



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

[www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us](http://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us)

## **APPROVED DRAFT MINUTES**

TREE/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF March 02, 2022  
4:00 P.M.

The notice of the meeting was posted on February 24, 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:**

<b>Present:</b>	Ted Luthin, Chair Lars Langberg, Vice Chair Cary Bush, Board Member
<b>Absent:</b>	Marshall Balfe, Board Member Christine Level, Board Member
<b>Staff:</b>	John Jay, Associate Planner

### **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

#### **March 17, 2021**

Vice Chair Langberg moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

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

#### **April 21, 2021**

Vice Chair Langberg moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Langberg, and Board Member Bush  
NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Board Member Balfe, Board Member Level

**August 18, 2021**

Vice Chair Langberg moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

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

**November 3, 2021**

Vice Chair Langberg moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

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

**Approval of Minutes for May 5, 2021 and October 6, 2021 were continued to the next DRB meeting.**

**4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST:**

Associate Planner Jay advised the Board that the City Council had approved the Huntley Square project at its March 1, 2022 meeting. The Council will consider the draft Housing Element portion at a special meeting on March 7, 2021.

Associate Planner Jay also reported that the RV park had opened with no complaints, and the Parking Ordinance was approved by the City Council two meetings ago.

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:**

**8. DISCUSSION:**

**A. STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL** – Consider and provide input to staff regarding Standard Conditions of Approval for development projects.

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

The Board had no questions of Associate Planner Jay.

Chair Luthin asked for Board questions of staff.

**Ted Luthin, Chair**

With respect to Item 4, which requires a licensed landscaped architect, is that for all projects, even ADUs and those sorts of things?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

It would be for larger development projects rather than ADUs. An ADU is typically a regular building permit and approved at the ministerial level, so most wouldn't come to a board or commission unless it required additional review. It is hard to deny or add in conditions of approval for an ADU by state laws.

**Ted Luthin, Chair**

I guess for residential stuff you don't necessarily need a licensed architect for those?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

I believe that's correct for those projects. A larger scale project would require a licensed engineer, architect, or landscape architect.

**Ted Luthin, Chair**

Yes, if you're doing a subdivision or anything commercial.

**Ted Luthin, Chair**

The other thing I had a question about, Item 10, "Preconstruction meeting is required for projects." Who is that meeting with?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

It looks like any of those conditions A-E would require a preconstruction meeting, and I would assume that they would be with the appropriate City staff. In regard to an encroachment permit, Public Works engineering would be required to be there. Dwelling units or buildings, land use items, would be Building and Planning.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

I think that's a somewhat common thing for bigger projects that have a lot to consider.

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

I can add in a note on there that says, "Preconstruction meeting is required with City staff for projects that..." so it's not a vague statement.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

That's probably a good idea, so it's not just the construction team doing their kickoff meeting, but you've got to call up the City and invite him to the meeting.

**Ted Luthin, Chair**

The main reason that jumped out at me is I read the part about you have to post a sign talking about work schedule and those sorts of things, which I think is great for the neighborhood, so I was thinking about neighborhood communications when I read that. I kind of figured it was a City meeting, I just thought you might want to clear that up a little bit.

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

That makes sense. This will be a document that gets revised or updated when things change, so if there is a condition later on that doesn't apply anymore or doesn't make sense

or needs to be revised, we can always go through the process of revising this exhibit and making it clearer before it gets fully adopted.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

I had a couple of questions. When you were introducing it you said, "As they apply to the project." This is going to be attached to every project basically, but is it up to the applicant to go through it and say this one doesn't apply to me, or this one doesn't? Does every applicant have to comply with every one of these conditions?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

The site-specific ones will be within Exhibit A and Exhibit B as per most use permits or things like that. This will be for all projects, so if it does apply to this project, then they are required to adhere to that standard. It will mostly be on the applicant to make sure that they comply with those standards, and as always, whenever we send out conditions of approval or required findings, if they have any questions they can reach out to us and we can verify if that finding X applies to their project or not.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

That makes sense. I had a specific question on Item 7, the construction management plan. I know we talked about this in our little subcommittee. There's a template that can be used for small infill projects so that they don't have to come up with their own CMP, but could a larger project use it too, or is it just trying to let the little guys have an easier time of it?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

It's probably geared toward the smaller projects, because applying all of these standards may not be feasible or economically appropriate for those smaller projects, so the template would be for them. That's always something that we can discuss on a staff level of where does your project fall? Does it qualify for the template program, or do you need a full-scale construction management plan? Like Woodmark Apartments is obviously going to need a full construction management plan whereas Habitat for Humanity might need a smaller template, because it's only for four units, even though it's an undeveloped site.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

That makes sense. Have you guys reviewed this with a certified access specialist? Is that something the City would be concerned about as a liability? There are a couple of comments about curb ramps and things like that, so it just may be worth it to put it in front of Craig Williams.

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

I haven't. I know that some of the stuff I've been working on with Tony from GHD Group, our engineering firm, so a lot of those kinds of engineering conditions came from their experience. But that is something that I can reach out to them and Kari and see if providing this to them makes sense, and maybe add in additional ADA conditions.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

Yes, it's probably worth it, just because we know how those things can be problematic down the road. I don't know if there would be anything else to add to it, but it might be worth a look.

**Cary Bush, Board Member**

I'm curious on Item 44. It seems to be redacted to some degree. Is there a reason for that, or was it just unclear terminology?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

I'm not sure, I'll have to clarify with Tony on that one to see if that was in there originally and it just doesn't make sense, or if it is just a strike-through typo.

**Cary Bush, Board Member**

I think that would be important to see that clearer. We've seen that condition apply to a particular job. It was unclear then, and it seems to be a little unclear now. My only other question would be in regard to a deferral. There are certain conditions that come up prior to a submission process. Is there any allocation for deferral?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

You mean like if site conditions change and you may not be able to meet a condition anymore and you need to revise plans, or anything like that?

**Cary Bush, Board Member**

Yes.

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

We do have a mention of that—I believe it's #3—that depending on the site changes or significant changes and their severity that come up over time, if it's deemed that it's not anything major and the project can go forward, then we can approve that at a staff level. If it's drastic enough we would send it back to the review authority that approved that project. It depends on if it's a small, minor thing like a wall location change, or change the height of a retaining section, something that doesn't affect the whole scale of the project, that's something that the Planning Department and staff can make a decision on. If it's any item that was discussed at the meeting that it was approved at, whether a tree or location of something that was of importance, then that might be something that we would take back to that review authority to see if they could approve it or if it needs a full revision.

**Cary Bush, Board Member**

There's a lot digest here, and it seems well written and is clear.

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

What's the process with this next?

**John Jay, Associate Planner**

I believe we might take it back to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to City Council for adoption. As I mentioned earlier, they did make a motion to approve these standard conditions and use these in their current state, and then as they change over time then they would get amended, but at the February meeting they approved them to be used for projects going forward after that meeting. I believe the next step is to have it go back to the Planning Commission and request a recommendation to City Council for full adoption of these standards conditions, so we can use them going forward. I know on some of the projects the Planning Commission and City Council are going to use these more than the Design Review Board will, but we felt that it would make sense to take them to all boards and have them looked at, as they do apply to all three committees. As I said earlier, this is going to be kind of changing documents, so after this meeting if you guys have any other questions that come up or want to go over rewording something, you can send me an email specific to whatever condition it is and we can go over it and revise it as needed. It will be an ongoing project.

**Ted Luthin, Chair**

We can read through it in a little more detail, and if anything jumps out send you some notes.

**9. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES**

**Lars Langberg, Vice Chair**

Public Art Committee. The PAC met on March 2<sup>nd</sup>. The community sculpture garden has installed three pieces of art and public feedback has been good. A second call to artists, with an early April deadline, has been put out to get five more entries. PAC hopes to review new works at its next meeting. An opening event for the sculpture garden is tentatively scheduled for June. The City will also commission art pieces, one of which will be installed on the wall of the library within the next three months, with other works being commissioned in 2023.

**10.ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 4:44 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Tree/Design Review Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 16, 2022 at 4:00 P.M.