

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
January 19, 2016
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma, CA
MINUTES**

Chair Randolph called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Chair Randolph, Comms. Barnett, Tippell, Johnson, Essert

Absent: None.

Others Present: Associate Planner Atkins, Planning Director Goodison, Administrative Assistant Morris

Chair Randolph stated that no new items would be heard after 10:30 p.m. unless the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission so decides. Any decisions made tonight can be appealed within 15 days to the City Council. He reminded everyone to turn off cell phones and pagers.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: Mary Martinez, resident, encouraged the public to participate in the discussions regarding the Downtown Design Guidelines by attending the upcoming City sponsored meeting at the Sonoma Community Center on January 25th at 6:30 p.m.

Robert Demler, resident, suggested that all late mail received prior to the meetings be distributed to all interested parties listed on the City's email distribution list.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the minutes of November 17, 2015 and December 15, 2015 with changes noted. Comm. Essert seconded. The motion carried unanimously 5-0.

CHANGES TO AGENDA: None

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail was received on Items #1 from Mary Martinez, and #2 from Lee Parry and Patricia Cullinan.

Item #1 – Continued Design Review – Consideration of new paint colors for a hotel (El Dorado Hotel) at 405 First Street West.

Applicant: El Dorado Hotel

Associate Planner Atkins presented the staff report.

Julie Workman, Moana Restaurant Group, Project Manager for EDI, proposed changing the hotel's façade and presented large visual displays.

Comm. Barnett confirmed that Julie Workman preferred design option 1 or 2.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Mary Martinez, resident, encouraged the Commission to select “warm” paint color.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Tippell appreciated the applicant working with the Commission and supported the revisions made. She preferred option 2 or 3.

Comm. Johnson agreed with Comm. Tippell's comments and supported option 2.

Comm. Barnett complimented the applicant for submitting a complete application that included site history. He preferred option 2.

Comm. Essert supported option 2 because it exudes warmth and contrast.

Chair Randolph agreed with her fellow commissioners and preferred option 2. She appreciated seeing the brand palette since it was very helpful in making a decision.

Comm. Barnett appreciated the new design and agreed with his fellow Commissioners that it was a vast improvement.

Comm. Tippell made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the recommendation for option 2. (Benjamin Moore paint). Comm. Johnson seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Comm. Barnett addressed the public, at the request of Planning Director Goodison, and said it was not necessary for him to recuse from Item # 2 as was requested by Robert Baumann, Robert Baumann & Associates, in a letter.

Item # 2 – Site design and architectural review of proposed alterations and an addition to a residence at 227 East Spain Street.

Applicant: Robert Baumann & Associates

Associate Planner Atkins presented the staff report.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Bill Wisialowski, property owner, proposed a new design to restore the original structure with a connector between the old and new addition. He said the design was inspired by the Barracks and he wanted to make it different.

Comm. Barnett appreciated the new design and questioned whether the applicant responded to direction given or independently preferred a Monterey Colonial home.

Charlene Hunter, neighbor/League of Historic Preservation member, confirmed with the applicant that the tank house will be removed. She is disappointed that many historic homes are being replaced therefore diminishing the neighborhood character forever.

Steve Weingard, next door neighbor, is disappointed with the uninterrupted mass and height and disagreed that the project complied with the Historic District guidelines. He believes that the addition should be set back from the existing structure.

Bill Jasper, resident, felt the project could be compared to the restoration of the "Haunted House" on Fourth Street East.

Cathy Sperring, neighbor, is primarily concerned with the second unit in the back that would compromise her privacy. She viewed the proposal as inconsistent with elements of the Development Code.

Staff noted that accessory buildings are not subject to review by the DRHPC, but are evaluated as part of the building permitting process.

Simon Blattner, neighbor, (20 year resident) stated that while he had no objection in principle to the concept of an addition, he was concerned about potential privacy impacts and hoped that the applicant would address that issue.

Johanna Patri, resident/former President for the League of Historic Preservation complimented the applicant for efforts made to preserve the home. She is of the opinion that the intent of the Secretary of Interior Standards is not to duplicate the structure or to introduce replications of historic structures, but rather to restore in modes that are contemporary but also complementary. She agrees that the Monterey style clashes with the original structure and that the massing of the addition is incompatible.

Mark Parry, architectural historian, stated that the project had been improved by retaining the historic façade and setting back the addition, but he was concerned that the design and materials proposed for the addition, as in his view, they are not subordinate to the original home and the materials selected are a distraction.

Robert Demler, resident/President for the League of Historic Preservation, said that the property owner is member of the League and that George McKale spoke on behalf of the League at the last meeting. He said the League discussed the proposal with the owner but did not have an opinion on the latest design.

Mary Martinez suggested that story poles would be helpful.

Patty DaFerne, resident/former Planning Commissioner, is mainly concerned with the addition and how it might impact views of the property from the street and the neighbor on the east.

Victor Conforti, resident/local architect, expressed reservations regarding current plan. He felt the addition could be viewed as false historicism. He is confident in Robert Baumann's ability to solve the problem of differentiating the design in a revised proposal.

In response to a question from Comm. Barnett, Planning Director Goodison confirmed that detached garages (up to 400 square feet) are exempt from the floor area ratio.

Chair Randolph asked the applicant to return to the lecturn.

Bill Wisialowski, property owner reviewed illustrations for his presentation to respond to the concerns that had been raised and expressed his desire to be flexible. He noted that the grade of the back yard would not be raised and that a drainage plan would be developed and implemented. He agreed with comments that the east elevation could be improved and that the existing house could be better integrated with the new addition.

Commissioner Comments:

Comm. Tippell is sympathetic to the applicant returning for a third review session and she appreciated the preservation of the existing residence and the significant setback associated with the proposed addition. However, she opposed the new design, and would prefer a less contrasting style (i.e. traditional, farmhouse, single story) and suggested a lighter palette and the same roofing style for a harmonious ridge line.

Comm. Johnson applauded the efforts made to preserve the original structure but found the remodel disjointed in terms of its relationship to the original structure. He felt that a design that is more complementary to the existing structure should be used.

Comm. Barnett is pleased that the historic resource is addressed in the revised plan with respect to adhering to specific historic guidelines. He recognized a need to strike a fair balance between the rights of property owners and stringent regulations. His major concern is that the new addition should be subordinate to the original structure. Although there has been tremendous progress made, he did not support the architectural style and is concerned by the unresolved issues expressed by the neighbors. He stated that the addition does not comply with the spirit of the Standards.

Comm. Essert thanked the applicant and agreed with the majority of his fellow commissioner's comments. He recognized the importance of respecting the historic resource. He suggested having story poles so neighbors can better understand the scope of the project. He would prefer a single story addition, if that can be accommodated in the program.

Chair Randolph is concerned with the massing, neighborhood compatibility, and overall style. She agreed with Comm. Essert that the commission's role is not to design the home, but rather to offer suggestions during the review process.

The owner is receptive to the comments made and welcomed another review. He and his team will work in good faith to address all the concerns raised by the Commission.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to continue the item to the next meeting on February 16, 2016. Comm. Essert amended the motion to have the applicant include story poles on site and provide a landscape plan rendering. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item #3 – Sign Review – Consideration of six window signs for a convenience store (Easy Stop Market #1) at 925 Broadway.

Applicant: Easy Stop Market #1

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Barnett confirmed with staff that the existing signs are neon not LED.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Tom Mackin, business owner/tenant, (12 years), commended the store owner for the positive changes made to improve his store front. He recommended a City survey of non-conforming signs and felt it should be uniform throughout the community.

Associate Planner Atkins responded that the City Investigates code enforcement issues on a complaint basis.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Essert supported the six signs.

Comm. Barnett agreed with Comm. Essert that this site might need a variance to allow for additional signage because of its setback location along Broadway/Highway 12.

Comms. Johnson and Tippell applauded the applicant for removing the non-compliant signs.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the proposal for seven window signs at 925 Broadway. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item #4 – Sign Review – Consideration of a new illuminated monument sign for a gas station (76 Service Station) at 19249 Sonoma Highway.

Applicant: United Sign System

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Barnett confirmed that the existing signs were approved in 2014 and the new sign is larger.

Comm. Johnson questioned if all the illegal signs were removed.

Miguel Bunting, business operator, will remove everything on the windows that advertise promotional items. He explained the Phillip 66 corporate office is reverting back to the original logo for branding purposes.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Brian Campbell, Sales Rep//United Sign Systems, said the sign will be similar and placed on the existing base.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comms. Tippell, Barnett, Essert and Chair Randolph supported the new design.

Comm. Johnson concurred and encouraged the applicant to remind outside vendors not to put non-conforming signs up.

Comm. Essert made a motion to approve a new illuminated monument sign for the 76 Service Station at 19249 Sonoma Highway as submitted subject to the conditions of approval that include conformance with California Building Code. Comm. Barnett seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item #5 – Sign Review – Consideration of design review and new canopy signs for a sign for a gas station (76 Service Station) at 19249 Sonoma Highway.

Applicant: Perry Builders, Inc.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Joe Sands, Parry Builders Inc., said that aluminum composite will be used not plastic.

Comm. Barnett confirmed the valiances will be illuminated.

Comm. Essert confirmed with the applicant there will be no audio sound or LED T.V.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

No public Comment.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comms. Tippell and Barnett are satisfied with the new modern branding proposed.

Comm. Essert liked the car wash.

Comm. Johnson made a motion to approve new canopy signs for a sign for a gas station (76 Service Station) at 19249 Sonoma Highway. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item #6 – Sign Review – Consideration of design review for a restaurant (Slice by Mary's), at 14 West Spain Street

Applicant: Michael Ross, AIA

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Barnett inquired when the building was built. Atkins replied that Senior Planner Gjestland determined it was built between 1941 and 1943.

Michael Ross, AIA, Ross Drulis Cusenbery Architecture, Inc., proposed a minor alteration to the building to accommodate a new service for the restaurant. The building underwent a major renovation in 1987.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

No public Comment.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comms. Tippell, Johnson, and Barnett supported the remodel application from a well-respected architect on behalf of a long time business on the Plaza.

Comm. Essert inquired about the windows.

Michael Ross said no changes are proposed for windows or the building's exterior.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve a restaurant addition (Slice by Mary's), at 14 West Spain Street. Comm. Essert seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item #6 – Design Review – Design review of exterior modifications for two vacation rental units at 162-166 West Spain St.

Applicant: Laura Olson

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

No public Comment.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Essert had reservations about the project as proposed. He confirmed with staff that George McKale, Historic consultant, submitted a letter of determination that the door is acceptable.

Comm. Barnett felt the proposal is respectful of the Historic standards.

Comms Tippell, Johnson, and Barnett supported the proposed modifications.

Comm. Johnson made a motion to approve exterior modifications for two vacation rental units at 162-166 West Spain St. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item # 7 – Design Review – Design review for a new single family residence and attached garage at 790 Second Street East.

Applicant: Russell Nobles

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Tippell requested to see the siding samples.

Gary Bishop, representing Russell Nobles Construction, showed building material samples for the home.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

William Burcham, homeowner, stated he spoke with the neighbors and received support for the project.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comms. Johnson and Barnett are impressed with the project and the receptiveness from the neighbors.

Comm. Barnett felt neighbors would have attended the meeting if there was opposition.

Comm. Essert concurred with Comm. Barnett and is pleased with the cleanup efforts.

Chair Randolph agreed that there has been significant improvement made to the property.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve a new single family residence and attached garage at 790 Second Street East. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Postponed to the meeting on February 16, 2016.

Discussion Item #8 – Discussion and review of sign regulations related to commercial real estate signs.

Issues Update: Associate Planner Atkins reported the following;

The Downtown Design Guidelines will be reviewed at a special study session on January 25, 2016, 6:30 p.m. at the Sonoma Community Center.

Associate Planner Atkins proposed action item minutes for the approval of the outstanding minutes from 2015.

All the commissioners agreed this was a good course of action.

Chair Randolph welcomed Comm. Essert as a regular member of the DRHPC.

Comments from the Audience: None

Adjournment: Chair Randolph made a motion to adjourn at 10:21 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 2016. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission on the 16th day of February 2016.

Approved:

Cristina Morris, Administrative Assistant