from the Audience: None

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Thursday November 10, 2011.

Approved:

Cristina Morris, Administrative Assistant



City of Sonoma
Design Review Commission
Agenda Item Summary

DRC Agenda Item: 6

Meeting Date: 11/15/11

Applicant

Robert Baumann, Architect

Project Location

131 Fourth Street East

Historical Significance

- ☐ Listed on National Register of Historic Places, including Sonoma Plaza district (Significant)
 - ☒ Listed or Eligible for Listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (Significant)
 - ☒ Listed within Local Historic Resources Survey (Potentially Significant)
 - ☒ Over 50 years old (Potentially Significant)
- Year Built: between 1907 and 1910

Request

Design review of proposed elevation details, exterior materials and colors, lighting, and landscaping associated with restoration and an addition to an historic residence.

Summary

Site Description: The subject property is a 1.65-acre parcel located on the west side of Fourth Street East near its intersection with Brazil Street. The property is currently developed with a two-story Craftsman-style residence, pump house and various landscape features, including a stone wall and two stone water features. In addition, there are several mature trees on the property, including two palms framing the entry walk. The residence was built between 1907 and 1910 and has been determined eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (refer to enclosed historical evaluation prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated August 2, 2011).

Background: On October 13, 2011 the Planning Commission approved a Use Permit to restore and construct a 2,704-square foot, two-story addition to the rear of the residence. The addition was designed for compatibility with the architectural features of the historic home in terms of form, roof height and pitches, exterior materials, details and color. Associated restoration activities will return the existing structure to its original appearance through retention and reuse of original exterior materials to the greatest extent possible and in-kind replacement where materials are deteriorated beyond repair. As part of the review process, proposed improvements to the property were evaluated for compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (see attached Standards Compliance Review letter prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated September 13, 2011). Because the project was subject to Use Permit review by the Planning Commission, consideration by the DRC is limited to review of elevation details, exterior materials and colors, lighting, and landscaping.

Elevation Details, Exterior Materials & Colors: In general, proposed exterior details and materials were guided by compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. An in-depth analysis of the proposed restoration and addition in terms of architectural form, exterior materials, colors and detailing is addressed in the attached Standards Compliance Review letter. To summarize, subordinate architectural detailing is proposed for the rear addition along with horizontal siding that would match the color and coursing of the shingle siding on the existing structure. Restoration activities would retain and reuse original exterior materials to the greatest extent possible with in-kind replacement where materials are deteriorated beyond repair, such as the shingle siding. As proposed, the four original one-over-one wood windows on the front elevation would be retained and restored, while windows on the north and south elevations would be replaced with new Marvin wood windows to match existing. Aluminum clad wood windows similar in style and design to existing would be utilized for the addition. New roofing for the residence and pump house would match the texture and color of the original roofing material. The proposed color scheme consists of stained wood with green or white trim and accents. Further details can be found in the attached project narrative and accompanying materials. A color and materials sample board will also be presented by the applicant at the DRC meeting.

Modifications Suggested by Historic Resource Consultant: The Standards Compliance Review conducted by Garavaglia Architecture concludes that the proposed project is generally compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. At the same time, the assessment suggests some minor modifications to improve historical integrity, including retention of the original wood windows on the north and south elevations (the proposal includes retention of the original windows on the front façade) and new roof cladding to match the color of original roofing material. These exterior material

and color considerations were specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission. With respect to window replacement, the applicant has submitted an assessment of the existing windows for the DRC's review (attached). As noted in the project narrative and window assessment, the existing windows proposed for replacement are in poor condition and new windows are desired for reasons of thermal efficiency, practicality, and cost effectiveness.

Landscaping: Substantial landscape improvements are proposed around the house as shown on the enclosed landscape drawings. In addition, stepped patios are approved on the south side of the home including a fire pit, cistern, and rustic wood pergola. Plant and materials keys are provided as part of the landscape plan submittal for reference. In addition, water budget calculations prepared by the landscape architect (attached) demonstrate compliance with the City's water conservation ordinance. The calculations indicate that the proposed landscaping would utilize 293,717 gallons or 65% of the associated annual water budget allotment of 448,935 gallons, based on a total planting area of 25,655 square feet. The required 2:1 tree replacement ratio is greatly exceeded as only four trees of relatively small stature will be removed to accommodate the project (an olive, two acacias, and a live oak).

Exterior Lighting: Specifications on proposed exterior light fixtures have been provided for consideration, including a variety of building and landscape lights. Fixture locations are indicated on the Floor Plans (Sheets A2.1 and A2.2) and Landscape Lighting Plan (Sheet L-2).

CEQA Compliance: As previously noted, an historic resource evaluation determined that the residence is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources, which means that it is an "historical resource" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to Section 15331 of the CEQA Guidelines, rehabilitation and additions to an historical resource, may be considered categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA provided the improvements are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Class 31 - Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation). Accordingly, a subsequent evaluation was conducted to determine whether the proposal complies with the Standards (refer to attached Standards Compliance Review letter prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated September 13, 2011). The review concludes that the project as proposed is generally compliant with the Standards, and therefore qualifies for the Class 31 Categorical Exemption.

Commission Discussion

Design Review Commission Action

☒ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Referred to: _____ ☐ Continued to: _____

Roll Call Vote: 5 Aye 0 Nay 0 Abstain 0 Absent

DRC Conditions or Modifications

- Approved as submitted, and explicitly allowed replacement of all windows on residence with new wooden replacements to replicate/match existing, including of east elevation (front facade)

cc: Robert Baumann, Architect (via email)
729 Broadway
Sonoma, CA 95476

Bill Jasper (via email)
80 Second Street East
Sonoma, CA 95476

Sonoma League for Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 766
Sonoma, CA 95476

Attachments:

1. *Project Narrative*
2. *Standards Compliance Review prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated September 13, 2011*
3. *Window Assessment*
4. *Perspective Renderings*
5. *Light Fixture Specifications*
6. *WELO Forms/Calculations*
7. *Plant and Material Keys*

Enclosures:

1. *Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, dated August 2, 2011*
2. *Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, & Landscape Plans*

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
November 15, 2011
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: Chair McDonald called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present:	Chair McDonald, Comms. Anderson, Appleman, Barnett, Cribb, Comm. Alt. Tippell
Absent:	None
Others Present:	Planning Director Goodison, Associate Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Evans

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the minutes of June 21, 2011, as submitted. Chair McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Appleman and Cribb abstained.

Comm. Appleman made a motion to approve the minutes of October 18, 2011, as submitted. Comm. Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Barnett abstained.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: None.

CORRESPONDENCE: Correspondence regarding Item #6 and Item #8 from the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation.

ITEM #1 – CONTINUED DESIGN REVIEW: Reconsideration of new door and window trim color for two retail businesses (Tiddle E. Winks and French Nest) located at 115 East Napa Street. Applicant: Holly Hopper Clifford.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

Holly Hopper Clifford, applicant, was present to discuss the application. She clarified that only the lower window trim would be painted; the second-floor balcony and window trim will remain the existing color.

Comm. Cribb questioned the rationale for painting only a portion of the building. Ms. Clifford noted there is very little color above the windows and the balcony is in poor repair and not suitable to be painted. She is only a tenant, and not the building owner. Comm. Appleman asked the applicant if she had discussed painting all of the trim with the landlord. The applicant noted the landlord is not willing to do any additional painting.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

Comm. Barnett had no issues with the application. Like the tenant, he wishes the landlord was open to general improvement, but understands it is a multi-step process. Comms. Appleman and Anderson concurred.

Comm. Cribb appreciates the difficult situation the applicant is in. He is concerned that making the bottom portion of the building look better will make the remainder of the building look worse. There is little distinction between the storefront and the entire building, but he doesn't have a reasonable solution other than redoing the entire building façade.

Chair McDonald encouraged the applicant to paint the trim to match the hunter green and white so the building will look consistent. The applicant suggested that she paint the trim as proposed in the application, and then maybe the landlord would be encouraged to paint the remainder of the building.

Comm. Anderson made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1, Cribb dissented.

ITEM #2 – CONTINUED DESIGN REVIEW: Reconsideration of a rainwater harvesting system for the Sonoma Community Center located at 276 East Napa Street. Applicant: Sonoma Community Center.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Anderson confirmed that the pump for the tank will be located behind the tank and covered with painted gray wood, so it will not be seen from the street. Chair McDonald questioned the height of the tank.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

Tony Castrone, deputy director of SCC, and Melinda Kelly, project manager, were present to discuss the application. They confirmed the tank is 23 feet tall.

Comm. Cribb questioned the use of PVC pipe in conjunction with an historic building. Ms. Kelly stated the PVC pipe will be gray and color to blend in and ties into the corrugated steel look. This material choice was recommended by the plumber.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

Comm. Cribb likes the idea of this project, but feels there is lack of consideration for the historic character of the building, and the project is being driven by engineering, rather than aesthetics. Comm. Appleman concurred. She confirmed that the location of the pump will not be visible from the street, and would prefer to see galvanized pipe, rather than PVC.

Comm. Barnett is in general agreement with Comm. Cribb, although he could support the application as submitted.

Comm. Anderson noted the relocation of the tank farther back was approved previously. The painted gray PVC pipe would not look much different than metal pipe, so he has no issues with the application. He suggested the applicant investigate the possibility of utilizing galvanized pipe and downspouts, as this would not be a costly impact.

Chair McDonald agrees that galvanized pipe would be a better option than PVC, and confirmed that the location of the booster pump is on the north side of the tank.

Comm. Anderson made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the following conditions:

1. Galvanized pipe shall be used instead of PVC pipe.
2. The pump equipment and pad shall be located on the north side of the tank.

Comm. Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #3 – CONTINUED SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a wall sign and freestanding sign for an auto parts store (O'Reilly Auto Parts) located at 289 West Napa Street. Applicant: JSJ Electrical Display.

Chair McDonald recused due to proximity and left the dais. Comm. Tippell ascended the dais.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Anderson asked whether the ADA and "no smoking" signs are considered in the calculation of the sign area. Associate Planner Atkins stated the business is allowed to have up to four information signs as long as each is less than one square foot in size.

Vice-Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.

The applicant, Sean West of JS Electrical Display, was present to discuss the application. The original application was for a wall sign and monument sign. The overall height of the monument sign is five feet from grade.

Comm. Barnett requested an explanation for the rationale for changing the existing freestanding monument sign from wood to illuminated. Mr. West stated this is a branch change from Kragen to O'Reilly. The proposed illuminated monument sign will be more visible at night and provide a more modern, upgraded look.

Chair Anderson clarified with the applicant that the sign is internally illuminated, but the red aluminum panel is not lit, the existing vertical posts will remain and be refaced, and the new sign extends above the posts about five inches, rather than even with the tops of the posts.

Comm. Cribb confirmed that the window statics can be changed out.

Vice-Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Barnett noted that since this is a more prominent location closer to the Plaza, care should be used in approving the freestanding monument sign as submitted. He does not favor the internally illuminated sign. As an alternative, he suggested lettering with reverse channel halo effect. He has no issues with the wall sign. Regarding the window signage, he questioned how many wall signs currently exist, and would encourage the applicant to take into consideration the recommendations of the Commission and return at a later date.

Comm. Appleman concurred with Comm. Barnett with regard to the wall sign and monument sign and noted the importance of being consistent with how the corridor is approached.

Comm. Cribb agreed with his fellow Commissioners. He would prefer to see a more subdued monument sign and feels halo lettering would be more appropriate. The basic dimension and design are good. He is not adverse to a reduction of the window clings to four panels as suggested.

Comm. Tippell noted the monument sign is more modern and streamlined than the existing signage, which looks worn. The other signage is consistent with the building. She has no issues with the application as submitted.

Vice-Chair Anderson appreciates the straightforward, honest application. The monument sign brings a new attitude and look. While the shape and size are appropriate, he is concerned with the lighting. He would not want to see the interior lighting become an additional eye-catching element. He requested the applicant's thoughts on the Commissioners' comments.

The applicant returned to the podium. He likes the reverse pan halo letters. He noted that O'Reilly's is a national account and they do have a sign program mandated. He has taken the Commission's comments into consideration and will recommend to O'Reilly's the use of aluminum panel with pan channel letters. He doesn't think it will be an issue.

Vice-Chair Anderson made a motion to approve the wall sign as proposed. Comm. Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, McDonald absent.

Vice-Chair Anderson made a motion to approve the statics and window signage, with the condition that the signs are displayed in a consistent manner. Comm. Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-2, Comms. Barnett and Appleman dissenting, Chair McDonald absent.

With regard to the freestanding sign, it was the consensus of the Commission that this portion of the application be continued to a future meeting in order to allow the applicant time to submit a revised application that reduces the overall size of the sign and incorporates reverse pan halo lettering.

Comm. Tippell left the dais; Chair McDonald returned to the dais.

ITEM #4 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a replacement monument sign for the Sonoma Valley Regional Library located at 755 West Napa Street. Applicant: Sonoma Valley Library.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

Bob Sanders, representing City and County library system, and Doug Hilberman, Axia Architects, were present to discuss the application. The proposed sign will be constructed of durable material that ties into the new architectural look. It will fit well into the landscaped area in front of the flag pole. The old sign was quite small and not very visible.

Chair McDonald asked whether the lettering is bronze or stainless steel. The applicant stated the lettering will be bronze, affixed with individual studs directly to the wall to make it more vandal-resistant.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

The Commissioners found this to be an excellent design utilizing high-quality materials and colors. Chair McDonald asked if there were any plans for relocating the existing plaques during the remodel. The applicant stated that cursory discussions had taken place and there is the possibility of adding another plaque. Chair McDonald suggested that if another plaque is to be added, it be of a similar material and placed in the same area.

Comm. Appleman made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Cribb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #5 – DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of site improvements and exterior building alterations for a commercial building located at 136 West Napa Street. Applicant: Michael Ross, AIA.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Cribb asked about the legal status of the easement vis-à-vis its current allowable uses, as it seems fairly narrow. Planning Director Goodison noted that auto traffic is allowed, but he has never seen it happen.

Chair McDonald asked about the fencing and removal of the previously approved decorative tiles. Planning Director Goodison noted the ownership of the building has changed since the original approval and the tiles will not be installed. Associate Planner Atkins noted that no landscaping is proposed along the fencing at this time.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

Michael Ross, architect, and applicant Bill Hooper, Kenwood Investments, were present to discuss the application. The application provides for an accessible path of

travel to the rear half of the building. Option 1 proposes to clean, resurface and stripe the alleyway; provide night lighting against the east wall of the building, install removable bollards to provide pedestrian safety. Option 2 provides a direct accessible path of travel from the City sidewalk to the building, which would result in the loss of four parking spaces. Their preference is for Option 1.

The applicants are also requesting approval of the color change from beige to stone gray and removal of the tile and metal grill insert in the middle bay on the front façade of the building. These changes are a result of the ownership change. The reason for the removal of the tile and grillwork is that implementation was difficult and it was not vandal-resistant. The exterior sconces are also different than the carriage lights that were originally approved, but are similar and less expensive. They propose two sconces on pilasters on the West Napa façade, mounted approximately seven feet above the sidewalk area. With regard to the fence at the back, no landscaping is being proposed at this time.

Comm. Cribb questioned the reason for the six-foot solid redwood fence. The architect noted they were looking for a quiet neutral backdrop when looking up the driveway and the fence will screen the Plaza Cabinetry building from this property. The new property owners are motivated to improve the overall look of the property.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

Comm. Appleman likes the application and has no issues with either of the proposed paths of travel. Comm. Barnett concurred, but would prefer the fencing at the rear be wire with vines, rather than solid.

Comm. Cribb is pleased with the changes at the property; however, he finds the redwood fence not compatible and likes the connectivity between the two properties. With regard to the path of travel, he commented that Option 1 is a longer path of access and is narrow and not pedestrian friendly.

Comm. Anderson commented the building has taken on a whole new character in a positive way and this is an application he can support.

Chair McDonald has concerns similar to those of Comm. Cribb (fencing and path of travel). He could support Option 2, and although it eliminates parking, it also gives an opportunity to add landscaping. The path of travel on the alley limits use of the building next door, and he would not like to see bollards too close to the sidewalk. He would be supportive of a six-foot fence with landscaping, but would favor a shorter fence.

Planning Director Goodison believes the neighboring property has a right-of-access through the Bank of Marin parking lot. From staff's perspective, this is a much better way for a vehicle to use rather than the alley which is potentially dangerous. It does not impact the ability of the neighboring property for vehicle access.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with following conditions:

1. A landscape plan shall be submitted for staff review and approval if Site Plan Alternate 2 is implemented.

2. Six-foot tall, hog-wire fencing with wooden framing shall be provided along the section of the northern property, along with an evergreen vine.

Comm. Appleman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #6 – DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials and colors, lighting, and landscaping associated with the restoration and an addition to an historic residence located at 131 Fourth Street East. Applicant: Robert Baumann, Architect.

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

Robert Baumann, architect, described the application. He thanked the DRC commissioners for visiting the site or calling him so their comments could be incorporated. The landscaping will be compliant with the City's water requirements. He noted that there are two alternate exterior colors. The photo shows the porch posts used to be white, and they are uncertain as to which color will be used, so they are requesting approval of both colors. With regard to the windows, they are requesting that all existing windows be replaced with new wooden windows. The historic consultant they retained noted the application was found to be fully compliant with respect to eight of the Secretary of Interior Standards, and marginally compliant with two of the standards. The report is advisory only and does not provide environmental clearance, as ultimately that is the job of the Design Review Commission. The historical character and distinctive features of the structure are being retained and preserved; however, the applicant would like to replace all of the windows on the existing residence with wooden replicas.

Planning Director Goodison stated that with respect to environmental review, it is the case that that the Commission is the decision-making body. However, as the City does not have an historic resource person on staff, staff and the Commission rely on expert consultants. Although the Commission has a level of discretion in making a determination as to whether or not a project is compliant with the Secretary of Interior standards and therefore exempt from environmental review, the Commission cannot be arbitrary and should demonstrate that its findings are based on facts. The issue of the windows is one the Commission will need to decide. On page 8 of the historic resources report, it notes that the structure is generally compliant with Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation, based on the assumption that most of the windows are being preserved. In discussing the revised proposal to replace all of the windows, the preparers of the report felt that this would take the project out of compliance.

Bill Jasper, owner, thanked the Commission for reviewing the application. His first motivation in restoring the property was to resolve a property line issue with the adjoining property he owns. With regard to the restoration, he has taken all the required steps. The structure was built between 1907 and 1910, and the architect and builder are unknown. The property has been notably modified over time.

Patricia Cullinen, Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, clarified the letter they had submitted and stated that if the windows were replaced, wooden replicas should be used, as suggested by the applicant.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

Comm. Anderson commented that this project is a monumental undertaking and complimented the owner and architect on their effort and ambition. Their efforts will save a structure that otherwise would be in danger of demolition. He prefers to have it remain and be restored, as it helps to preserve the character of the City.

Comm. Barnett is very excited about the application and is pleased with the comprehensive presentation. He has no issues with the application.

Comm. Appleman concurred with her fellow Commissioners regarding the thoughtfulness of the application. She would be inclined to approve either color. She has no issues with the windows being replaced in kind, as this will provide a consistent look throughout.

Comm. Cribb echoed the sentiments of his fellow Commissioners. He is delighted to see this project undertaken. A tremendous amount of effort has been put forth, and he can find little to quibble about. He is perplexed that the windows will be changed out, as everything else in the proposal is geared toward preservation.

Chair McDonald thanked the applicant and owner for the thoughtfulness evident in the proposed rehabilitation plan. He has no issues with the colors. He feels the windows are an important element. If the structure was closer to the street or highly visible, he might be inclined to have the windows rehabilitated rather than replaced. He has no issues with the colors.

Comm. Appleman made a motion to approve all aspects of the project as submitted and allow for replacement of all windows on the residence, including those on the front façade (east elevation), with new wood windows utilizing clear glass to replicate the existing, making the finding that based on the information provided, including correspondence, site visits by the Commissioners, and the testimony presented at the hearing, the DRC finds that the replacement of the existing windows with wood replicas utilizing clear glass will not significantly diminish the historic integrity of the structure. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM #7 – DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of landscaping and exterior lighting associated with expansion of the South Parking Lot serving Sonoma Valley Hospital located at 851 and 853 Fourth Street West (the vacant property between Fourth Street West and Hayes Street). Applicant: Sonoma Valley Hospital.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair McDonald questioned whether the existing signage would be used; Associate Planner Atkins replied in the affirmative. He also questioned how the landscaping, with a tree for every ten parking spaces, was calculated. Planning Director Goodison noted

that the landscaping is based on a percentage requirement and it is under the Commission's purview to make changes to the parking lot landscaping. This parking lot will serve a specific purpose, as the main parking area in front of the hospital will be substantially reduced in size, and this parking lot will compensate for that. It will maintain the status quo of availability of off-street parking to serve the needs of the hospital. Care should be taken about changes that would substantially reduce the number of parking spaces.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

John Flath, architect for hospital project, was present to discuss the application. When this portion of the project first began, they were just trying to meet the parking standards. The south parking lot is to keep the parking counts where they are, and he noted that putting a new parking lot in a predominantly residential area has been challenging. Regarding the signage, they plan to reuse the signs at the driveway entrance to site. The property owner is developing full sign program for the facility. The basic design of the site is to berm off the immediate neighbors with nice landscaping. There will be a single strip of lighting up the center of the island. They decided to have more lights with less light leakage. The center lights and outer lights will be on two different timer systems. They worked closely with the City Engineer and Planning Department to mitigate impacts. Fourth Street West will be widened as part of the proposal to accommodate the flow of traffic.

Chair McDonald noted that on both outer perimeter parking configurations, there is a long expanse of parking, and questioned whether a landscape finger could be utilized to add a tree. Planning Director Goodison stated that the parking proposal was driven by comments by the Planning Commission. There was concern that not enough buffering was provided. The design group met with staff and neighbors and came up with some alternatives and was able to greatly increase the setback of the parking lot from Hayes Street. The focus was on the perimeter of the lot to screen it from neighboring residences. The current design utilizes compact parking spaces, probably at the limit for percentage of compact spaces. The only way to go further would be to remove to two four spaces. A standard size parking space is nine feet, and a compact space is eight-and-one-half feet.

Bart Ito, landscape architect, commented that five feet would be adequate for trees. Chair McDonald questioned whether they could make more compact spaces without sacrificing parking. Mr. Flath responded that compact spaces are not ideal for a hospital situation and the trend is toward full-size stalls.

Comm. Barnett noted the lack of neighbors at this meeting. It was noted that neighbors came to the Planning Commission meeting when this item was heard and spoke in favor of the proposal.

Comm. Anderson noted that on sheet L-1 of the plans, there are four handicapped parking stalls, and one for a van. Typically the ramp for the van deploys from the passenger side, but the one illustrated deploys from the wrong side. The applicant noted this comment.

Comm. Cribb asked the height of the light standards. Since they are currently on 24 hours, what type of shielding will be utilized?

Richard Dale, Sonoma Ecology Center, questioned whether any stormwater plan was provided. Chair McDonald noted that a swale system is in place. Mr. Flath noted there is a flow-through planter system for drainage between the center strip and lower end of the drawing.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

Comm. Appleman believes this is a thorough project as far as landscaping and parking and does not see the need for additional planters. Comm. Barnett generally concurs with Comm. Appleman. He would be open to trees added in fingers, but would approve the application as submitted.

Comm. Barnett generally concurred with Comm. Appleman. While he would be open to the addition of finger trees, he could approve the application as submitted.

Comm. Anderson appreciated the fact that much of the available parking area has been made into landscaped area and likes the park-like setting around the perimeter. Comm. Cribb concurred, and would rather see the setbacks maintained. Chair McDonald concurred, and appreciated that the landscape plan for the parking lot exceeds the number of trees required.

Comm. Cribb made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM #8 – DEMOLITION REVIEW: Demolition of a single-family home and barn constructed in the early 1900's located at 19990 Seventh Street East. Applicant: City of Sonoma.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Planning Director Goodison noted that the process for demolition of this residence is the same as for any other residence in city limits. The Design Review Commission reviews applications for the demolition of structures older than 50 years. The City Council is the property owner, and the Council recently voted to authorize the application for a demolition, following a review by the Facilities Committee.

Chair McDonald asked about the condition of the building. Planning Director Goodison stated the Facilities Committee review included an evaluation of the structure prepared by the Building Department that identified deficiencies and provided rough estimates of what it would cost to bring the buildings up to standards. Chair McDonald asked about re-use options given the limitations imposed on the property by the bequest. Planning Director Goodison stated that, if rehabilitation was feasible, the residence could be used as a caretaker's residence, as it was in the past, or as office/meeting space associated with the Garden Park. However, it could not be used for commercial purposes or rented as a residence (apart from the Caretaker option).

Comm. Anderson noted that in contrast to the Maysonnave property, the Bond property is in a park-like setting. The language in the bequest has a lasting downstream effect on the use of the property.

Comm. Cribb confirmed that the demolition is the only item being proposed at this time, and no site rehab or landscaping is planned.

Chair McDonald opened the public hearing.

Richard Dale, Sonoma Ecology Center (SEC), noted that when beginning the design process for the master plan, the house was not included. The house has serious problems, compliance issues, nonconforming additions, and would be very expensive to bring up to code. The barn provides dry storage and the SEC would like the barn to be preserved, if possible, so it could be used to store equipment associated with the operation of the Garden Park.

Loyce Haran, Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, noted that the City needs to be careful to adequately maintain its properties. In her view, this is an unfortunate example of demolition by neglect. From now on, if someone offers the City a property, the City really needs to take a look to see if they have the resources to maintain it.

Chair McDonald closed the public hearing.

In light of the SEC's request to make use of the barn, Commissioner Appleman asked whether the barn needed to be removed at the same time as the residence and what the timing of the proposed demolition was. Planning Director Goodison stated that additions made to the barn raised safety issues, but that it might well be possible have them removed and allow the main portion of the barn to be used for storage. There is time to investigate this option and staff recommends that the SEC make its request to the Facilities Committee.

Commissioner Anderson noted that habitability standards are different for the barn, which could allow it to be preserved for use as storage.

Commissioner Barnett asked whether any thought had been given to restoring the residence. Planning Director Goodison stated that the Facilities Committee had been evaluating various options, including preservation, for at least two years. Unfortunately, restoration does not appear to be cost-effective. There does not seem to be much point in spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to return it to use as a caretaker's cottage and it would cost even more to bring it to a standard that would allow for public use, such as meeting space for the Community Garden. Ultimately a decision has to be made and currently the residence is an attractive nuisance.

Commissioner Appleman stated that if the demolition application is approved, it should be with the understanding that Sonoma Ecology Center will work with Facilities Committee to try to use barn.

Commissioner Anderson concurred.

Commissioner Cribb stated that he would reluctantly support the application, but would like to see the building residence fully photo-documented.

Chair McDonald noted that under normal circumstances he tends to oppose applications for demolition and he is concerned that in this instance the need to demolish the building is the result of neglect. He stated that it would have been helpful

to have the building survey as part of the packet and he would have like to see greater outreach to other agencies and organizations to solicit interest or partnerships for preserving the residence.

Comm. Cribb made a motion to approve the demolition as submitted, with direction to the SEC to approach the Facilities Committee as to the use of the barn for storage and with direction to staff to ensure that the residence is fully photo-documented. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1, Appleman dissenting.

ITEM #9 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Discussion and review of the Sign Regulations.

Comm. Appleman made a motion to continue this item to the next meeting. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ISSUES UPDATE: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: None.

Mayor Laurie Gallian was in attendance at the meeting and wanted to make sure she visited every Commission and thanked every Commissioner for their service to the City.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, December 20, 2011.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Design Review Commission on the 21st day of February 2011.

Robin Evans, Administrative Assistant