

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
May 31, 2016
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma, CA
MINUTES**

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

Present: Chair Randolph, Comms. Johnson, Essert, Barnett, Cory (Alternate)

Absent: Comm. Tippell

Others Present: Associate Planner Atkins, 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. She reminded everyone to turn off cell phones and pagers.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: No public comments.

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail was received on Item #2 from Mary Martinez and Item #4 from Glenn Ikemoto, Ron Alpert, MacNair & Associates, and Horticulture Associates.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the minutes of June 16, 2015 as submitted and May 17, 2016 with changes noted. Comm. Essert seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item 1- Consideration of design review for two commercial buildings at 19366 and 19370 Sonoma Highway.

Applicant: Studio 101 Designs

Associate Planner Atkins presented the staff report.

Comm. Barnett confirmed with staff that the use permit is active since building permits had been issued for the residential units in the Planned Unit Development.

Steven Mosley, Studio 101 Designs, said the changes will modernize the building.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Joan Jennings, resident Villa de Lunas, viewed the proposal for the mixed use parcel as not conforming with the Development Code and General Plan in regards to size and compatibility. She said the "transition between residential and commercial" is not cohesive with the neighboring uses. She urged the Commission to reevaluate the area and oppose the proposal.

Nick Dolata, neighbor, concurred with Joan Jennings' comments and considered it a "piece meal" development. He encouraged the Commission to deny the application.

Jack Ding, resident, is primarily concerned with parking. He supported the use of City funds to develop affordable housing.

Brian Rowlands, neighbor, is concerned with parking and the location for garbage bins. He requested that the developer fix the gate.

Steve Jennings, neighbor, wants the landscape plan revised to ensure an adequate buffer between the homes and commercial buildings since the Planning Commission had requested harmonizing uses. The neighbors are disappointed that there has been no contact with Kibbey Road, LLC. He felt the townhome residents are absent of consideration.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Barnett questioned if the design fits into the area along Highway 12. He evaluated the proposal within the context of the approved master plan.

Comm. Essert preferred a wood guard rail welded with wire mesh that conformed with the regional architecture in the wine country.

The applicant has not developed a landscape plan but the bio swale retention will be included in the landscape plan.

Comm. Essert asked the applicant if underground parking was considered.

The applicant responded that it was an option but cost prohibited.

Comm. Johnson asked about proposed changes from the original plan.

Chair Randolph confirmed with staff the parameters under review.

Associate Planner Atkins said the DRHPC is limited to elevation details, colors and materials, landscaping, lighting, and site details.

Comm. Essert confirmed with staff that the DRHPC approved a landscape plan on April 18, 2006.

Chair Randolph reopened the item to public comment.

Joan Jennings said it is problematic to approve a “piece meal” development and she is not satisfied with the communications with the developer and felt they should be more flexible.

Jack Ding, neighbor, is disappointed that more consideration is not made for the residents.

Christine Rowlands, resident, is very concerned with traffic flow (i.e. ingress/egress into the project).

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Johnson struggled with the overall design.

Comm. Barnett noted two primary concerns; 1) project aesthetics 2) unable to make the finding that the project responds appropriately to the context of the adjacent development, as well as existing site conditions and environmental features.

Comm. Essert agreed with Comm. Barnett and recommended more collaboration with the neighbors regarding parking concerns.

Comm. Cory visited the project site and recognized the views expressed by the residents.

Chair Randolph appreciated the public comments and noted that it is customary for commissioners to read the entire packets before considering the merits of a project.

Comm. Essert viewed parking as a tradeoff between underground or between the residential and commercial buildings.

Comm. Barnet made a motion to consider the meeting a study session and encouraged the developer to attend the next meeting, make a good faith effort to work with the neighborhood to come up with a revised development solution, return with a full landscape plan that addresses buffering with the existing development, highway frontage, and Lyon Street frontage, and strongly encourage repairs be made to the gate. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item 2- Demolition review demolition of a single family residence well and pump house and two sheds at 1181 Broadway.

Applicant: Scott and Claudia Murray

Associate Planner Atkins presented the staff report.

Comm. Essert questioned why the narrative stated it was not historically significant.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Scott Murray, Valley resident/property owner, said the existing structure had no redeeming value and he was granted a demolition permit 10 years ago. He is meeting a City goal of building more affordable housing units.

Mary Martinez, resident, is concerned with infill projects located on the Broadway corridor.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Barnett suggested that the applicant submit a historical evaluation.

Comms Essert and Johnson agreed that a report would be helpful.

Comm. Cory stated he had discussed the plan with Mr. Murray and is satisfied.

Chair Randolph reopened the item to public comment.

Scott Murray said the plans are the same and did not hire a consultant to prepare a historic report because of the cost.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Essert made a motion to request the applicant return with a Historic Resource Evaluation. Comm. Johnson seconded. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Item 3- Demolition Review of a single family residence at 324 Second Street East.

Applicant: Glenn Ikemoto

Comm. Johnson recused and left the room.

Associate Planner Atkins presented the staff report.

Glenn Ikemoto, applicant, was available to answer questions.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

No public comment.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Barnett complimented the applicant on submitting a Historic Resource Evaluation.

Comms. Essert, Cory and Chair Randolph agreed with Comm. Barnett's comments and supported the demolition.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the Demolition Permit project as submitted. Comm. Essert seconded. The motion carried unanimously (4-0) (Comm. Johnson recused).

Item # 4 Design Review- Consideration of site design and architectural review of a new single-family residence, and accessory structures at 314-324 Second Street East.

Applicant: Glenn Ikemoto

Associate Planner Atkins presented the staff report. Comm. Barnett confirmed with staff that the setbacks conformed with City standards and it was staff's opinion that the findings could be made.

Comm. Essert questioned the exterior lighting plan. He confirmed with staff that the proposal is contingent upon merging the two lots together.

Chair Randolph opened the item to public comment.

Glenn Ikemeto, applicant, introduced the project team Ira Kurlander, Architect, Penny McGrain, project designer and thanked staff. His goal is to accommodate his extended family and preserve the "rural setting" as much as possible. He felt he addressed the neighbors' concerns by providing a shade study and arborist report.

Claudia Ranniker, neighbor, valued her gardening and outdoor living space. She requested that five trees be removed.

Ira Kurlander, project architect, presented the sample board to illustrate the building and design materials. He said the "T" shape of the parcel was an anomaly. He said the top of the residence will peek over the garage and olive trees will be situated in the center of the property.

Penny McGrain, project designer, held the parcel in the highest regard and envisioned a non-evasive integration into the neighborhood. She said the olive grove will be an enhancement to the streetscape.

Comm. Barnett clarified that the olive trees planted will be over 150 years old.

Mr. Ikemeto claimed that shade will not negatively impact the neighbor's along the northern property line.

Ron Albert, adjoining property owner/landlord, did not oppose the uses proposed but his main concern is with the guest house, which is a two-story building at the rear of his property. He applauded the applicant's efforts (i.e., preserving the view to the north and the plantings of olive trees). He said that Claudia and Roger Ranniker are good neighbors. He said he received an email sent by Rob Gjestland where the roof height is 26 feet. He is concerned with privacy, the health of the tree on his property, and the environment for the tenants. He felt the shade study did not validate the applicant's contention that both arborists' report were the same. He is of the opinion that the proposal is not harmonious with the adjoining neighbors.

Claudia Ranniker, neighbor, felt encroached upon by the intensification of uses proposed especially the landscaping, which would limit her freedom. She felt constrained by the proposal and suggested a sense of "entitlement" by the applicant.

Comm. Essert asked Claudia Ranniker if she had a solution/remedy to improve the situation and she replied in the negative.

Comm. Barnett appreciated her comments and confirmed that by cutting down trees it provided more sunlight for her fruits and vegetables. He stated that the property owner is well below the development potential for the site which is 11 units per acre.

Comm. Cory is of the opinion that it would be ideal to remove the Italian cypress tree.

Molly Rolig, tenant, downstairs unit (310 Second St. East) is concerned with the solid front wall of the structure compromising her privacy and sunlight.

Penny McGain, project designer, believed the shade line is improved with the proposal.

Chair Randolph closed the item to public comment.

Comm. Cory felt the shade issue is not enough of a reason to deny the application.

Comm. Essert appreciated the team building, neighbor dialogue, positioning of the guest house and overall site design.

Comm. Barnett appreciated the complete submittal. He thought that the applicant made “good faith efforts” with the adjoining property owners. He acknowledged the conflicting arborist reports and is satisfied with the shade studies. His main concern was the positioning of the guest house.

Chair Randolph was impressed with the project and level of creativity for the space. She understands the concerns over the location of the guest house and is confident that the tree will be protected. She is not convinced that relocating the guest house will be a vast improvement for the shading issues raised.

Comm. Essert made a motion to approve the project as submitted. Comm. Barnett seconded. The motion carried unanimously. (4-0) (Comm. Johnson recused) (The approval is contingent upon merging the two lots together prior to the submittal of any building permits).

Issues Update: Associate Planner Atkins reported the following

A draft of the Downtown Design Guidelines will be reviewed at the June 21st meeting.

Comments from the Commission: Comm. Essert asked that the use of story poles be placed as a future agenda item. He said the microphone volume at the dais had improved.

Adjournment: Chair Randolph made a motion to adjourn at 10:50 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 21, 2016. The motion carried unanimously.

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 19th day of July.

Approved:

Cristina Morris, Administrative Assistant