



City of Sebastopol
Incorporated 1902
Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us

APPROVED MINUTES

TREE/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF December 7, 2022
4:00 P.M.

The notice of the meeting was posted on December 1, 2022.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:

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

2. ROLL CALL:

Present:	Ted Luthin, Chair Lars Langberg, Vice Chair Marshall Balfe, Board Member Melissa Hanley, Board Member Christine Level, Board Member Cary Bush, Board Member
Absent:	None.
Staff:	John Jay, Associate Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.

4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST:

Associate Planner Jay reported that:

- The City Ventures project at the north end of town behind the O'Reilly building that went through a preliminary review a couple of years ago and then was dormant during COVID has now submitted a formal application that is now going through review.
- The Housing Element will be reviewed at the Planning Commission meeting on December 13th with a recommendation of adoption to the City Council.
- The Planning Commission will conduct a preliminary review of the project at 7621 Healdsburg Avenue at its December 13th meeting, and then the Design Review Board will review the project at its regularly scheduled meeting on the December 21st.
- On December 6th the City Council appointed three new Council members: Jill McLewis, Stephen Zollman, and Sandra Maurer, and bid farewell to departing members Mayor Patrick Slater, Sarah Gurney, and Una Glass.
- The City has not received applications for the Design Review Board vacancies, so Chair Luthin and Board Member Bush will continue in their positions until those

positions are filled. The DRB will vote for a new Chair and Vice Chair at the next meeting on December 21st.

The Board asked questions of Associate Planner Jay.

5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC REGARDING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None.

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. 700 Gravenstein Highway North – Starbucks Signage

This project proposes to add new signage for the newly approved Starbucks located at 700 Gravenstein Highway North.

Associate Planner Jay presented the staff report and was available for questions.

Ted Luthin, Chair

The staff report says three logo wall signs, but I'm seeing four: three round disks and one set of Starbucks letters, one on each frontage.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes, that is correct.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

There's also a drive-through sign on the building as well as over at the drive-through.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I was figuring that drive-through was part of the Starbucks sign, but yes.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

So you said they're not doing a monument sign, but there's one for the shopping center, so even though the shopping center has one this building technically would be allowed its own monument sign?

John Jay, Associate Planner

They would be allowed to have their own monument sign if they were going to attach signage to the shopping center sign, but it would have to go through the shopping center's sign program to have their sign affixed to that location.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Because it is its own little building within that shopping center.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Correct. It is its own separate parcel essentially.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Another thing I noted was that the directional sign's square footage is a little funny if you look at page 19 of 24. I'm not sure why there are two square footage numbers here. I think one is for if you have the entire sign including the open base, and one is if you just take the face, so just the faces of those directional signs are pretty small, 3.2 and 2.6 square feet. If you take the square footage of the entire structure it gets more, but the structure is fairly open.

John Jay, Associate Planner

I know that for signs that are double-faced we would count the square footage for both sides. That's where the exceeding part comes in.

Chair Luthin asked for further Board questions of staff. Seeing none, he invited the applicant speak.

The applicant gave a presentation and was available for questions.

Ted Luthin, Chair

So the Starbucks letters on the south elevation are mounted on a raceway mounted on a roof. What color is that raceway?

David Ford, Applicant

I believe the raceway is going to be black, but it's designed to match the color of the roof, and that's what is shown on here, but it would be matched to the roof so that it doesn't show up; it's going to blend in as best it can.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I thought the roof was black, but I couldn't remember from our design review meeting.

John Jay, Associate Planner

The overall building is close to the one that was just rehabbed at the north end of that shopping center, kind of the white-ish green exterior and then the black, dark galvanized roofing.

Ted Luthin, Chair

The City of Sebastopol in general discourages internal lighting. Did you give any consideration to external lighting? I know the Starbucks south of town is all externally lit letters and these are all internal.

David Ford, Applicant

I'm not sure what discussions Starbucks may have had as far as what they wanted for lighting. This is pretty much their standard package with the internally illuminated signs. I'm not sure where that other site is located, if it's in a shopping center or it's close to residential, or if it was a requirement that it be externally lit. I know they typically prefer the internal illumination as opposed to installing down-lighting, gooseneck, floodlights, or something on the building to light them.

Chair Luthin asked for further Board questions of the applicant. Seeing none, he asked for Board deliberations.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

Melissa Hanley, Board Member

I don't have any comments on this.

Christine Level, Board Member

I'm going to comment on the three things we have at hand: 1) the number of signs on the building; 2) the square footage of the finding signs; and 3) the internal illumination. As far as the building itself, we had a precedent before where we had a multi-sided building where we allowed additional signs, and because this is not like a standard storefront where you

could plaster signs on the front, this goes all the way around and it's one on each side, I would approve that. Regarding the additional square footage on the way finding, I feel that way finding is important and I don't have a problem with the additional square footage. Regarding the internal illumination, we've been pretty consistent about denying the internal illumination and I don't see any reason on this building why we should have a special exception, so I think we would have to go to our standard of external illumination.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

No comments.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I don't really have any comments other than the staff report seems pretty straightforward. It's meeting the staff-level approval, so more inclined in that direction.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

No comments.

Melissa Hanley, Board Member

Are the other tenant signs in that shopping center internally illuminated?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Some of them are, and they're the older style that came before internal illumination was discouraged within Sebastopol. That came up when we looked at the sign program for the shopping center in general.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Yes, they've got old cabinet signs suspended from the soffit from the arcade. I'm inclined to agree with Board Member Level that way finding is important here; we talked about that in design review. Getting people in and out of there is important and I think the additional square footage is modest. In terms of the number of signs on the building, even with one sign per frontage in total on the building they're significantly under their maximum square footage, which is like 150 square feet and they're asking for 114, so it seems like a reasonable amount of signage. I like that they're using logos and not letters on every frontage, so it's more of a decorative element. I agree with Board Member Level that we have been fairly adamant about external lighting; I think that's why the Starbucks south of town has external lighting, as do a lot of other places in town, so I would tend to approve the additional signs and square footages, but ask them to come back with an externally lit solution.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

The Exchange Bank, the new building, I remember it's sign was more of an old style that we were looking at, but I don't remember the lighting of it.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I think it was like halo lit, right?

Ted Luthin, Chair

I also think it was halo lit, and halo lit would be nice; I'd support a halo lit solution.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

So it doesn't have to be fixture and gooseneck type fixtures; halo lighting would be another idea.

Chair Luthin opened public comment. Seeing none, he asked for a motion.

Board Member Level moved to approve the application and allow four wall signs, one on each face, increased square footage on the directional way finding signage, and to direct the applicant to return with revised plans for a non-internally illuminated sign solution to be approved by City staff.

Chair Luthin requested the motion be amended to include halo lighting as a possible external illumination solution.

The maker of the motion accepted the amendment to the motion.

Board Member Hanley seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Langberg, and Board Members Balfe, Bush, Hanley, and Level

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

8. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Objective Design Guidelines Subcommittee.

- The City has hired a consultant that has done an initial round of work. The subcommittee met with the consultants and give feedback. A round of meetings between the subcommittee and consultant is being set up to bring the consultant's recommendations forward and the subcommittee will give feedback.

9. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Tree/Design Review Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 1, 2022 at 4:00 P.M.