

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 April 25, 2023 3:30 P.M.

The notice of the meeting was posted on April 20, 2023.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Langberg called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M. and read a procedural statement.

2. ROLL C	ALL: Pre	ent: Lars Langberg, Chair Melissa Hanley, Vice Ch Marshall Balfe, Board M	lember
	Abs	Lynn Deedler, Board Mo ent: Cary Bush, Board Mem Christine Level, Board I	ber
	Sta		

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 5, 2022, November 16, 2022, December 7, 2022

Board Member Balfe moved to approve the minutes of October 5, 2022 as presented.

Vice Chair Hanley seconded the motion.

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

Chair Langberg continued the minutes of November 16, 2022 to the next Design Review Board meeting.

Vice Chair Hanley moved to approve the minutes of December 7, 2022 as presented.

Board Member Balfe seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg, Vice Chair Hanley, and Board Members Balfe and Deedler NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Board Members Bush and Level

PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST:

Associate Planner Jay reported that:

- The Woodmark project held a pre-application meeting on April 6th with City Council staff and the development group. The project has obtained a building permit with plans to begin construction in June or July 2023.
- The Hotel Sebastopol site is finishing up the State permit for the archeology portion of the building permit phase, with plans to begin construction in the late spring or early summer of 2023.
- 7631 Healdsburg Avenue has applied to convert the ground floor commercial space to two residential units.
- The City will begin scoping sessions soon for two future projects: 1) The Canopy, an 80-unit housing project behind the O'Reilly building at the north end of Sebastopol; and 2) The Barlow Hotel.

The Board asked questions of Associate Planner Jay.

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

5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Vice Chair Hanley disclosed that she went to high school with one of the applicants.

Chair Langberg disclosed that Zac Guerinoni, applicant for item 6.A., Creekside Industrial Park, was once a potential client, but not a client.

6. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT: 6871 Abbott Avenue – Creekside Industrial Park. The applicant is applying to improve outside of the building by installing LED lights to help deter crime and make the nearby trail safer for the people who use it. The lights will be 120 volts, 50 watts, and they will be 5,400 and 6,750 lumens. The casing for the lights will have a dark bronze finish and will be 8-5/8" wide, 9-3/8" tall (with mounting unit), and 3-1/2" deep.

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

Melissa Hanley, Vice Chair

Did we hit our max last year, and did this contribute to hitting the max?

John Jay, Associate Planner

The cycle runs not on a calendar year but a fiscal year, so the cycle ends June 30th of this year, and what's left for remaining balance this year is \$2,500, so Zac would be within that.

Melissa Hanley, Vice Chair

I'm wondering if he took funds from a previous year that now we're basically double dipping and they took funds away from somebody else.

John Jay, Associate Planner

No, I don't believe so. I think he was on the calendar year of last year, but still within this fiscal year cycle.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

How long does the applicant have to submit a request? Can they do work in one fiscal year and apply the next fiscal year?

John Jay, Associate Planner

No, the application has to be put in, the grant is approved, then the work is done, and then the approval of disbursement of those funds is done afterwards, so the work can't be done prior to the grant funds going out; it's meant to go hand-in-hand like that. The last couple of Façade Improvement cycles were a little bit more difficult because the timeline is so short with June 30th being the cutoff for the fiscal year cycle.

Melissa Hanley, Vice Chair

The remaining \$2,500 takes into account the previously approved for Main Street Mercantile?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes.

The applicant gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board had no questions for the applicant.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

Lars Langberg, Chair

As I said earlier, it's how much we give to Zac is somewhat contingent on the next item as well, so can we just roll into that one too, or do we have to approve this one and the money for this one before we get to the second one?

John Jay, Associate Planner

We can go over the second one, and then have further deliberation on disbursement of the overall funds that are left over, and then we can go back.

Lars Langberg, Chair

That makes sense.

B. FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT: 122 N. Main Street – Sunshine River. The applicant is applying to improve the outside of the building by replacing the current awning with a black awning made from Sunbrella material. The applicant is also going to paint the front of the building white with black trim to match the neighboring business Lunchbox.

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

The Board had no questions for Staff.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

Lynn Deedler, Board Member

I have a concern about the application. I find the excessive amount of hard white is just harsh in the middle of the town. The fact that it is Swiss Coffee, if you put that next to a white sheet of paper you can barely tell the difference; that's pretty hard white, especially with the sun shining on it. Quite a few things in our design review guidelines speak against coloring like that, but to sum up a few things: "Preserve the historical nature of the downtown." I've been around 45 years and not seen one white building in the downtown, or anywhere in town. "The buildings should be complementary in form, size, color and should complement existing structures, should be coordinated in regard to colors and materials to achieve harmony. Design should be based on the architectural traditions of Sebastopol and should have a harmonious integration with the community." These white buildings, particularly in a row, stand out hard. The rest of the town has warmer, softer colors that don't pop out so much. I would ask that the color be changed to what it is now or a light cream.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

I had the same feelings about that, and I would agree with Board Member Deedler.

Melissa Hanley, Vice Chair

I disagree. I'm looking at Street View right now. The Basso building is white. Global Village is cream. Artist Supply has a white area above their awning. The work that has been done to Flourish and Lunchbox just crisps up that part of town really beautifully. I don't have a problem approving the white.

Lars Langberg, Chair

We have these two projects to vote on. We don't necessarily mandate paint color on the Design Review Board, but we are approving a Façade Improvement Grant. It's an interesting position to be in; it's less about mandating color than sprucing up the exteriors of our downtown facades. How shall be proceed on this? We can call a vote on both projects and see where that lands.

Melissa Hanley, Vice Chair

We could probably slice it. If the paint color was an issue for the Board, the awning portion of this is \$2,092.50 that we could start to approve pieces of it.

Lars Langberg, Chair

We can take a straw vote on the first item for the lighting and Zac's project, we were all okay with that, and that's just a percentage of what we have left to spend, \$746 of the \$2,500; so whether we approve all of that to Zac and then can determine for the rest, or there is some other division of funds. But I would agree with Vice Chair Hanley that the building needs help to spruce it up and the awning and the paint are both going to do that, so giving some money towards that makes sense to me. It's less about approving colors than just helping offset costs.

Melissa Hanley, Vice Chair

It sounds like the City Council is subtly instructing us to benefit the businesses in the downtown core through this program.

Lars Langberg, Chair

Moving forward we may only be looking at projects in the downtown core. That did occur to me as far as the location of things.

Lynn Deedler, Board Member

For the applicant. Was it your intent to paint the original tile on the building?

Lars Langberg, Chair

The tile below that is above the windows.

Serafina Palandech, Applicant

No.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

Did the 7C project, 236 S. Main Street, already get money paid by the City?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Yes. It's not part of the remaining \$2,500. That project was reviewed by the Board at its last façade improvement meeting where they were generally okay with the project as it is, but wanted to see if there was a possibility to change the design and orientation of the awning to save the window space that's above the building a little bit. The applicant was unable to find anything reasonable, and I did reach out to the Chairs and see if that was acceptable for them to come back with the same proposal the Board has already seen.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

So she was not given any money?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Correct, there was no money dispersed, but the \$2,500 that she's requesting is already accounted for in the overall fiscal year.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

So she could delay her project into the next fiscal year?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Technically, yes, she could.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

So the money we're talking about that we have left goes to two people?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Correct.

Serafina Palandech, Applicant

To be clear on the proposal that I submitted on the two estimates, the proposal for the awning is the entirety of the awning, so it's both over my business and the business next door; it's for Sumbody as well. In order to replace the awning we have to replace it for the entirety of the building. I do believe 122 and Sumbody are not exactly the same building, but they share the awning.

Lars Langberg, Chair

Thank you for that clarification; that's helpful. I guess we should vote on each of these, just yay or nay, and then we can figure out the money apportioning from that point.

John Jay, Associate Planner

That's probably the best way.

Board Member Deedler moved to approve the application for a Façade Improvement Grant to install outdoor lighting for 6871 Abbott Avenue, as submitted

Board Member Balfe seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg, Vice Chair Hanley, and Board Members Balfe and Deedler NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Board Members Bush and Level.

Vice Chair Hanley moved to approve the application for a Façade Improvement Grant to replace the current awning for 122 N. Main Street, as submitted.

Board Member Balfe seconded the motion.

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

Lars Langberg, Chair

Let's have a quick discussion on how to disperse the funds. We have \$2,500 to give to these two worthy candidates. What Zac qualifies for with the program is \$559.80.

John Jay, Associate Planner

So the remaining balance is \$1,940.14.

Lars Langberg, Chair

And that project is eligible for the max \$2,500?

John Jay, Associate Planner

Correct.

Lars Langberg, Chair

There are different ways we could divvy this up. We could give the first project the total of \$559.86 and the remainder to the second project. That's an easy solution. Any other thoughts on how to do this?

John Jay, Associate Planner

I suggest it might be easier to do \$2,000 for Serafina at Sunshine River and then \$500 for Zac at Creekside Industrial Park.

Lars Langberg, Chair

That seems good to me. Since the percentage of one is less than the other.

Vice Chair Hanley moved to approve \$500 for a Façade Improvement Grant for Item 7A, 6871 Abbott Avenue, and \$2,000 for a Façade Improvement Grant for Item 7B, 122 N. Main Street.

Board Member Balfe seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg, Vice Chair Hanley, and Board Members Balfe and Deedler NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Board Members Bush and Level

C. FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT: 236 S. Main Street – Main Street Mercantile. The applicant is applying to improve the outside of the building by replacing the existing awning with a new 13'-4" by 4'-0" Sunbrella awning. The new awning will have 6" letters identifying the business. The color of the awning and letters are to be determined.

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

The Board has no questions for staff.

The applicant gave a presentation and was available for questions.

Donna Waldman, Applicant

I've changed the color. Here's the green that I'm planning on asking for, and the green is a little bit similar to what the color of the building is. We thought that the orange was a little bit too much and it wasn't exactly the same as the paint. This is a beautiful green; it matches the building. We thought the green matches the brown next door for the new restaurant and was less of a contrast. I wanted to explain that there is only 8" between the two sets of windows, so there's really no way for them to do it, but we do have an idea. If I leave the sides open so that there is no awning-like train on each side, when you're walking down the street you will see the windows, because it won't be blocked by the two sides. You won't necessarily be able to see it from the front, but you will be able to see it from the sides. I thought that was a good way to address your concerns.

Chair Lanberg asked for questions of staff or the applicant. Seeing none, he closed public comment and asked for Board deliberations.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

Lynn Deedler, Board Member

I thought that rusty orange that she held up would go really well. I know everyone has a color opinion, but that's exactly the color I thought would work.

Lars Langberg, Chair

I think Donna's comment about opening up the sides of the awning is a really nice move. In some ways the windows are seen more as you approach from the sides than straight on. I was at the Redwood last night and really admiring those windows again on both those buildings, but thank you for that.

Board Member Balfe moved to approve the application for a Façade Improvement Grant to replace the current awning for 236 Main Street, as submitted.

Board Member Deeler seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg, Vice Chair Hanley, and Board Members Balfe and Deedler NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Board Members Bush and Level **D. 231 Petaluma Avenue – Chase Bank.** This item is for Design Review Board consideration for a sign permit and sign exception for Chase Bank, to be located at 231 Petaluma Avenue. The applicant is proposing four non-illuminated signs identifying the business to be placed on the Northern, Southern, and Western sides of the building and one illuminated sign to be placed around the ATM.

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

Chair Lanberg asked for questions of staff.

Marshall Balfe, Board Member

What was the exception?

John Jay, Associate Planner

The exception is for one additional wall sign. The code allows for two wall signs, and they're requesting a third wall sign, so there is one on the south end of the building, the west end, and then I believe the north end.

Lars Langberg, Chair

But to clarify, they're asking for three non-illuminated signs.

John Jay, Associate Planner

I might have David clarify. When we originally spoke it was non-illuminated, but when we reviewed the sign program, I believe it does allow for internal illumination.

Lars Langberg, Chair

It allows for it, but it's not being applied for, according to the applicant. The ATM sign is illuminated, but it's also sort of tucked away.

Chair Langberg asked for further questions of Staff or the applicant. Seeing none, he opened Board deliberation.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

Lars Langberg, Chair

It's an exception because of the multiple frontages of the building, the fact that they're within the size parameter, they're not huge, and they're not illuminated; I think it's pretty low-key for a sign, so it seems good to me.

Board Member Deedler moved to approve the application for a sign permit and sign exception for 231 Petaluma Avenue, as submitted.

Board Member Balfe seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Langberg, Vice Chair Hanley, and Board Members Balfe and Deedler NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Board Members Bush and Level.

7. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Lars Langberg, Chair

The Design Guidelines Subcommittee will meet on April 27th with the City's consultant, Opticos, to put together objective design standards.

8. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Langberg adjourned the meeting at 7:19 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Tree/Design Review Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 23, 2023 at 3:30 P.M.