

**CITY OF SONOMA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
March 13, 2014**

Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma, CA

MINUTES

Chair Roberson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma, CA

Roll Call:

Present:	Chair Roberson, Comms. Edwards, Felder, Heneveld, Howarth, Cribb (Alternate)
Absent:	Comm. Willers
Others	Planning Director Goodison, Senior Planner Gjestland, Associate Planner
Present:	Atkins, Administrative Assistant Morris

Chair Roberson stated that no new items would be heard after 10:30 p.m. unless the Planning 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. Comm. Cribb led the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: No Public Comments

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. Edwards made a motion to approve the minutes of February 13, 2014 with the changes noted. Comm. Howarth seconded. The motion carried 6-0-1 (Comm. Tippell abstained).

CHANGES TO AGENDA ORDER: None

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail was received regarding items 4 and 5.

Item #1 – Public Hearing – Continued review of a Use Permit to operate a mobile food trolley on a commercial property at 455 West Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: TIPS Tri-Tip/Innovative Properties & Development LLC

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Cribb asked staff if there would be sufficient room between the back of the trolley and building to accommodate an accessible path of travel. Staff indicated there appeared to be sufficient room and noted that ADA upgrades are typically triggered by a building permit, which would not be an element of this project.

Comm. Howarth questioned whether the bathrooms are ADA compliant. Staff said it is doubtful since they are the original bathrooms.

Commissioners questioned how the secondary striping would function. Planning Director Goodison suggested using a contrasting color for the parking striping to differentiate it from the drive-through lanes.

Chair Roberson expressed concern about traffic flow and supported a temporary use permit for the trolley as a means of evaluating the project.

Chair Roberson opened the item to public comment.

Andrew Pryfogle, applicant, noted that an alternative site layout was considered but they felt the proposed plan was safer because it separates customers from the parking area. He confirmed the picnic table would be folded and stored behind the building when the trolley was not operating and that power to the trolley would be run overhead from the building. A contrasting striping color for the additional parking was proposed to differentiate it from the drive-through lanes, however another option would be to use temporary striping.

Comm. Howarth confirmed that the slope in front of the building prevents parking the trolley there. He suggested consideration of an alternative layout, with the trolley at the back of the site and parking in front of the building.

Andre Pryfogle, applicant, requested that the Planning Commission approve the proposed layout and if there are issues consider those and make adjustments as necessary when they come back to the commission in October. He also requested that the trolley be allowed to be park on-site overnight.

Nick Grimm, owner of Café Scooteria/Sorento Imports, spoke in support of the proposed site plan and confirmed that the building's power supply is located in the office directly behind the proposed trolley location.

Chair Roberson closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Tippell stated that he likes the proposed site plan and would be in favor of approving the Use Permit as conditioned by staff.

Comm. Felder stated that the site plan is decent and he is willing to support the proposal on a provisional basis. However, he did not support the trolley being parked on-site when not operating due to parking impacts.

Comm. Tippell clarified that he is not in favor of striping the additional parking spaces any color, as this would be confusing and visually chaotic. Planning Director Goodison confirmed that Comm. Tippell would prefer signage or some other method for identifying the additional parking, which could be reviewed by the DRHPC.

Comm. Edwards concurred with Comm. Tippell about not striping the additional parking and stated that he cannot support the trolley on-site overnight or when not operating.

Comm. Cribb supported the site plan but felt that an accessible path of travel should be provided from the handicap parking space to the service side of the trolley. Comm. Cribb could only support the trolley being parked overnight if it were to leave the site 30 minutes prior to opening of the coffee service.

Comm. Howarth opposed allowing the trolley to stay on-site overnight and preferred having the trolley at the back of the site, but noted this can be reviewed when the Use Permit is reconsidered in October 2014.

Comm. Cribb made a motion to approve the Use Permit with modifications to the conditions of approval specifying that a four-foot wide path of travel shall be provided from the existing handicap space to the service side of the trolley, and the three new spaces west of the trolley shall be identified by signage or alternative means, subject to review and approval by the DRHPC. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried 6-1 Comm. Howarth opposed.

Item #2 – Public Hearing – Consideration of an Exception to the side yard setback requirements to construct a residential addition at 264 Wilking Way.

Applicant/Property Owner: Daniel Strening, Architect/Steve Zocchi

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Felder confirmed with staff that the addition meets the combined side yard setback requirement.

Chair Roberson opened the item to public comment.

Daniel Strening, project Architect, stated that they wanted to build off the existing wall line for the addition and the proposal is typical for the neighborhood.

Chair Roberson closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Howarth appreciated the property owner respecting the character of the neighborhood.

Comm. Felder made a motion to approve an Exception to the side yard setback requirements to construct a residential addition. Comm. Edwards seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Item #3 – Public Hearing – Consideration of an Exception to the accessory structure height standards to construct a second floor residential accessory room over an existing detached garage at 725 East Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: James and Larissa McCalla

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed with staff that the garage, as modified, would still meet the standard for off-street parking.

Comm. Cribb confirmed with staff that the proposed accessory room would not be considered another dwelling unit.

Chair Roberson opened the item to public comment.

Norm Oliver, project Designer, noted the following points: 1) the request is only for an additional 1.5 feet of height above the 18-foot height limit; 2) the immediate neighbors support the project; 3) the garage sits in somewhat of a hole with taller buildings around; 4) the second-floor addition

is architecturally compatible with the residence; and 5) the Planning Commission should review the merits of each request on a case by case basis.

Comm. Cribb expressed concern about the bathroom included in the upstairs addition since future uses cannot be determined and the intended use may change. Mr. Oliver emphasized the applicants would primarily use the space for sewing projects that now occupy the garage; however the room may also function as a workout area and the bathroom would be convenient in that regard.

Chair Roberson closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Tippell noted he was the project manager for the subdivision at one point and initial site planning included multiple detached casitas/guest rooms as they are very practical. He emphasized that if these types of features are not approved as part of a larger development plan, then they have to be reviewed on a case by case basis by the Planning Commission. He appreciated seeing the neighbor support for the project.

Comm. Edwards agreed with Comm. Tippell. He noted the courtyard on the adjoining property to the east and considered decreased sunlight from the project. However, the neighbors are not concerned so it is not material.

Comm. Cribb indicated he cannot support the proposal because it is inconsistent with the approved design guidelines for the subdivision.

Comm. Felder concurred with Comms. Tippell and Edwards in support of the Exception.

Comm. Edwards made a motion to approve the Exception to construct the second-floor addition. Comm. Tippell seconded. The motion carried 5-2 Comm. Cribb and Comm. Heneveld opposed.

Item #4 – Public Hearing – Consideration of an Exception to the fence height standards for over height fencing on a residential property at 620 Este Madera Court.

Applicant/Property Owner: John MacConaghy

Comm. Heneveld recused himself due to a conflict of interest and left the room.

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Planning Director Goodison stated that there might be a disagreement between the owner of the subject property and an adjoining property owner with respect to property boundaries and other issues. However, to date, no correspondence has been submitted to that effect.

Comm. Howarth confirmed with staff that the fence standards have changed since the 1970's.

Chair Roberson opened the item to public comment.

John MacConaghy, applicant, explained that he inherited the home with lots of deferred maintenance and hired a local fencing contractor to replace the fence, which was falling over. Mr. MacConaghy is pleased with staff and is disappointed with the neighbors' reaction to the

improvements made to his property. He presented a photo from 1951 to illustrate the difference from the original fence height to current standards.

Alexandra Thomas, neighbor, does not oppose the changes made to the fence or allowing an exception to the fence height standards.

Heidi Danielly, neighbor/landlord, disagreed with the applicant's comments. Her viewpoint is that the 8-foot fence installed along her property line was not a true replacement structure because the height of the original fence that it replaced was only six feet and of a grape-stake design. She requested that this section of the fence be lowered to six feet.

Chair Roberson closed the item to public comment.

Planning Director Goodison highlighted the portion of the fence on the shared property line that is disputed.

Comm. Edwards stated that it was his understanding that the fence height was only discovered when the property was cleared.

Comm. Tippell expressed frustration that so many fence height exceptions are before the Planning Commission because homeowners and contractors say they are not aware of the regulations.

Comm. Howarth suggested that companies are notified of the guidelines when they apply and renew their City business license.

Comm. Felder confirmed with staff that no exception is needed if just maintenance of the fence.

Comm. Cribb never agreed with granting changes based on the excuse of not knowing the rules.

Chair Roberson is annoyed with the process and the perception of leniency by the Commission when exceptions are made. He walked the property and sees nothing out of the ordinary in comparison to other fences in the neighborhood.

Comm. Edwards made a motion to uphold the exception from all elements of the application. Comm. Howarth seconded. The motion was approved 5-1 Chair Roberson opposed. Comm. Heneveld recused.

Item #5 – Public Hearing – Consideration of a Use Permit to operate three former residences on two commercial properties as vacation rental units at 158, 164 and 172 West Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Michael Marino/Marino Enterprises LLC

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

Comm. Howarth confirmed with staff that the building at 158 West Napa Street is an historical resource under CEQA but the other two buildings at 164 and 172 West Napa Street are not. Comm. Howarth also clarified with staff that exterior building modifications beyond maintenance and in-kind replacement would be subject to review by the DRHPC.

Comm. Tippell confirmed with staff that the residence at 158 West Napa St. is historically significant due to its architecture.

Comm. Cribb confirmed that conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is for exterior building modifications only and that interior changes are not subject to review.

Chair Roberson opened the item to public comment.

Michael Marino, applicant, emphasized that he does not intend to diminish the integrity of the buildings, but noted they require renovation due to their age. His overall plan is to create a "bungalow court" hotel development with up to ten rooms/units that would fit Sonoma. Conversion of the three front buildings to vacation rental use as requested would be the first phase; however, the current application is important even if the long-term plan is ultimately not approved. Mr. Marino noted that he has successfully operated four vacation rentals in Sonoma Valley for many years.

Comm. Tippell inquired about the plan for the duplex at the back of the west parcel. The applicant indicated that he ultimately plans on demolishing the building and will leave it unoccupied in the meantime.

Comm. Howarth asked about occupancy of the front buildings. The applicant responded that they are all empty except for 164 West Napa St., which is still occupied by KSVY who should be leaving by the end of March.

Karla Noyes, resident, spoke in support of the project but asked that exterior modifications to all three structures conform to the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Chair Roberson closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Felder commended Mr. Marino on a good proposal and indicated that he looks forward to considering the second phase.

Comm. Tippell concurred and stated that he likes the adaptive re-use nature of the project.

Comm. Howarth concurred and added that he is impressed by the applicant's renovation of the former residence at 853 Broadway for vacation rental use.

Comm. Edwards concurred and noted the proposal leaves some breathing room downtown and encourages pedestrian activity.

Comm. Felder made a motion to approve the Use Permit to operate the three former residences at 158, 164, and 172 West Napa Street as vacation rental units. Comm. Edwards seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Item #6 – Public Hearing-Update of the City of Sonoma Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Tippell valued the importance of the City of Sonoma Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. He confirmed the location of the Class II bicycle route on Eighth Street East.

Comms. Tippell, Felder and Chair Roberson thanked Associate Planner Atkins for her work on the master plan.

Comm. Cribb referenced page 39 under Bicycle Collisions, he understood from media outlets that a bicyclist was riding on the sidewalk and requested the statement be revised.

Chair Roberson is disappointed that a Class II bike route on West Napa Street is proposed instead of West Spain Street, because in his view the traffic on West Napa Street is such that Class 2 lanes would not work. He confirmed with the staff that the reason the bike bridge crossing at Newcomb Street has not been installed yet because funding has not been identified. He proposed that this section be included in the map. He is pleased with the progress and overall connectivity of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Comm. Howarth made a motion to forward the updates made to the City of Sonoma Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan to the City Council for approval. Comm. Edwards seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Issues Update:

1. The City Council meeting 4/7/14 appeal 639 Third Street West-covered parking and driveway cuts.
2. The City Council meeting 3/17/14 review the tasting room criteria proposed by the Planning Commission.

Comments from the Audience:

Comm. Edwards made a motion to adjourn. Comm. Howarth seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 10, 2014.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on the 10th day of April 2014.

Approved:

Cristina Morris, Administrative Assistant