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 November 03, 2021
4:00 P.M.

The notice of the meeting was posted on October 28, 2021.

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:** None.

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

Director Svanstrom updated the Board on the following:

- The City Council is looking at a potential safe parking for RVs site. The Council considered the Public Works stockyard at a special meeting last week and voted to submit a letter of intent.
- The Huntley Square mini townhome subdivision at 7590 Bodega Avenue will go to the Planning Commission on November 9th. The Planning Commission will provide a recommendation to the City Council.
- The Planning Commission held a design input session for Calder Creek Naturalization project at its October 26th meeting and will discuss it again at its December 14th meeting.
- The Local Hazard Mitigation Plan was presented to the Planning Commission at its October 26th meeting and is now out for public review. The public comment period will close at the end of November and the plan will then be submitted to Cal OES and FEMA for approval.

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

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. PRELIMINARY REVIEW: 333 North Main Street – Habitat for Humanity Townhomes – The applicant is seeking the Design Review and Tree Board's input via a Preliminary Review for a four-unit townhome project located at 333 N. Main Street. Potential entitlements include a proposed subdivision, a use permit, design review, and tree removal permit/tree protection plan. This Preliminary Review will allow the DRB/Tree Board to provide input to the application on the design and tree removal portions of the project.
Note: this is a Preliminary Review only, and no decisions will be made at this meeting. The applicant will need to submit a formal application to proceed with the project.

Associate Planner Jay presented the staff report.

The applicant gave a presentation and was available for questions.

Chair Luthin asked for Board questions of the applicant.

Christine Level, Board Member
Does Habitat for Humanity develop these units and then sell them privately to private owners?

Wayne Kleefeld, CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County
We choose Habitat families, which is between 60-80% of the average median income. This project here will probably average in the 70-80%.

Christine Level, Board Member
Do these become separate properties when you sell them? You will sell them, and individuals will own them, and you will no longer own them?

Wayne Kleefeld, CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County
Correct. These are for sale, yes.

Christine Level, Board Member
Given that, would it be like a condo association or is it like separate properties?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Habitat is a little new to the subdivision process and we've been working with them through this Preliminary Review. They will obviously need to engage a civil engineer as it moves forward, but yes, it would be a townhome subdivision. It would need some sort of an HOA because with connected units and a shared building they would need to share maintenance costs for roofs and things like that.

Christine Level, Board Member
If they were going to try to put in an ADU there would be no chance of doing that, because there is no place to put them. Then you'd have four separate lots here and there really is no place to put an ADU unless it's like a third story ADU or something to that effect?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Right. That's one of the things we explored with them at some point was, because it is basically a condo where everyone will have their own lot with a small piece of land towards the back, but the garage building will be part of the common area since it's shared and they're all in one building, so like a condo you could put something on top of the garage structure, like a detached or semi-attached ADU for one of the townhomes, but I'll let Wayne and Jeff talk about that, because I know they did explore that a little bit.

Christine Level, Board Member
If you were to try to get to that 1.0 number, could you put one unit on top of the garages and get to that 1.0? How much more square footage do you need to meet that 1.0?

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
Our first proposal would be that the City consider excluding the easement area, in which case we are over 1.0, but if that isn't acceptable then I believe 0.89 is the number we're at currently, so it wouldn't require much, but again, it is a challenge to build something over that shared garage space.

Ted Luthin, Chair
Christine, to answer your question, I think to get to 1.0 if you did consider the entire site area, not the easement area, the site area is 7,286 and what's proposed is 6,500, so you've got a split of 750 square feet.

Christine Level, Board Member
One more question for Habitat. You've got the 60-80% of median income qualifies you to buy one of these units, so what do you do? Do you down-price them so that they could qualify, because presumably they're getting a loan? How does that work?

Wayne Kleefeld, CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County
We look to Cal Loans funding; we look at CDC, Community Development Commission, funding; we do fundraising; and if we have the available funds, we subsidize it. We work hard to put together a funding package to bring the cost of the home down where these families can afford a mortgage to purchase it. Sebastopol as well, we'll be knocking on their door to see if they've got any change in their pockets that they can help toward the project.

Cary Bush, Board Member
The question I have revolves more around the grading and the civil aspect of the project, the garage entrances and exits, and looking at the grading plan as proposed. You guys really feel like that will work, given existing cross-slopes that are there and such? You've got to step these garages and meeting a percentage, what is your analysis?

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
The next step, assuming that we get positive feedback today, is to get our civil engineer, who has already done a survey of the property, on board to help us survey the property again. The challenge is that that drive currently is fairly steep going up there, so trying to create the steps in the garage elevations to correspond to the grades that exist there is really what we're gesturing, but actually looking at how that transition occurs and to allow you to get into these units is certainly more of an engineering exercise that we haven't done yet.

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
This is a very tricky site, and it's one of the reasons that it hasn't been developed up until now, so we're doing the best we can to come up with a design that is cost effective for

Habitat to construct, but at the same time is going to be a benefit to the community, and that's obviously the challenge.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
I have one question that is architectural planning related, but also Habitat's model. Did you consider three- or four-story buildings that would give you more rentable space or sellable units potentially, both economically and architecturally?

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
Are you talking about just more units, not a three- or four-story individual unit?

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
Either one. Architecturally thinking, just going up higher even for the urban quality, and if you did that, would it give you more of an economic edge?

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
Obviously, higher density, taller building is certainly a model that we're going to be seeing in a lot of areas. In general, those are for-rent units, but Habitat's model is not to be a landlord, it's to create and sell, and so we didn't feel that that model lent itself to what Habitat was trying to accomplish. These are fairly narrow structures as it is, so going up a third floor and trying to narrow them up into more of a row house type scenario didn't lend itself either. Also, additional square footage for these individual homeowners would just drive the price up. It sounds like I'm giving you lots of excuses, but these are all things that were part of the conversation that we had.

Christine Level, Board Member
What is the square footage of each of these units?

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
Each of the units is 1,350 square feet.

Christine Level, Board Member
And what is the square footage on the garages?

Jeff Bousfield, Jeff Katz Architecture
Each one of the garages is approximately 22 feet deep and they vary a little bit in width, but a minimum of 12 feet wide.

Chair Luthin asked for additional Board questions. Seeing none, he opened public comment.

Bob Severson, a member of the public
I live in one of the units directly behind this proposed unit, so I have quite a few questions. I don't see how anybody could possibly park in the garages. There's no way somebody could pull into one of those garages. The other thing is that's a private driveway that's owned by the two associations that are behind these units, so it's kind of weird that it's part of the proposal that that driveway that's privately owned is going to be used to access garages for these units. It's really hard to pull out of here now without any dwellings here, because you can't see down the street, and the garages are sticking out beyond the units themselves as well. I'm the furthest south unit, so my house is actually held up by the retaining wall that's there now, and in looking at the plans it looks like they're going to build another retaining wall beyond that, and my question is do they know what the footing is on the retaining wall now?

Patricia Deignan, a member of the public
I am Bob's neighbor, and I'm the other unit directly adjacent to this site. First, I'm actually excited about the idea of this lot finally getting built out, and really excited about it being Habitat, so this is not a NIMBY thing at all; we were just trying to make the best possible project. It's my understanding that there is a height restriction, an easement on the property, so when you were talking about three or four stories, I don't think that would work. The only other thing that I have at this point is window placements. I am concerned based on these drawings, and I know they're preliminary and I know they're kind of rough, but I am concerned that I will be standing at my kitchen and looking into someone's bedroom, so I'm hoping that the designers are taking that into account.

Chair Luthin thanked the speakers for their comments and asked if there were other speakers. Seeing none, he asked the applicant to respond the speakers' questions.

Ted Luthin, Chair
The question regarding the use of the driveway, is that permitted, negotiated? How does that work?

Wayne Kleefeld, CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County
We've identified it as something on our checklist of dealing with getting a joint easement on the road, but we haven't pursued it at this point.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
I know our City Engineer, Joe Gaffney, looked into it, and I'll try to look for the email about that. My understanding is that he did identify that there was an access easement for this parcel to utilize that as a driveway. When we get into a formal application we will have a title report, and it's supposed to include all the various easements, view restrictions, things like that. I will note, Patricia, your question about the view easement. Often those are private easements, and if they're only recorded on your property but not theirs it will not show up, so if there is information on that, please do let the Planning Department know.

Ted Luthin, Chair
The other question was about the existing retaining wall. Jeff, I'm not sure you've gotten this far to where you know anything structurally about that existing retaining wall.

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
We are doing some investigation on that existing retaining wall, but our responsibility will be to make sure that we properly shore up during the course of construction so that there is no movement in that wall, and design our wall to take on any imposed loads from that existing wall. It's one of the challenges and one of the reasons that we have held off on doing much more exploration of it. Obviously, if we can come up with alternatives that involve less retaining, that would better for everybody, so part of the next step on this project is to do that exploration.

Ted Luthin, Chair
That's really what the preliminary review is all about, bringing these issues to light to see what can be done about them.

Bob Severson, a member of the public
If there is an easement granted for them to use the driveway as access to their garages, where does that leave our association with the upkeep on the driveway if somebody is going to be using it?

Ted Luthin, Chair
I'm not sure this project is there yet, but I'm guessing some sort of agreement.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Usually those are an agreement that is part of the easement agreement when the easement was created, and that's legally binding, or if there's not, then it's still governed by civil code in terms of responsibilities and how to portion out costs and those types of things. But like I said, if there is an actual easement, we would look to the easement language for what that means.

Ted Luthin, Chair
The only other thing I will add, Bob, in response to your concern about the access to the garage being usable is when this does come as a formal review by the City there are standards for turning radiuses and access to parking and all those sorts of things, so it will need to meet those standard City details.

Bob Severson, a member of the public
They are pretty small garages, and my concern too is that they'll be used as garages but more used as a driveway and the cars will be sticking out into the roadway. What's going to be handled as far as the garbage for these units? I don't even see that in the plan.

Ted Luthin, Chair
That's a good point.

Chair Luthin closed public comment and asked for Board deliberations, reminding Board members that as this is a Preliminary Review there would be no action taken on the item, and the three issues to consider: 1) overall site design; 2) building design; and 3) tree protection plan. Chair Luthin began with overall site design.

Cary Bush, Board Member
It would be good to see the civil plan, some reality to the grading issues that are being discussed. It's going to be interesting to see the flavor of the project come to life from a site development perspective, such as how they address the fishbowl effect, as Patricia put it, and understanding the vehicle access and how that's presented in regard to the existing driveway. I think most of the things were covered, and the presentation is preliminary, so it will be good to see the project in its entirety. It's exciting to see some of the thought that went behind it. It's good to see some preliminary work, so I commend the applicant for that, but ultimately it's going to be more of a detailed landscape plan to see if we have a project, which I think we do. It would be interesting to see where the garbage goes and how we access the garbage, those sorts of things. Some of the spaces that come to life are going to be related to the scale of the project, and that would be of course vertical scale as well as how it fits within the site. But overall, a great project and good to see this site become useful.

Ted Luthin, Chair
It's one of those sites that I've walked and driven by for years and said why hasn't anybody done anything with this? And now I think I know: it's a challenging site. It's got cross-slopes; it's got front to back; it's got existing retaining, easements, those sorts of things; it's a tricky site. I agree it's nice to see a proposal come here.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
This is sort of site and architecture, but putting the entrances for the cars on the side and not having them right on the main street was a nice move. Having to take down mature

trees is never good and if there is any way to avoid that, it would be nice. I was walking this morning on the upper property. They have a little walkway back to their courtyard, and it just feels like they would be on full display to whoever is in their back yard, so that relationship, whether it's from the windows up above, like Patricia was saying, but even from the outdoor spaces looking down into this site, is going to be very tricky to make that a pleasant experience for everybody; it's the nature of the contour. Otherwise, I'm very excited to have it as a possibility and have Habitat working on it. Those are my only site comments.

Christine Level, Board Member
It's difficult for me to separate the site and building design. It's a difficult site and that's why it's never been developed; it just doesn't pencil out with the conditions within the site. But since this is a preliminary design, I'm going to comment much more generally. These types of buildings and floor plans, it's the same old thing you see everywhere, this formula of this living condition with these units, and I want to believe that we humans can come up with something better than this for people to live in, and something more creative in use of land. Every single one of these projects we look at is virtually the exact same floor plan, and it's depressing to me. The units themselves, the problem is trying to divide it into these living units, because if we had the whole site, not having these property lines, maybe we could come up with something more vibrant and creative that people can live in besides these little boxes like this with no air flow, light on two sides only, and no cross-ventilation. The site itself, I just did a little bit of math on it, and I don't see how you make this into anything affordable on a $48,000 income. Your basic prices today for these sorts of cracker boxes are $400-$450 a square foot, and that doesn't include land costs. It seems like there's got to be a way we can do better to come up with something affordable. I know this is outside the box, and I know we're going to end up back at these units, but I just have to say this for the sake of humanity, that we could come up with something better for people to live in that's actually affordable, and I don't know exactly what that is, but here we go again. I guess this is the way that people who don't make a lot of income have to live. I don't believe that personally. Getting to the site, I'm not sure about those trees in the southeast corner of the site. Are those mature cypress trees part of the site or are they on the neighbor's property?

Bob Severson, a member of the public
They belong to the house to the south.

Wayne Kleefeld, CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County
Correct.

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
A couple of the trees pretty much straddle the property line, but they are predominantly the homeowner to the south, who we have been in communication with. We have explored what it would take to move the retaining wall and get outside of the canopy of those trees to try to save them, and the City had an arborist go out and look at them. One of the trees is not in great condition and the others are in good condition currently, but short of loosing a unit at this point we have not come up with a solution that would allow construction to happen without damaging the trees.

Christine Level, Board Member
I talked to the City Arborist myself personally about these trees, so I think the general feeling is if you put that retaining wall in as you have shown, you will be removing those trees; they're not going to make it. There are some mature trees there; that's a reality.

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
Correct.

Ted Luthin, Chair
I more or less agree with what's been said. I'm glad to see a project on this site. I understand the Habitat for Humanity model, and I like that. I like that they're going to be for sale units, but I also understand that that makes some of the site planning a little more difficult. When we updated the General Plan and we talked about floor area ratio I think we knew that that was going to be a challenge for properties exactly like this: these smaller lots that are difficult to park and still meet the floor area ratio requirement. If we did get another 700 square feet, a couple of ADUs on this thing, and we got a couple more parking spaces we need to provide, it just doesn't work, so I think when we wrote that we kind of knew that there were going to be properties like that that were going to be a challenge and they were going to need some solution to it. But in general I like the site plan. I'm a little concerned about the retaining wall. I know it's going to be a tall one, and so for the back patio of the southern unit is pretty much going to be at the bottom of a retaining wall and I don't know what can be done about it. I'm not sure anything can be done about that. On one hand, I agree with Christine's analysis that we see this floor plan often. On the other hand, I've lived in little townhomes, and I think one of the reasons we see this floor plan is it's pretty livable. I've lived in a number of houses in San Francisco and other places that have the typical townhome floor plan: you walk in, there's the staircase, and they've all been pretty decent places to live, so sorry Christine, I don't know that I share your hatred of the little in row house townhome. In general, I would like to see more information come forward in terms of civil obviously, and in trees and landscape. If we're going to lose those trees, what are we going to do about a landscape plan to mitigate that and to replace them somehow and make sure that we have some living things on this property? That's going to be important as we move forward, both the civil and landscape plans. That's about all I had on site-specific stuff. I think we've also sort of covered tree protection plan; I think we talked about that at the same time as site. Let's go back around one more time for architectural input.

Cary Bush, Board Member
I don't know if I have much to add to the conversation here. I know they're probably trying to make it affordable since the families trying to own these are on a fixed income, or at least a limited income, and everything is expensive to live here, so I'm leaving it to the pros to work out that matrix. There's a complicated site here that's going to have its challenges, and a certain percentage even to site development is going to absorb some of that fee, and then the architecture is probably trying to counterbalance that percentage. I think overall it's fitting within its context. That's what we're here to review, that's the guidelines that we consistently have looked at, so therefore I think it's fitting. Color-wise, it's all the same; it's great.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
To me there's something about the expression of the buildings that is a little bit what Christening was harkening to, that they're fitting into this, for lack of better words, cutesy little architecture that Sebastopol has, or has had, and I wish there was room to do more and be more inventive. It comes at a cost, I know that, but if Habitat is raising money, can they raise a little bit more money to do something more interesting? That's coming from somebody who is not involved in that process at all, so I know that's sort of a glib statement, but I live right around the corner and there are some lovely little bungalows and that's what Sebastopol is, but this is Main Street, this is Highway 116. There's a Safeway across the street. The scale is completely different than if you go around the corner, and I think the scale of this should reflect that more. There could be windows that go two stories,

or different massing. I think you certainly get more opportunity to do that if you go three stories or four stories; that's one of the reasons I brought that up. Can you make it condominiums instead of single-family homes as far as your economic model? I don't know if that works, but do a one-story ADU and a two-story building and those are each condos that are for sale. It feels like you're marching down this very busy urban corridor, and to put kind of a cutesy little thing with a porch and a window, it's fine, I don't have a big problem with it, I just wish there was opportunity to do something more interesting, provocative, more urban, that could raise the level of design we have in our community. One other point, I'm sure Habitat takes this into account, but every project I address now starts with the impact on the climate, and that's a good way to raise money too. We haven't talked about that, but I think features of this project that are green building that have to be efficient, that are resource efficient, needs to be part of the discussion for sure.

Christine Level, Board Member
Do we have street parking in this location? I can't remember. Is there parking in front, or is that red zoned?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
There is parking in front. There is straight parking.

Ted Luthin, Chair
Yes, there is parallel parking.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
I think there are about four spaces along this frontage.

Christine Level, Board Member
Parking is an issue, obviously. Even if you have a house like this and you've got one parking in the garage or the driveway, it's much more realistic to assume that there's going to be two cars per unit. In going back to this overall concept here, with the cost per square footage I'm looking at $540,000 at $400 per square foot to build each unit. That's not sounding like low-income to me. I don't hate townhouses; I'm trying to break out of the box here. This concept of condos is interesting. We've seen this all over Central Europe. It's great, because they get high-density in somewhat like the same building bulk, because if you're going up you still only have one roof, so you go up another story. I'm just brainstorming here, but you're still going to have the same foundation and the same roof, but more units, and I believe the new General Plan allowed for an increase in height. Do we have an increase in height in this location now under the new plan? I think we do, so you could go up. I think we're not within the height restriction here, is that correct?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
That's correct. This is the Downtown zone. We have two different residential development standards that we look at. For Downtown, it's 40 feet or three stories, but it can go up to 50 feet—I'm not saying this is appropriate in this site or construction technologies—and four stories if it is allowed for projects with residential uses. Those require a conditional use permit and appropriate height transitions and massing to adjoining sites, so the base zoning is 40 feet and three stories.

Christine Level, Board Member
So, this could be taller. If you had taller, if you went with more like the condo kind of a thing and you went taller, then you would still have one roof, one foundation, but you'd have a lot more units. You look at this idea of affordability, everybody likes to throw that word around, but like at the Hollyhock, the way they made those units "affordable" is they

put those people on 40-year loans, so yes, their monthly payment was lower, but they were just immediately under water, and is that beneficial for people? I'm looking at the cost of construction and the cost of land in California, that's the difference driving it up, and what can we do and how can we think differently about that? That's all I'm asking is to try to go outside the box and think differently about how we can really provide real, truly affordable units, and I don't think that this formula is ever going to get there. I'm not disregarding the idea here. If these were not affordable but just regular projects for sale at market rate, in today's market they'd probably be like $750,00, but that's not what you guys are trying to do here. You're trying to actually provide affordable housing, and maybe there's a way to do it and maybe there isn't, maybe this is the best we can do. This may come back later as an application like this and that will be fine. I'm just suggesting that we can do better than this in terms of what we're thinking. And Lars is saying maybe it costs a little bit more money. I don't think that creative, good design has to cost more money; we just have to think about it differently. I'm just taking this opportunity today to plead with humanity here. We can do better.

Ted Luthin, Chair
I appreciate that, Christine, and I get what you're saying. The trick with more units is more parking, because I totally agree that with four units you are going to have probably eight parking spots, just realistically. You're going to have one in the garage and one on the street.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
Could they park across the street?

Christine Level, Board Member
That's what I'm thinking. Is there any way we can creatively start to think about something like that?

Ted Luthin, Chair
We as a city need to start thinking about collective parking, but that's not going to happen fast enough to accommodate this. I do think it is interesting to think outside the box, and maybe it's actually think inside the box. Is one structure, one roof, more economical and affordable divided up into condos or something like that?

Christine Level, Board Member
If you had eight units instead of four units in the same footprint you would still have one roof and one foundation. That's why I'm starting to think about this kind of thing. You're driving your overall cost of construction down per unit square footage when you start to do that.

Ted Luthin, Chair
In terms of architecture, just talking about what we have rather than what we might have, the basic row house is recognizable; it's almost iconic. I like the change of direction and materials. I understand it needs to be affordable and efficient construction, so we don't have a lot of expensive detailing, but I like that there is some variation in siding and directional materials. I would like something to happen on that one end garage wall. That is going to be a tall wall, so rather than a big, blank wall with a door, a landscape solution or a green screen or something different there would be nice. But just talking about what we have, I think the canopies break it up and I like the little jog in elevation; it's the little things. The work seems to be efficient and still affordable, so it's nice to see someone trying to give an affordable unit some design character. Would something more urban or contemporary looking work here as well? I think we'd all be open to that. I don't know that

any of us are really married to the more traditional Sebastopol bungalow townhome sort of thing, but I don't know that any of us are adamantly opposed to it either. I think it's a nice looking project and it sounds like everybody else does too. I think in general it sounds like we're supportive of the project and would like to see it move forward and see some more details. I think you heard it from the Planning Commission as well. If you can get some more units on there we'd certainly welcome that and the Planning Commission would probably work with you on parking or whatever they need to work with you on.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
I think overall it's a great presentation for preliminary review. Thank you for coming forward. We'd be excited to have more housing here, have Habitat here, no question. I look forward to what comes next, and hopefully we can make this site work.

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
We certainly appreciate the feedback we've gotten, and on a personal and professional level I love the discussion that you were having about trying to push the boundaries, and whether or not it's appropriate for this project is certainly something that we'll continue to discuss, but I commend you as a group for pushing that. I think architecturally we took the approach of trying to do something that fit in, and we're hearing you say that fitting in isn't the only solution, so that's certainly something we can go back and have a conversation about creating something that maybe has its own character, that has more of an urban feel there. I've taken notes here and I appreciate all of the input. It's certainly something that we'll continue to explore and we're hopeful that we'll be able to bring a project back to you and address probably not all, but some, of the comments we've heard here today.

Chair Luthin asked the Board for any final comments.

Cary Bush, Board Member
I think everyone said it well. It's a safe project, sure, but to hear that as a parting note was really quite inspiring and I'm definitely encouraged, so thank you.

Christine Level, Board Member
Jeff, I want to encourage you to think about this one. I'm certainly not opposed to something that's different and not fitting in. I don't think there's really anything that fits in with Sebastopol, so I say put your best creative mind to it and I would like to see what you could do. I think you can do it.

Ted Luthin, Chair
I agree. That concludes our meeting. Look forward to seeing you again. As Lars said, thank you for bringing the project forward and for the work you've done. Really appreciate it.

Jeff Katz, Architect/Applicant
Thanks again, we really appreciate all of the input.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
John, can you review the upcoming meeting schedule?

John Jay, Associate Planner
We had originally had the First Street project that was going to come back for the DRB's review of the language in regard to house size and what's allowable for those three lots. After speaking to the applicants they want to provide a little bit more information on their end as to what they feel is acceptable and more robust project detail, so we are going to move that meeting from November 17th to December 1st. The City Attorney will also attend

that meeting for any concerns or questions as it relates to the legalities of those terms in that resolution.

Cary Bush, Board Member
Thanks, John, but I'll be out of Dodge that whole entire week.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
I'm gone that day. I'm gone that first part of the week, including that Wednesday.

Ted Luthin, Chair
I'm actually gone the entire month of December.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
The 15th works for me, but maybe not for Ted.

Ted Luthin, Chair
I might be able to Zoom in.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
I anticipate the meetings will still be virtual at that point. It's on the consent calendar for our next Council meeting, but they have certainly extended it at this point.

Ted Luthin, Chair
Yes, I could probably Zoom in on the 15th.

Cary Bush, Board Member
I think I'm available as well.

John Jay, Associate Planner
Then I will let them know that the 15th will more than likely be the next available meeting for us to present that project to you guys, and then for them to also provide any comments or concerns that they might have.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
And it would actually give them more time, which they might appreciate. For the November 17th meeting, and this is specific to Lars and Christine, I am looking into whether we can schedule a Design Guidelines Subcommittee that day, since that meeting is hopefully already on your calendars. If you could for now reserve that time, that would be great.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
You're saying just at our typical meeting time, or before?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
That's up to you. If we could move it earlier, that's always helpful for me, but if needed we can do it at 4:00. I anticipate you'll probably need about an hour.

Lars Langberg, Vice Chair
I can do it any time that afternoon.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Christine, what about you for that afternoon on November 17th in lieu of the regular Design Board meeting?

Christine Level, Board Member
I left it open for the other meeting, so that's fine. If you want to bump it a little bit earlier I can make that work.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Great, I will confirm that as soon as I hear from the other two members and I'll let them know.

Christine Level, Board Member
As soon as you know the time, that would be really super to find out.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
It won't be any earlier than 3:00 for sure, I can tell you that because I've got another meeting. Then, John, can you talk about the tour?

John Jay, Associate Planner
I sent out that list to you guys to see if you had anything additional to add on as far as project sites that we want to go check out. I am still in the process of making the Google Maps digital tour, and then I will send that out as well. It's possible to make it an agenda item. I know with the time constraints we may not be able to get to all of the sites. Does City Hall work for everybody as a starting point, or does it make more sense to start at the first project and then go from there?

Ted Luthin, Chair
That's fine for me.

Cary Bush, Board Member
We know where it is.

Christine Level, Board Member
City Hall is fine for me.

John Jay, Associate Planner
Perfect, so we'll start off with whatever we can accomplish in that two-hour timeframe, and then whatever is left over we'll schedule for another time and go from there. And like I mentioned, it doesn't have to be all the bad eggs of projects past.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
It will be a mix hopefully. We'll get the Exchange Bank in there for sure, because that's the interesting one.

Ted Luthin, Chair
That sounds good.

Cary Bush, Board Member
I'm looking forward to it really. It's a great idea, and I'm glad we'll get to do it.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
I've asked John to try to arrange to be at a restaurant or something with outdoor seating in case we want to hang out afterwards a little bit.

Ted Luthin, Chair
That sounds good too.

Cary Bush, Board Member
We can do that, yeah.

John Jay, Associate Planner
That's all that I have as far on the upcoming agendas. Like I said, once I get that tour set up I will send that out to you guys as soon as possible so you can get ready for that and re-jog your memories of those projects.

8. **SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES –** None.

9. **ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 5:21 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Tree/Design Review Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 18, 2021 at 4:00 P.M.