



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

www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us

APPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

TREE/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF May 04, 2022
4:00 P.M.

The notice of the meeting was posted on April 28, 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 Christine Level, Board Member Cary Bush, Board Member
Absent:	Marshall Balfe, Board Member
Staff:	Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director John Jay, Associate Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 2, 2022

Vice Chair Langberg moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

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

4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST:

Associate Planner Jay advised the Board that:

- The Standard Conditions of Approval were presented to the City Council on May 3rd. Council made minor modifications and approved the request that any additional modifications to the document be made by either the Design Review Board or the

Planning Commission. He added that the Woodmark Apartments project would not be subject to those design conditions of approval, as that project was submitted before they were approved.

- The Huntley Square project was approved by the City Council on March 1st and would be heard by the Design Review Board at its next meeting on May 18th.
- The City Council has begun discussing hybrid scheduled format meetings, potentially to begin in the fall of 2022, and other boards and communications would follow suit.
- The Woodmark Apartments project is within its 90-day completeness review. Once completed, any comments or questions for the applicant team would be uploaded to the City's website.

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

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. 2022-021 – 150/154 North Main Street

The applicant Connie Salinas is requesting a Façade Improvement rebate to update the existing wood awning, which has rotted out, to a new canvas style awning. It also includes new fascia boards and paint quoted at \$14,186.73 and would qualify for the \$2,500 rebate.

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

Chair Luthin asked for Board questions of the applicant.

Ted Luthin, Chair

The plan here is to remove the existing wood-frame canopies and replace them with fabric, correct?

Connie Salinas, Applicant

Yes, and they were rotting so badly the water was leaking into the front windows and coming in through the electrical lights in the front, so we've already removed those because it was a hazard. The rotted areas have been removed and sealed off and we're waiting to put the fascia boards and paint on. The awning company has started the procedure to get the permits through the City, so that's where we are right now.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Are you running two separate awnings, or one awning, across both buildings?

Connie Salinas, Applicant

It's two separate awnings. There are two businesses, which was true of the wooden awnings as well.

Chair Luthin moved to the next item.

B. 2022-022 – 6741 Sebastopol Avenue

The applicant Payton Kelly is requesting a Façade Improvement rebate to update the existing landscaping and install new irrigation. The project has been quoted at \$5,640 and would qualify for the \$2,500 rebate.

C. 2022-023 – 6761 Sebastopol Avenue

The applicant Payton Kelly is requesting a Façade Improvement rebate to update the existing landscaping and install new irrigation. The project has been quoted at \$3,960 and would qualify for the \$2,500 rebate.

D. 2022-024 – 6771 Sebastopol Avenue

The applicant Payton Kelly is requesting a Façade Improvement rebate to update the existing landscaping and install new irrigation. The project has been quoted at \$5,640 and would qualify for the \$2,500 rebate.

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

Chair Luthin asked for Board questions of the applicant.

Christine Level, Board Member

Is all of this landscaping for the three addresses all on the street front?

Payton Kelly, Applicant

Correct.

Christine Level, Board Member

So you're going to have one continuous design that draws the whole thing together?

Payton Kelly, Applicant

Yes, and we're not tied to any certain plan. The direction that we've given our landscapers is we want perennials that are long-lasting and water-efficient plants, so if you guys have any recommendations on what you would like to see at the gateway to Sebastopol, we're more than open to suggestions.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I picked through the application, and I don't know if I'm getting into the Board review, but I was going to ask exactly what Christine asked: what were the 5-gallons, the 1-gallons, and the 9-gallons? I don't see a plan. We have a WELO policy in place, which is a water efficient landscape ordinance, and we would have to see some good faith for estimated water uses, allowances, etc., so I would like to know more about the material. While it is kind of left up to us, that's not our role. Our role is to review the application and reply to that, or at least make our recommendations from that, but I would like to make sure that what is put out there is definitely meeting the WELO policy.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

Obviously we want to conserve as much water and reduce the property's operating expenses as much as we can. I do apologize; I had to call in from the phone today, so I'm not on Zoom. John, can you remind me if the examples of the landscaper-provided plans are attached to that?

John Jay, Associate Planner

I didn't see any exhibits for our review.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I know I sent it separately, so maybe it didn't make its way in there, but we did provide photos and examples of what our landscaper recommended we use when we directed them to use water-efficient plants and perennials so it would look good all year round. I can share

them again after this, or if John has it maybe he can share it. And again, if there is a specific flower that kind of represents the City of Sebastopol, we'd be happy to do so; I guess that's more what I was referencing. I apologize that it was not provided in that initial document.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Can I clarify again, is it just on the Highway 12 front, or it's around the rest of the buildings too?

Payton Kelly, Applicant

No, the budget for it is just on the front of the property.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Cary, I was able to find that document. If you want to go through these a little bit more, we can definitely do that, but it looks like these sections up there are roughly the same. These last two pages are the plant material that was suggested.

Cary Bush, Board Member

It's hard to know how they're presented, their arrangement, or their spacing. Let's just say there's a matrix that allows for water use when and how they're applied, and we usually see plans that suggest how they'll be applied, so it's hard for me to really give a thumbs up or thumbs down on this. I know all these plants pretty well and there are rather tough. It would be interesting to see from a designer's perspective how they'll be used. Will they be candy striped or grouped in massings? How will even some of these perennials be maintained?

Payton Kelly, Applicant

We were a little reluctant to move forward, because they wanted a design fee from us in order to do that, and we've had some trouble with income at this property. I'm sure you know this property was sold in the last couple of years, so it's like the property taxes were updated, COVID hit, then the hotel was converted and we had a lot of tenants unhappy and not wanting to pay the same rents that they were paying previously. Again, we were reluctant to move forward with it unless we had an idea of the chance of the grant going through, but if we're going to be able to utilize the grant I think I could convince the landlord to move forward with the formal design.

Cary Bush, Board Member

That's huge, because it's a great step forward in regard to not only the brand of the building and property, the entrance to town, it is good faith efforts. As a Board we're here to review designs and see how they apply, especially when it comes to code and ordinance, so it's hard for me to respond with 100% certainty if it meets that code and ordinance. I'm supportive of these endeavors, and in fact I'm in support primarily of this whole program, and I'm speaking for myself as a Board Member here.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

And we certainly appreciate it, the landlords and the tenants. SPARC has really been pushing forward on this, and they're like we'll spend some money on the landscaping. They're spending probably \$200,000 right now on a build-out of their space, so they're going to be there for the long-term. It's more the other portions of the building that are struggling. We'd love to make a step in the right direction so we can either find some new tenants or figure out what's going on with the current ones, and if you guys are supportive of that I think I could get the landlord to proceed. I think it was like \$1,000 that they

wanted to charge us for a design review or a design mockup, but I think we can get that done.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I'm always looking for a sketch, and we're looking for colors, rhythm, repetition, line, form, and texture. These are things that really influence me as a designer, so when I can see these sorts of things and how they're applied, it's a lot more for me to respond to, other than you've got hundreds of plants, some in 5-gallons, some in 1-gallons, and I don't know how they're fully applied. But again, I'm here to say that I'm supportive of your efforts to date.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

And we're always open to feedback too, so we'll move forward with that first step, and if you guys think there could be a way that it could better represent Sebastopol, then we're more than happy to hear feedback and to act on it.

Cary Bush, Board Member

Just one more minor question. You mentioned brown mini mulch. Is that the ¼" minus type of organic matter that is a mulch, or is it like a dyed brown mini mulch?

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I'd have to ask my landscaper, but I can do so. I'm pretty sure we'd have the option, so if they're not quoting organic it wouldn't be much to get that changed, so I can just direct them to do so.

Cary Bush, Board Member

It actually may save you some money to go to the full organic. Maybe if it's a ¼" minus or a Sierra mini it would be a lot more cost effective than bagged brown dyed mulch, so that's why I'm asking.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

Then I'll make sure we're saving as much money as possible, because we're always into that.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Echoing what Cary said, the Board is very supportive of reinvestment in local businesses. I can't remember the last one of these things we've denied, but we like to see little sketches, drawings, plans, so we understand where the City's money is going. Question for you, John. It says the City's fiscal year ends July 1st. Is that when the funding for this program gets re-upped?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes, the end of the fiscal year would be June 30th, and then when the new fiscal year begins, that's replenishment of the Façade Improvement funds and it goes back to \$20,000, or if Council decides to increase that amount, then it would change to that new amount.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Is that money committed for next year that you know of, or is that something that's going to happen in budget discussions as the fiscal year comes to an end?

John Jay, Associate Planner

I believe it's going to be a consideration within the budget talks, and that's something that we can also discuss later on today; I believe that's one of the points on the agendas,

potentially looking at day changes as well to make it a little bit earlier so we don't get so many last minute applications and requests.

Ted Luthin, Chair

The reason I'm thinking about it is if Payton needs a little bit of time to design and comes back in a month, now we're in June, so if they make the investment, say they go ahead with the work in June, come to us in July in the next fiscal year, that's something we can approve retroactively, correct?

John Jay, Associate Planner

I believe that is an option if they've gone through and you've approved the project before the end of the fiscal year, and then that project moves forward and gets funded when the new fiscal year starts, but I'd have to double check with Kari to see if that's the correct order of operations.

Payton Kelly

I'm not sure what the formal process looks like, but these guys do a lot of work for me on my other properties, and if I ask them to I could probably get something done in a week.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Okay, sounds good.

Chair Luthin moved to the next item.

E. 2022-025 – 127 North Main Street

The applicant Craig Goldstein is requesting a Façade Improvement rebate to remove the existing "Tombe Realty" sign and replace it with a new updated version. The project has been quoted at \$7,054.49 and would qualify for the \$2,500 rebate.

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

Chair Luthin asked for Board questions of the applicant.

Christine Level, Board Member

How does the new sign differ from the old sign, or is it the same and just new?

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

It's the same type of font, and John, I just sent to you a photo of the front of the building. Some of our signage is faded, so all we're doing is just updating it the same way and cleaning it up. One thing I want to clarify though, that estimate is actually for the front and the back of the building, but I can get an updated one breaking down what it's going to cost to do the front and what it's going to cost to do the back, so you guys can have a better understanding.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Your building does have multiple frontages and they're kind of publicly visible from both sides, so I think consideration of both sides would be appropriate.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

There's a front on the next slide that looks different than this one, so it's not just replacing it exactly as is.

Ted Luthin, Chair

That's going with a more serif typeface.

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

You're correct. Because we're doing a subtle change to our brand, that will be the new font, which you guys have.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Is it going to be the same kind of thick, chunky letters that you have up there in terms of thickness?

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

Not as thick, but it will stand out, yes.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Still have some dimension?

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

Yes.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Any idea what that dimension is? Is that half-inch? It looks like they're probably two- or three-inches now?

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

He only has it as a 12-inch by 2-inch HPU description on here. He doesn't have what the depth is going to be on it.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Okay. 12-inch by 2-inch. It's probably 2-inches thick.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Yes.

Ted Luthin, Chair

So it's probably very similar to what's up there now, probably a high-density urethane letter with a painted finish.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Ted, can you place the timeframe of that original font on the original sign?

Ted Luthin, Chair

Oh boy, a long time ago.

Cary Bush, Board Member

Is it internally illuminated?

Ted Luthin, Chair

I don't think so. I think it's just built up probably on a big, foam, chunky backer. My first thought was maybe that's lit, and I walked by and I was like no, I don't think so.

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

Yes, nothing is going to change, just maybe a little bit on the front side.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Yes, a little more serif font.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

You made a point about the budget, that this is for two signs, front and back. We can approve front and back, right? It's still a façade improvement. Like you made the point, Ted, the back is still a visible entry.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Yes.

Craig Goldstein, Applicant

My apologies. I wasn't aware that we couldn't use that façade money for the back, but yes, it is for the front and the back.

Ted Luthin, Chair

If it were facing some back alley or something, I would say probably not, but if they were both public frontages, certainly the plaza counts as a public frontage, I would think. All right, thank you, Craig.

Chair Luthin moved to the next item.

F. 2022-026 – 156 North Main Street

The applicant Anya Concoff is requesting a Façade Improvement rebate to remove existing tenant signage and new exterior painting. The project has been quoted at \$4,300 and would qualify for the \$2,500 rebate.

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

Chair Luthin asked for Board questions of the applicant.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Welcome, Anya. So you're going to get rid of the arts supplies sign and maybe make it more appropriate for your business?

Anya Concoff, Applicant

Yes, exactly.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Sounds good. There was mention of some colors. What colors are you painting this building?

Anya Concoff, Applicant

We're thinking of like a pewter, a lighter grey, and then a color for the fascia that would either be brick red, which is very true to the building, or maybe a burnt orange. We're going to wait and see some swatches soon.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Do new signage as well?

Anya Concoff, Applicant

We will be, but we didn't include this in the bid, because we have a few bids. It's going to take months to schedule potentially and we wanted to move on the painting while the weather is with us.

Ted Luthin, Chair

What are you doing with the big awning?

Anya Concoff, Applicant

We've had the awning professionally cleaned once with really good results and it's time for that again, although we're thinking of either replacing or painting according to the new colors. It would be the color of the fascia trim, so the third color, which would likely be that brick red, something that would tie in with the businesses we see across the street.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Nice to see people breathing some new life into these buildings. They've needed it for some time.

Anya Concoff, Applicant

It's wonderful, and the owner of the building renovated it beautifully. We love moving from our 700 square foot spot a few doors down to this; it's great.

Chair Luthin asked for Board Member questions of the applicant.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I have a comment. I'm looking at the street view right now and the big Pine Cone Café sign that's next door on a building that's no longer the Pine Cone, and to me there's something very interesting about having these remnants of signs that show a history of a downtown. So the fact that your store is not artist supplies, although it's not radically different than artist supplies, and I kind of like it up there, but I totally understand if you don't want to do that. I just think to erase all history every time a new tenant comes in is not as interesting as leaving the history.

Anya Concoff, Applicant

We still have some signage inside left over from when it was a toy factory, when it was HeartSong Toys; I remember playing in there as a child. You notice we haven't been in a big hurry to remove the lettering, because we do feel like it reflects our brand a little bit; these are handicrafts made by artists overseas. But it is a little confusing, especially to out-of-towners. They come in, they've parked, they're looking for the art store, and then they get a little peeved.

Robert Williams, Applicant

If I could chime in here, Global Village has been on Main Street since before that artist supplies sign was ever hung up.

Anya Concoff, Applicant

Before it was an art store, yes. Thirty years on Main Street.

Robert Williams, Applicant

We've got 30 years at the end of May, so I think keeping a piece of downtown Sebastopol would be the front of the building saying "Global Village."

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Fair enough.

Ted Luthin, Chair

There you go. So now you need to put up a Global Village sign that in 75 years is going to be like Pine Cones.

Robert Williams, Applicant

In 75 years we'll still be here. Well, it will be our children.

Anya Concoff, Applicant

Grandchildren. I love the charm of the Pine Cone next door and that sort of feeling of what it's held.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I saw part of the application that said that swatches were attached. I don't know if it just didn't come through on my end, but I know you mentioned and you described the swatches well, Anya, but do we not have them attached?

Anya Concoff, Applicant

I can resend them. They were JPEGs that were samples from the paint company that were basically what I described to you: pewter, silver and/or grey, and some sort of accent color, and I can definitely send those over to you.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Let me see if I can pull them up real quick.

Anya Concoff, Applicant

When we were doing the narrowing down we were looking at Victorian and post-Victorian house paint colors to stay true to the era.

(Paint color samples appear on screen.)

Cary Bush, Board Member

Help me out, Ted or Lars, are those Benjamin Moore or Kelly-Moore colors?

Ted Luthin, Chair

Looks like Sherwin Williams.

Anya Concoff, Applicant

Yes, this is Sherwin Williams. We actually have to bids that are very, very close that we're deciding between. One uses Sherwin Williams and the other uses Kelly-Moore.

Chair Luthin moved to Board deliberations.

The Board discussed the applications as follows:

Ted Luthin, Chair

I guess it's time for us to have a conversation about how to move forward. John offered a couple of recommendations. One would be taking the total and dividing it by our number of applicants, and then the other one I didn't quite get, "Award each parcel, which has one address." Can you explain that to me a little bit better, John? I wasn't quite following that.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Basically the one parcel that has one address would be 127 North Main and 156 North Main, and those would get whatever that awarded amount, if it was up to the \$2,500 amount. Then since the other ones are for Gravenstein Station, it's one parcel but multiple addresses, splitting that amount in equal ratio, and then the other one being 150 and 154 North Main, since they are one building parcel with two addresses kind of splitting that cost equally.

Ted Luthin, Chair

So awarded per parcel, not necessarily per address?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Correct.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Then I guess the other option would be to do some other new math.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I wish we had enough money for everybody. I want everybody to have \$2,500 for each project.

Ted Luthin, Chair

Yes, and I get the parcel argument on the surface of it, but at the same time Gravenstein Station is a big public frontage that could use an injection of a little more money, so I do get that too. I guess I'm leaning toward take what we have left and divide it evenly.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

And what is that amount?

Ted Luthin, Chair

\$2,139.37 each.

John Jay, Associate Planner

It's almost \$2,500.

Ted Luthin, Chair

It's \$350 short. It's reasonably close.

Christine Level, Board Member

My tendency is a little towards John's suggestion, because although it's nice that this is an entry into town, but these are all part of the downtown experience, and the three landscape projects, they feel like one project to me. What I was thinking was giving the \$2,500 to 150/154 North Main, 127 North Main, and 156 North Main and giving the balance, which came to \$5,336.23, to the landscape project. That's a slight modification of John's way of looking at it, and I would be happy with John's way of looking at it too, but the three landscape projects, they just feel like one project to me.

Cary Bush, Board Member

So you're saying that all the North Main Street projects would get the full rebate for \$2,500, and then the remainder would go to the Gravenstein Station project?

Christine Level, Board Member

That was my first thought, but I would be okay with going along with John's interpretation, which was to pull out the 150/154 North Main, so just the two projects. The 127 North Main and the 156 North Main would get the entire \$2,500 as separate entities, and then dividing up the balance between Gravenstein and 150/154 North Main. I would be okay with that also. But the landscape project feels like one project to me trying to get three different dips into the pool, and it's also fairly undefined because we don't have the landscape design for it either.

Cary Bush, Board Member

I'm inclined to go in that direction as well based on what we do know that we can give money to for certain versus what we don't know for certain, and so I'm on board with that approach in theory as well.

Christine Level, Board Member

Let me ask John about this. If we're dividing these three landscape projects into three separate properties, can they come back and apply again for additional money later when the funding re-ups?

John Jay, Associate Planner

No, the parcels and tenants would not be eligible for future funding for three years. That's noted within the program directions.

Christine Level, Board Member

This is a complicated little nuance, but he pulls one of the addresses off, then we have enough money to divide amongst everyone. Then he comes back and applies after June 30th for the other address as a separate landscaping project, in which case he could get an additional \$2,500 at that point.

John Jay, Associate Planner

I think that makes sense. You're saying remove one of the addresses from the application for this year and reapply next fiscal year to get the full rebate essentially? Is that what you're asking, Christine?

Christine Level, Board Member

Yes.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes, I don't think there would be a problem with that. Basically it would just be withdraw their application and we would not award that address.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

That would get us at \$12,500, which is almost what we have left.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Correct.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

I think that's a good strategy.

Christine Level, Board Member

That seems like it would make sense for the applicant.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Yes, they'll get more money overall than they would if we divided up with three addresses now and with everybody. I think that's a good idea, if Mr. Kelly is up for that.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I'd be more than happy with that. I think that's a very fair solution. Obviously, I want to get the water tower area done, and SPARC has really been pushing for it, so would it be an issue if we did those two sides first and then did the middle last, or is there a preference on that?

Ted Luthin, Chair

I think that strategy sounds decent. If I had a preference I'd say start with the water tower and work your way down.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I have to deliver something to SPARC. They're going to be really frustrated if I can't get them something.

Christine Level, Board Member

We're so close to this deadline cutoff, I don't think it really matters to me which one you do first, because you're just going to roll into the next one.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

Would it be an issue if I just move forward with all of the work and then applied retroactively?

Ted Luthin, Chair

Let John confirm that, but I don't think there's an issue.

Cary Bush, Board Member

It needs to comply with the water efficient landscape ordinance, and that's something that needs to be confirmed. It's to protect the ordinance, and it's something I can't approve today, because I have little to go on, so I'm pushing more of a continuance on this type of project. I'd like to assure Payton his project is there, that there's a project, but for me to physically confirm a go-ahead to start building with hundreds of plants on the ground without any type of assurance that it's going to meet a the water efficient landscape ordinance and the estimated water use allowed, I can't do that. Every project I've seen today other than this one has the information that I've been able to assess and get behind and support, and I want Payton to know that I do support his project, but it's lacking information for me to move forward with giving approval.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

That's fine. I totally understand that and I'll push my landscaper to get that design as quick as possible. I guess the question I have is what would the process be for me? I don't know how often you guys meet? Do we need to go to this meeting again, or if I send you guys a plan and John confirms that it meets all the requirements of the City, are we going to be good to go, or what is that process like?

Cary Bush, Board Member

That's a great question and I'm wondering if the Board can even talk to John here about just waiving any new fees that make the application process even that much more streamlined for someone like Payton and his team? I'd like to see it go through. I want to do that with all good faith, if that's a possibility.

John Jay, Associate Planner

There is no application fee for the Façade Improvement program, so that wouldn't be an issue. Because an approval motion does need to be made—I could confirm with Kari if we continue it to the next meeting on the 18th and Payton is able to provide those documents that the Board needs to approve the project going forward—then we can take that route, and then also decide if we are going to pull one of the addresses so that Payton's team can get the full amount for all three parcels or all three addresses. I feel like we should make that decision tonight going forward.

Christine Level, Board Member

If he was just doing a landscape improvement and he wasn't trying to get into the program here, would he have to go in front of the Design Review Board?

John Jay, Associate Planner

It would just be a regular permit review making sure that they met the requirements.

Christine Level, Board Member

And the water conservation is part of the requirements?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes.

Christine Level, Board Member

So I think if we pulled one project and he went ahead the question remains can he apply after the fact for the monies if he did all three parcels at once? Let's just say he pulls one parcel, he gets approval for two, we give him the funds, he does all three projects and then on July 1st he's able to come back and apply for the funds for the third parcel. Can he do that?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes, I believe that's a possibility for the Façade Improvement. Usually it's the opposite way where the amount is awarded before the work is done, but this way it would be flipped where the work would be done and then we would basically be reimbursing the applicant for that.

Christine Level, Board Member

I would be supportive of that if we could just decide right now. He pulls one now, we approve everybody the \$2,500, and then he comes back after he's done the work and applies for the funding. I would personally be supportive of that.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Kari just messaged me. The item can be continued for the next meeting, and no, they cannot apply after the work is done. So if that were the case, then they could do the two for today's meeting, or the next meeting if we continued it, and then for the third address it would fall under next fiscal year's program.

Ted Luthin, Chair

But they'd have to hold off on doing that work until the next fiscal year. So yes, I just looked in the application and it said has to be submitted prior to the work.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

And I think if we go that way, we talked earlier about is the budget going to be approved again, and I would think the answer is a very high percentage. It's not like Payton is going to have two projects approved and one that he doesn't then get funded in July. I think we could all probably say with high confidence this program will keep going.

Christine Level, Board Member

So when would we have another meeting, John, where he could present this? The new funding starts on July 1st, but when would he have a meeting where he could get approval for this?

John Jay, Associate Planner

I believe it's roughly in October.

Cary Bush, Board Member

It's actually really good for a better growing season, because we're going into the heat, and you have more risk of failure. We're trying not to plant too late in the summer, need a little bit more water to establish, you have a little bit more maintenance. We love planting in the fall, but I'm not you, Payton.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

That makes sense. To be frank, I guess I'm not that well versed in it; I just rely on my landscaper. I think we are more of the frame of mind like if we can get some money to make the property look better, let's do it. We want the residents of Sebastopol to be happy with it, so whatever is going to be best for you guys. If we could get the money to help to improve the property, we would love that.

John Jay, Associate Planner

Kari just showed up to save the day.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I can try to provide guidance. I'm sorry I've been in and out today, so I didn't catch all of the conversation, but I'm aware of the funding issue. I can say that while it requires full Council approval, the Budget Subcommittee has revealed the Planning Department budget and the Façade Improvement program, so I do not think it is in danger. It has requested the same funding as this year of \$20,000, and I noted at that meeting that this is actually the first year that we're oversubscribed and people were very happy about that. The Budget Subcommittee I believe would be recommending it to Council, and Council has been very supportive in the past, even changing the requirements to make it easier for folks. I will note, yes, the reason you can't do the work and then apply for the funds is we have had a number of applicants in the past ask for reimbursement for something after they've done the work, and just to be super fair to everybody we have to turn those folks away as well, and so that's where that came from.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I guess the other question for the Board is if we are going to earmark or approve funds for Gravenstein Station, do we do that with a condition of approval that you want to see a plan back before those funds are finalized? In terms of process, how do we do that? We'd be conditioning an approval, right?

Cary Bush, Board Member

I think we've done it in the past where we actually almost let staff approve these as long as they meet requirements.

Ted Luthin, Chair

I'm game for that. I'm supportive of Christine's approach where we divide up the Main Streets and take the balance and put it toward the Gravenstein Station. I think that sounds reasonable to me. Is everyone else in agreement with that?

Cary Bush, Board Member

I am.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Instead of pulling one of the addresses?

Ted Luthin, Chair

Well, I guess that's the other possibility. Pull an address and put that in the next fiscal year.

Christine Level, Board Member

There are two options here. We can divide it, just give him the balance, which is \$5,336.25 and he can just call it good, or he gets \$5,000 for two parcels. We have the 336.25 sitting around, and then he can reapply with the third parcel. I think we can ask Payton which one he thinks he wants to do.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I would love to reapply. That would be amazing, and I appreciate you guys making that option available.

Christine Level, Board Member

So which one?

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

To pull an address and reapply.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I'll guess I'll leave that in your hands on which one, but I do have to give something to SPARC; they've been asking for this all year. So I can either do the water tower and SPARC, or I can do the middle train building and SPARC.

Christine Level, Board Member

I don't have a problem with that myself. You decide which parcel you want to pull.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

I say pull 6761 Sebastopol Avenue so that we get the water tower. I think that's truly the entrance to Sebastopol and I think that would benefit the most, so 6761 is the building we pull.

Christine Level, Board Member

Well, I can wholeheartedly say, Payton, when you come back with this I will be happy about it, so you'll get my vote for 6761 in the future.

Payton Kelly, Applicant

Thank you. I appreciate that.

Ted Luthin, Chair

It sounds like if we're pulling one we can distribute evenly, correct?

Christine Level, Board Member

Correct.

Board Member Level moved to approve all the projects submitted with the exception of 6761 Sebastopol Avenue, and to award the full amount of \$2,500 to each project.

Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Board Member Balfe

8. DISCUSSION – 1) Provide direction to staff regarding the potential fiscal year 2022/2023 quarterly deadlines; and 2) New format for hybrid or in-person meetings.

Associate Planner Jay provided presentations on both items.

The Board asked questions of staff.

The Board discussed both matters.

9. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair

Public Arts Committee. A new sculpture has been installed on the side of the library. The community sculpture garden at Ives Park has three sculptures installed. PAC has put out a second call for entries for more sculptures.

10. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Tree/Design Review Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 18, 2022 at 4:00 P.M.