



City of Sonoma Planning Commission **AGENDA**

Regular Meeting of September 12, 2013 -- 6:30 PM
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West
Sonoma, CA 95476

Meeting Length: No new items will be heard by the Planning Commission after 10:30 PM, unless the Commission, by majority vote, specifically decides to continue reviewing items. If an item is not heard due to the length of the meeting, the Commission will attempt to schedule a special meeting for the following week. If a special meeting is necessary, potential dates will be established at the close of this meeting, and a date set as soon as possible thereafter.

CALL TO ORDER – Chair, Chip Roberson

Commissioners: Gary Edwards
Robert Felder
Mark Heneveld
Matt Howarth
Mathew Tippell
Bill Willers
James Cribb (Alternate)

*Be Courteous - **TURN OFF** your cell phones and pagers while the meeting is in session.*

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: Presentations by audience members on items not appearing on the agenda.

MINUTES: Minutes from the meeting of August 8, 2013.

CORRESPONDENCE

ITEM #1 – DISCUSSION

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

ISSUE:

City Engineer update on municipal water issues.

Receive.

Staff: David Goodison

ITEM #2 – PUBLIC HEARING

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

ISSUE:

Consideration of amendments to Title 2 (Section 2.60) and Title 19 (Chapter 19.42 and Section 19.54.080) of the Sonoma Municipal Code strengthening provisions related to historic preservation, clarifying the duties of the Design Review Commission, and adding provisions establishing a process for the designation of locally-significant historic resources.

Recommend adoption to City Council.

Staff: David Goodison

ISSUES UPDATE

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

ADJOURNMENT

I do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing agenda was posted on the City Hall bulletin board on September 6, 2013.

CRISTINA MORRIS, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Rights of Appeal: Any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council. Appeals must be filed with the City Clerk within fifteen (15) calendar days following the Planning Commission's decision, unless the fifteenth day falls on a weekend or a holiday, in which case the appeal period ends at the close of the next working day at City Hall. Appeals must be made in writing and must clearly state the reason for the appeal. Appeals will be set for hearing before the City Council on the earliest available agenda. A fee is charged for appeals.

Copies of all staff reports and documents subject to disclosure that relate to any item of business referred to on the agenda are available for public inspection the Monday before each regularly scheduled meeting at City Hall, located at No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma CA, (707) 938-3681. Any documents subject to disclosure that are provided to all, or a majority of all, of the members of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda after the agenda has been distributed will be made available for inspection at the Administrative Assistant office, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma CA during regular business hours.

If you challenge the action of the Planning Commission in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described on the agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Administrative Assistant, at or prior to the public hearing.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk (707) 933-2216. Notification 48-hours before the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

**CITY OF SONOMA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West
August 8, 2013
DRAFT MINUTES**

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the agenda for this meeting was posted on Friday, August 2, 2013, on the bulletin board outside the front of Sonoma City Hall, No. 1 the Plaza, Sonoma, California. Chair Roberson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West.

Roll Call:

Present:	Chair Roberson, Comms. Edwards, Henevald, Felder, Willers
Absent:	Comms Tippell, Howarth
Others	Planning Director Goodison, Associate Planner Atkins, Administrative
Present:	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. Henevald 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 July 11, 2013. Comm. seconded. The motion was unanimously approved 5-0. (Comm.Tippell, Howarth absent)

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail regarding Items #3 and #5. Staff Memo Item #5.

Comm. Willers recused due to proximity and financial interest and left the room.

Item #1 – Public Hearing – Request for a one-year extension to an approved Planned Development Permit for a four-unit project at 881-887 First Street West

Applicant/Property Owner: Clyde Ikeda

Associate Planner Atkins explained consent calendar protocol.

Comm. Felder made a motion to approve a third one-year extension of the approved Planned Development Permit for a four-unit project at 881-887 First Street West (maximum number of discretionary extensions for the project is six). Comm. Edwards seconded. The motion was unanimously approved 4-0. Comm. Willers recused. (Comms. Tippell and Howarth absent).

Comm. Willers returned to the dais.

Item #2– Public Hearing – Re-evaluation of a previously approved Music Venue License allowing live music to be performed in association with special events at 405 First Street West.

Applicant/Property Owner: Treg Finney/EDI Associates

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Staff notes that there have been no calls of service for noise or associated issues at the site.

Chair Roberson opened the public hearing.

Treg Finney, applicant and General Manager, is pleased with the music license conditions of approval. There have been special events with music-seven DJ's and seven acoustic performers.

Chair Roberson opened the public hearing.

No public comments

Chair Roberson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Henevald confirms that there are no changes to the amplified music provision.

Comm. Howarth made a motion to approve the re-evaluation of a previously approved Music Venue License subject to the existing conditions of approval. Comm. Willers seconded. The motion was unanimously approved 5-0. (Comms. Tippell and Howarth absent).

Item #3 – Public Hearing – Re-evaluation of a previously approved Music License allowing regularly-scheduled live music to be performed at Hopmonk Tavern at 691 Broadway.

Applicant/Property Owner: Dean Biersch/Hopmonk Tavern

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Staff received one written complaint from a neighbor when a performance exceeded the noise limits. There have been no calls of service to the Police department. There have been four separate reviews of the music venue license permit.

Comm. Felder confirms with staff that moving forward the license is administratively reviewed unless issues/complaints arise then the Planning Commission would re-evaluate.

Comm. Henevald confirms that the City has received no other calls about noise disturbances during musical performances.

Dean Biersch, applicant, feels he has compromised and worked through many of the neighbors issues/concerns relating to music performances. He has successfully dealt with each issue as presented. The applicant responded to the recent letter from a neighbor.

Chair Roberson suggests that the owner, restaurant staff and musicians become more familiar with the music limits including the type of instruments. In his view, this is a "wake up call". An ambient noise level check list is recommended and the music should not compete with the crowd noise.

Chair Roberson opened the public hearing.

Robert Ryan, commercial property owner, (Broadway) supports the music permit and likes the ambiance at Hopmonk.

Chair Roberson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Felder commends Mr. Biersch for acknowledging the isolated noise issue. He wants a more complete report from the restaurant management/staff going forward. He feels the administrative review is fine and is optimistic/confident that there will be continued diligence on the part of Mr. Biersch.

Comm. Edwards agrees with Comm. Felder.

Comm. Edwards made a motion to approve the re-evaluation of a previously approved Music License allowing regularly-scheduled live music to be performed at Hopmonk Tavern subject to the current conditions of approval. Comm. Henevald seconded. The motion was unanimously approved 5-0. (Comms. Tippell and Howarth absent).

Comm. Willers recused due to proximity and left the room.

Item #4 – Public Hearing – Consideration of a Use Permit to convert a single-family residence into a two-bedroom vacation rental at 780 Broadway.

Applicant/Property Owner: Donna Dambach and Christine Argenziano/Lisa Ellis

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

Vacation rentals are allowed in mixed use zones with a Use Permit that complies with the standards set forth in the Development Code and met through the conditions of approval. The City of Sonoma has approved 18 vacation rentals within the past 13 years. Although there has been a steady increase in applications, in staff's view vacation rentals do not negatively impact housing stock in Sonoma. The close proximity to the Plaza may reduce traffic since tourists might walk rather than drive a car.

Comm. Henevald suggests a change to the curfew time from 10 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Comm. Edwards would not support this change.

Donna Dambach and Christine Argenziano/Lisa Ellis, applicants, are experienced vacation rental managers and are in contract to purchase the property. They have spoken to many of the neighbors.

Chair Roberson opened the public hearing.

No public comments.

Chair Roberson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Henevald suggests that the 10 p.m. curfew time change to 9 p.m.

Comms. Edwards and Felder would not support this change.

Comm. Felder made a motion to approve a Use Permit to convert a single-family residence into a two-bedroom vacation rental. Comm. Edwards seconded. The motion was approved 3-1 Comm. Henevald opposes. Comm. Willers recused. (Comms. Tippell and Howarth absent).

Comm. Willers returned to the dais.

Item #5 – Study Session – Study session on a proposal to construct 12 apartments on a 1-acre site at 840 West Napa Street.

Applicant/Property Owner: Victor Conforti, Architect/ Michael Rabbitt

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Victor Conforti, applicant/architect, explains that this rental housing infill project has certain characteristics; difficult site with narrow dimensions. The existing building has no significant historical value. Mr. Conforti met and discussed some of the issues with the neighbors on Palm Court. The Fire Department access drives the site plan and leads to the driveway extension leaving a narrow remainder. There are a series of smaller scale buildings with duplex elements. The enclosed yards are oriented to the North and South ends of the duplex units.

A demolition permit is required from the Building Department and the Design Review Commission will review the project at a later date. If approved, the applicant is amenable to reversing the driveway location. He appreciated Associate Planner Atkin's table showing the adjacent properties. The guest parking has been expanded. A single gate would be agreeable on West Napa Street. The units facing West Spain Street will have private front yards (224 sq. ft. exceeds the private open space minimum requirement) with picket fences and landscaping on both sides of the gate. Trash bins may be located within the fenced yards with recycling bins limited to curbside pick up.

Chair Roberson confirms that Sonoma Garbage will pick up the garbage along the driveway.

Comm. Henevald suggested that the intent for this housing project may be for a future condominium conversion,

The applicant says the project is designed for rental units not condominiums.

Planning Director Goodison explained the process for condominium conversions.

Chair Roberson opened the public hearing.

Robin and Kathleen McCartney, Sonoma Garden residents, are situated between Nicora Place and the project. They have not discussed the following concerns with the applicant: noise, traffic, proportion of structures to lot size (small and narrow). They are not opposing development on the site however they expressed reservations for the demolition of the house since it represents a "piece of Old Sonoma". Sonoma Gardens backs up between two new proposed housing projects creating the potential for negatively impacting existing residents. A major concern is the density that will increase traffic in the area at the detriment to pedestrians.

Wendy Byrd, Palm Court resident, says her primary concern is density along with safety. She also discussed “affordable housing”.

Jeff Paggini, resident representing his son, is concerned about privacy, garbage, noise and aesthetics. His opinion is that the driveway fire access does not matter.

Jessica Shore, resident, does not want any changes to the bucolic setting that has been her home for many years. She is concerned about the size of the units. In her opinion, there are differences between homeowners and renters assimilating in the community. She envisions/perceives the changes proposed for the neighborhood as “negatively changing her lifestyle forever”.

Sarah Hartnet, Sonoma Garden resident is concerned about an increase in area traffic. Her family rides bikes and more cars may jeopardize their safety.

Mike and Lori Hemner, resident property managers at Sun Valley (a neighboring 14 unit housing development) received a letter from the applicant but have not had an opportunity to voice their concerns until tonight’s meeting. They feel that the new apartments would not be “visually pleasing” and that there is already enough density in the area. They suggest a senior housing facility may be more suitable with one level units or a smaller scale housing project. Their main objections stem from the demographics, traffic and noise.

Mary Jane, Sonoma Park resident, (24 condos), has similar concerns. She is concerned with noise and air pollution during the construction period. “Quality of life” may be compromised since there would be a demand for limited valuable resources.

Anthony Hass, adjacent property owner is surprised that there is not a denser use. His only concern is to have the driveway flipped to the other side so it would not limit his future development plans. He does not oppose the project.

Mike Rabbitt, property owner, does not intend to have condominiums in the future.

Berryl Brooks, 20 year resident, met with City staff. She feels that only eight units will be directly affected. She hopes there is a revision for either fewer units or one level to make the project more “livable”. She has no issue with garbage trucks. Her opinion is that West Spain Street is “unsafe” at times.

Chair Roberson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Henevald is concerned with egress and thinks the hedge along West Spain Street (20 foot sight line) should be addressed. He is concerned for the Palm Court residents living in a “fishbowl”. He proposes a right turn only lane on West Napa Street and the repositioning of the driveway.

Comm. Willers suggests that changing the driveway may cause more concerns. He has practical experiences from a similar development and is familiar with community involvement. There may be a reduction in garbage with this type of project. The neighbors are concerned about setbacks. He is not concerned with the density. The current layout has carports dimension almost 2 narrow between buildings. He feels that garbage can be solved favorably with adjacent properties and yards. It is preferred that dumpster trash be picked up more frequently.

Comm. Edwards confirms with staff that the new Valley Oaks affordable housing project is full and the demand for affordable housing has increased due to the economic climate/recession. The Housing Element requires some affordable units in new developments. The urban growth boundary dictates the perimeters for infill projects. The traffic on Spain Street is of concern and two people have written to the Traffic Safety Committee. He is of the opinion that the majority of traffic is generated from travelers through Sonoma. He envisions neighbors sharing garbage services. Comm. Edwards feels that the project is not being overbuilt since more units are allowed under the zoning/regulations.

Comm. Edwards encourages the public to continue dialogue with the City and as a Planning Commissioner is happy to be a facilitator. (Planning Commission is a "bridge" to the City.)

Comm. Felder feels the project options are limited by the constrained lots confronted with density issues. He agrees with Comm. Willers that carports and driveway access is problematic. He is also concerned with traffic, water and the impacts on the neighborhood and community at large. He is optimistic that the project has merits and will be successful.

Comm. Roberson wants more width in the driveways and feels the configuration of units to single story might mitigate some of the issues. He feels that constructive feedback is very important in the process.

Comm. Willers discusses the City's condo conversion policy that is not automatic. The owners would apply for a subdivision/tentative map that the Planning Commission reviews. The retrofitting would apply if it was determined to be better for rentals than for owner occupied units.

Issues Update:

1. The Valley Oaks affordable housing project received 450 applications for the 44 rental units-fully occupied
2. The City Engineer/PW Director will present a report on water issues.
3. The City Council meeting on August 19th will discuss the Planning Commission vacancy and the Hotel Ballot measure.
4. The Chateau Sonoma Hotel project was suspended in the planning department by the applicant a while ago.
5. The Sonoma County Water Agency is close to a critical water level for Lake Mendocino. The next meeting is September 1st.

Comments from the Audience: Wendy Byrd inquired about affordable housing. Staff says there is no longer the substantial financial subsidy offered through the City since the close of the State's Redevelopment Agencies. She suggested senior housing for the project at 840 West Napa Street. .

Comm. Edwards made a motion to adjourn. Comm. Henevald seconded. The motion was approved 5-0. (Comms. Tippell and Howarth absent)

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 12, 2013.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on the day of , 2013.

Approved:

Cristina Morris, Administrative Assistant

September 12, 2013
Agenda Item 1

MEMO

To: Planning Commission

From: Planning Director Goodison

Re: Update on Municipal Water Supply Issues

As requested by the Planning Commission, Public Works Director Takasugi will present an update on the municipal water system and associated supply issues, including a discussion of strengths, weaknesses, challenges and opportunities. The current and projected storage levels in Lake Mendocino will also be reported on in light of the water conservation efforts necessitated by low levels of precipitation experienced over the last year. A similar presentation was made to the City Council at its meeting of June 17, 2013, at which time the Council directed staff to pursue the “proactive” water supply strategy suggested by the Public Works Director.

cc: Dan Takasugi, Public Works Director

Attachments:

1. Minutes of the City Council meeting of June 17, 2013

Councilmember Barbose then asked if either of the two members who did not support the motion would move to reconsider the item, noting that he could not do so since he did not vote on the prevailing side. Mayor Brown responded in the affirmative, with Councilmembers Barbose and Rouse supporting the reconsideration.

It was moved by Clm. Barbose, seconded by Clm. Rouse, to adopt the resolution requesting Sonoma Clean Power Authority act as the Community Choice Aggregator on behalf of the City and Implement the Sonoma Clean Power Community Choice Aggregation Program within the City of Sonoma and to introduce the ordinance entitled An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Sonoma Authorizing the Implementation of a Community Choice Aggregation Program. with the understanding that the ordinance may not be later adopted. The motion carried with the following vote: AYES: Barbose, Brown, Rouse. NOES: Cook. ABSENT: Gallian.

Item 8B: Discussion, consideration and possible action on directing staff regarding a Water Supply Strategy and an update to the Water Rate Structure and Rate Model.

Public Works Director/City Engineer Takasugi presented a comprehensive report that included the history and description of the water operation facilities. Consulting Engineer Cargay presented information regarding groundwater management and Consulting Engineer Winkelman described the current Capital Improvement projects. Director Takasugi stated that staff was seeking Council direction on whether to pursue 1) a minimal strategy which would focus on maintaining current system operations; or 2) a proactive strategy which would include all current and planned Capital Improvement projects, collaboration with Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) and Valley of the Moon Water District (VOMWD) for conjunctive use projects, and a rate adjustment to incorporate enhanced reliability, resiliency, adaptivity, and stability.

Clm. Barbose stated he would like to see projected cost estimates for each of the two strategies and would want to know the impact of some of the larger projects on the consumer rates. City Manager Giovanatto stated that staff would be providing the information as it became available and would not move forward with any projects without Council authorization.

Clm. Rouse inquired if there could be any efficiencies achieved by joining forces with VOMWD. Director Takasugi stated he was in contact with the new General Manager at VOMWD and would pursue opportunities which made sense.

Mayor Brown invited comments from the public. Ann Hancock stated the "Pay as you Save" was a good program. City Manager Giovanatto stated the City was looking into it.

It was moved by Clm. Rouse, seconded by Clm. Gallian, to pursue a proactive water supply strategy and to direct staff to come back with some concrete details and cost estimates. The motion carried unanimously.

Item 8C: Discussion, consideration and possible action authorizing a letter urging President Obama to deny permits for the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

City Manager Giovanatto stated that Mayor Brown had placed this item on the agenda. Mayor Brown invited comments from the public. Ruth Lombard, Howard Coen, Truman Hunter and Ann Hancock spoke in favor of sending the letter.

MEMO

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Director Goodison
Re: Public hearing of draft amendments to the Municipal Code concerning historic preservation

Background

The Certified Local Government program, administered by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) in partnership with the National Park Service, provides a broad structure for local governments to identify, evaluate, register, and preserve historic properties within their jurisdiction. As described in further detail below, required components to qualify for certification include a system to survey and inventory historic resources, a historic preservation review commission, a local preservation ordinance consistent with National Historic Preservation Act, and a local preservation plan. In order achieve certification, a local government must file an application with the OHP, which reviews the proposal for compliance. Following certification, the OHP conducts periodic reviews to ensure that the programs required for certification continue to be administered. In November of 2012, the City Council adopted a preservation plan and staff forwarded an application for CLG status shortly thereafter. Along with the preservation plan, this application also included draft amendments to the Municipal Code addressing various requirements of the CLG program, as detailed below.

Required Elements of the CLG Program

There six required program components associated with becoming a Certified Local Government. While in some instances, these programs are already in place in Sonoma, in other cases there are programs that need to be added or expanded.

1. *Enforce appropriate state or local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties. Key provisions in this area include a local preservation ordinance, and a preservation plan. (Note: The preservation plan may take the form of General Plan Element, but this is not a requirement.)*

Sonoma has a preservation ordinance, in that the Development Code includes provisions addressing the preservation, adaptive re-use and demolition of historic structures. However, these provisions need to be modified in certain areas to ensure compliance with Certified Local Government (CLG) standards. A Preservation Plan was prepared based on existing policies and programs, supplemented as needed to meet CLG guidelines. This plan was reviewed by the Design Review Commission and the Planning Commission and it was circulated for comment to the City Historian, State Parks, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, the Sonoma Historical Society, the Chamber of Commerce, and others. Following this review process, the preservation plan was adopted by the City Council at its meeting of November 16, 2012.

2. *Establish an adequate and qualified historic preservation review commission by local law. This commission must have at least five members each of whom must have “demonstrated interest, competence or knowledge in historic preservation.”*

In the development of the Preservation Plan, the Design Review Commission (DRC) was designated to meet this requirement. However, it is necessary to update the DRC's charter as set forth in the Municipal Code to fully comply with CLG standards in this area. A draft ordinance amendment has been prepared that would accomplish this (attached).

3. *Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties.* The survey criteria must include a process for ongoing updates using criteria consistent with both state guidelines and the National Register of Historic Places.

In 2006, the City Council adopted a local inventory of historic sites and structures. While this inventory provides a starting point for achieving CLG compliance in this area, the State Office of Historic Preservation has advised staff that the survey process should be amended in two ways: 1) it needs to include a better method for updating of the survey; and, 2) it should include criteria for the designation of locally-significant resources. Staff has prepared a draft ordinance (attached) that would enact these changes and incorporate the process into the Development Code, while reaffirming the designation of those properties named in the 2006 Resolution. A related ordinance amendment to the site design and architectural review permitting process (attached) modifies that process to account for local historic resources and districts.

4. *Provide for adequate public participation in the local historic preservation program.* The CLG guidelines promote public participation in all aspects of historic preservation programs. Commission meetings must be open to the public with participation encouraged. In developing the Preservation Plan, staff has solicited comments and feedback from the City Historian, State Parks, the League for Historic Preservation, the Sonoma Valley Historical Society, and the Sonoma Valley Chamber of Commerce.
5. *Satisfactorily perform the responsibilities delegated to the CLG.* This portion of the CLG guidelines reiterates the requirement for a preservation plan and establishes a process by which the OHP conducts an annual review to ensure ongoing compliance with CLG standards. This component is addressed in the draft ordinance amending the duties and composition of the Design Review Commission.
6. *The CLG shall assume certain responsibilities for reviewing and recommending properties within its jurisdiction to the National Register of Historic Places.* In essence, a CLG must establish a process for reviewing and commenting on nominations to the National Register involving resources within its boundaries and this process must be consistent with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act. Once a CLG has been established, any nomination of a property for designation in the National Register must be reviewed by the local preservation commission and the comments and recommendation of the Commission are forwarded to the State Office of Historic Preservation for consideration. This requirement is addressed in the draft ordinance amending the duties and composition of the Design Review Commission.

Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code

As discussed above, in order to fully comply with the program requirements associated with CLG certification, staff prepared a set of amendments to the Municipal Code, as follows:

1. *Design Review Commission—Composition and Duties*
Section 2.60 of the Municipal Code, which sets forth the duties and responsibilities of the Design Review Commission would be clarified and expanded with respect to activities related to historic

preservation. These changes include reference to administering the process for identifying and designating locally-significant historic resources, as discussed below.

2. *Process for Designating Locally Significant Historic Resources and Districts*

Establishing a processing for identifying and designating locally-significant historic resources is a requirement of the CLG program. As set forth in the attached draft ordinance, staff suggests that these provisions be placed in Chapter 19.42 of the Development Code, “Historic Preservation and Infill in the Historic Overlay Zone.” There are actually two proposed processes: 1) the designation of an individual resource, and 2) the designation of a historic district. The criteria for designating a locally-significant historic resource are modeled after those used for the listing of resources on the California Register, except that they emphasize significance in terms of the context of Sonoma. The criteria proposed for the identification of a historic district are based on the definition of a historic district as set forth in the Nation Register Bulletin “*How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.*” As proposed by staff, a key difference between these two processes is that while the designation of an individual resource would be acted upon by the Design Review Commission (subject to appeal to the City Council), the City Council would be the final decision-making authority on the establishment of a local historic district (with DRC having a recommending role). Staff would also note that, as the ordinance is currently drafted, while affected property owners would be notified of and could comment on a nomination for designation as an individual resource or for inclusion in a local historic district, a property owner could not ultimately veto such designation.

3. *Site Design and Architectural Permit Findings*

The third draft amendment to the Development Code, to section 19.54.080, establishes a requirement for additional findings for the approval of a site design and architectural review permit for projects involving a locally-designated historic resource.

These draft amendments have previously been reviewed by the Planning Commission, the Design Review Commission and the City Council. They have not yet been adopted because, following the adoption of the Preservation Plan by the City Council, they were forwarded to the State Office of Historic Preservation for comment as part of the City’s application for CLG status to ensure that they complied with the requirements of the CLG program. The State Office of Historic Preservation recently completed its review of the proposed amendments and found that through their adoption, the City would achieve compliance with CLG standards. (See attached correspondence.) They did recommend that the name of the Design Review Commission be changed, but they did not identify this as a requirement for certification. (Note: When the Design Review Commission discussed this issue, it was preference of the Commission to retain its existing name.)

Environmental Review

The adoption of amendments to the Development Code strengthening procedures related to historic preservation are considered exempt from environmental review, because there is no reasonably foreseeable likelihood that such actions would result in any significant environmental impact.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Development Code and recommend to the City Council that they be adopted.

cc: League for Historic Preservation, attn.: Robert Demler

Attachments:

1. Letter from SOHP
2. Draft amendments to SMC 2.60 (Design Review Commission)
3. Draft amendments to SMC 19.42 (Historic Preservation and Infill in the Historic Zone)
4. Draft amendments to SMC 19.54.080 (Site Design and Architectural Review)

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-7100
(916) 445-7000 Fax: (916) 445-7053
calshpo@parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

**RECEIVED****AUG 19 2013****CITY OF SONOMA**

August 13, 2013

David Goodinson
Director of Planning & Community Services
City of Sonoma
No. 1 The Plaza
Sonoma, CA 95476-6618

Dear Mr. Goodinson:

Re: City of Sonoma Certified Local Government Application

Our office was pleased to receive the City of Sonoma's application for the National Parks Service's Certified Local Government (CLG) Program. We have long supported the City's efforts to establish a local preservation program founded in best practices. Seeking CLG status is an excellent way to demonstrate that you have achieved that goal of establishing a sound program.

After reviewing the documentation provided by the City for the CLG application we can tell you that you are making great strides towards achieving your goal of certification. Please keep in mind that our review of the application must consider the existing circumstances. Unfortunately, the current City codes involving historical resources and historic preservation do not meet the minimum requirements for becoming a CLG and, as a result, we cannot recommend certification at this time. However, draft code changes were prepared by City staff and submitted for our review with this application. The proposed amendments contain the components we would expect to see in an effective historic preservation ordinance. Should the City formally adopt these draft changes, our office would be able to immediately act favorably and support the City of Sonoma becoming a CLG. We do strongly recommend that while modifications to the code are being considered that the name of the Design Review Commission be changed to the Historic Preservation Commission (or Board) to more accurately reflect the historic preservation responsibilities of the body.

The Local Government Unit will be happy to assist the City in any way possible as you continue to develop your comprehensive historic preservation program. Please do not hesitate to ask for guidance, assistance, or support at any time. We look forward to continuing to work with the City as you move towards your goal of becoming a Certified Local Government. As the staff person assigned to work with your program at this point, I can be reached at shannon.lauchner@parks.ca.gov, or (916)445-7013.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Shannon Lauchner".

Shannon Lauchner
State Historian II

2.60—Design Review Commission

Sections:

- [2.60.010](#) Purpose.
- [2.60.020](#) Composition.
- [2.60.030](#) Duties and responsibilities.
- [2.60.040](#) City Council review.

2.60.010 Purpose.

The purpose of the Design Review Commission shall be to protect the architectural heritage of Sonoma, identify and preserve significant historic resources, enhance the visual character of the built environment, and promote excellence in town design and architecture through its review of projects in accordance with this Chapter and other applicable provisions of the Sonoma Municipal Code.

2.60.020 Composition.

The Design Review Commission shall consist of five members, appointed in accordance with SMC [2.40.100](#). ~~At least four members shall be qualified electors of the city. The city council may choose to appoint qualified applicants who also have a professional expertise in one or more of the following areas: architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, historic preservation, arboriculture, or a related field; however, no more than two seats on the commission may be held at any one time by persons having such expertise.~~ The members of the commission shall include persons who have demonstrated special interest, competence, experience or knowledge in the following areas: historic preservation, cultural geography, or other historic preservation-related discipline; architecture and architectural history; prehistoric and historic archaeology; urban planning; landscape architecture; or related disciplines, to the extent such persons are available in the community. All members must have demonstrated interest in and knowledge of the cultural heritage of the city.

2.60.030 Duties and Responsibilities.

The Design Review Commission shall have the following responsibilities:

- A. Exercise the authority set forth in this chapter and as otherwise provided in the Municipal Code.
- B. Recommend to the city council policies and programs in support of historic preservation including but not limited to goals and policies for the General Plan and other regulatory plans as well as programs for historic preservation incentives.
- C. Review and make recommendation to the State Office of Historic Preservation regarding nominations of property located within the city to the National Register of Historic Places.
- D. Perform the duties pursuant to the certified local government provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This shall include undertaking review and comment upon those projects on which the city as a certified local government has an obligation or opportunity to provide review and comment under the National Historic Preservation Act including but not limited to private and public projects undertaken within the Sonoma Plaza National Landmark District, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Municipal Code.
- E. Administer the nomination, designation, and registry of local historic resources and districts as set forth in Section 19.42.020.

- D. Develop and administer historic preservation plans, historic resource inventories, context statements, design guidelines and other information, plans and procedures related to historic preservation.
- E. Implement the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act pertaining to historic and cultural resources, consistent with its authority under the provisions of Chapter 19.54.
- F. Conduct the review of applications for the demolition or relocation of buildings and structures within the Historic Overlay zone and of potentially historic buildings and structures located outside of the Historic Overlay zone, in accordance with [Section 19.54.090 \(Demolition Permit\)](#);
- G. Conduct architectural review, in accordance with [Section 19.54.080 \(Site Design and Architectural Review\)](#);
- H. Conduct sign review in accordance with the provisions of SMC Title [18](#);
- I. Conduct landscaping review in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 14.32;
- J. Consult with, advise, and report to the city council on a regular basis in connection with the exercise of the Commission's duties and functions.

The above listed duties and functions shall be performed in compliance with [Section 19.52.020 \(Authority for Land Use and Zoning Decisions\)](#), [Table 5-1 \(Review Authority for Planning Permits\)](#), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as applicable.

2.60.030 City Council Review.

The city council shall review the duties, responsibilities and effectiveness of the Design Review Commission on an annual basis commencing one year from the effective date of this section.

19. 42—Historic Preservation and Infill in the Historic Zone

Sections:

[19.42.010—Purpose](#)

[19.42.020—Designation of a Local Historic Resource or District](#)

[19.42.030—Adaptive Reuse](#)

[19.42.040—Guidelines for Preservation and Adaptive Reuse](#)

[19.42.050—Guidelines for Infill Development](#)

19.42.010 Purpose.

This Chapter is intended to safeguard the historic character of Sonoma by recognizing and preserving significant historic and cultural resources buildings, by providing incentives for the preservation and rehabilitation of historically and culturally significant resources, and by ensuring that new development in the Historic Overlay zone is architecturally compatible.

A. *Officially designated historic structures.* This Chapter establishes incentives, minimum standards, and guidelines for the preservation and adaptive reuse of officially designated historic structures to the greatest extent feasible, as well as a process for listing districts, sites, structures and other resources possessing local historic significance.

B. *Potentially historic structures.* This Chapter establishes guidelines for the preservation of historic structures within the City, using the League for Historic Preservation’s inventory of historic structures as a guide for determining whether these provisions should be applied.

C. *Infill development.* This Chapter establishes guidelines to be used in review of infill development within the Historic Overlay zone for which a discretionary permit is required.

19.42.020 Designation of a Local Historic Resource or District

A. *Purpose.* In order to recognize and promote the preservation of sites, structures, and areas that are important to the history of Sonoma, this section provides for the nomination and designation of locally significant historic resources and districts.

B. *Designation Process—Local Historic Resources.* Local historic resources shall be designated by the Design Review Commission in the following manner:

1. Initiation of Designation. Designation of a historical resource may be initiated by the Design Review Commission or by the owner of the property that is proposed for designation. Applications for designation originating from outside the commission must be accompanied by such historical and architectural information as is required by the commission to make an informed recommendation concerning the application, together with the fee set by the City Council.
2. Review, Notice and Hearing. The Design Review Commission shall conduct a public hearing on a nomination for local historic resource designation. Notice of the public hearing shall be provided, and the hearing shall be conducted in compliance with Chapter 19.88 (Public Hearings), including mailed notice to the owners of any property proposed for such designation.
3. Findings, Decision. Following a public hearing, the Design Review Commission may approve or disapprove a nomination for designation as a local historic resource. The Commission shall record the decision and the findings upon which the decision is based. The Design Review Commission may approve such designation only if it

findings that the resource meets at least one of the following criteria:

- a. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to Sonoma's history and cultural heritage; or
- b. It is associated with the lives of persons important in Sonoma's past; or
- c. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- d. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in Sonoma's prehistory or history.

B. Designation Process—Local Historic Districts. Local historic districts shall be designated by the City Council upon the recommendation of the Design Review Commission in the following manner:

1. Initiation of Designation. The designation of a local historic district may be initiated by the City Council or the Design Review Commission.
2. Requirements for Designation. The designation of a local historic district is subject to finding by the review authority that all of the following requirements are met:
 - a. The proposed district is a geographically definable area.
 - b. The proposed district possesses either a significant concentration or continuity of buildings unified by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development.
 - c. Considered as a whole, a sufficient concentration of buildings within the proposed district demonstrate integrity of design, setting, materials workmanship and association.
 - d. The collective historic value of the buildings and structures in the proposed district is greater than the historic value of each individual building or structure
 - e. The designation of the area as a historic district is reasonable, appropriate and necessary to protect promote and further the goals and purposes of this chapter and is not inconsistent with other goals and policies of the city.
3. Design Review Commission Hearing and Recommendation. The Design Review Commission shall conduct a public hearing on a nomination for local historic resource district. Notice of the public hearing shall be provided, and the hearing shall be conducted in compliance with Chapter 19.88 (Public Hearings), including mailed notice to the owners of any property proposed for such designation. Following the public hearing, the commission shall recommend approval in whole or in part or disapproval of the application for designation in writing to the city council, setting forth the reasons for the decision. The Design Review Commission may approve a recommendation for a local historic district only if it makes the findings set forth in section 19.42.020.B.
4. City Council Hearing and Decision. The City Council shall conduct a public hearing on a nomination for local historic district. Notice of the public hearing shall be provided, and the hearing shall be conducted in compliance with Chapter 19.88 (Public Hearings), including mailed notice to the owners of any property proposed for such designation. Following the public hearing, the City Council shall by

resolution approve the recommendations in whole or in part, or shall by motion disapprove them in their entirety. The City Council may approve a designation as a local historic district only if it makes the findings set forth in section 19.42.020.B. If the City Council approves a local historic district, notice of the decision shall be sent to property owners within the district.

C. Amendment or Rescission. The Design Review Commission and the City Council may amend or rescind any designation of an historical resource or historic district in the same manner and procedure as are followed for designation.

D. Previously Designated Historic Resources. The sites and structures previously designated by the City Council as having local historic significance through the adoption of Resolution 18-2006 are hereby designated as local historic resources as defined in this Chapter.

E. Register. The Design Review Commission shall maintain a register of designated local historic resources and districts.

19.42.030 Adaptive Reuse

The adaptive reuse of historic structures within the Historic Overlay District, involving uses not otherwise allowed through the base zone, may be allowed subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit, in compliance with [Section 19.54.040](#) and as set forth below.

- A. *Eligible Structures.* The following types of structures are eligible for adaptive reuse:
1. Officially designated structures. Those structures of officially designated historical significance as indicated by 1) listing with the State Office of Historic Preservation, or 2) listing as a locally-significant historic resource, regardless of whether they are located within the Historic Overlay zone.
 2. Structures with potential historical value. In addition to officially designated structures, there are other structures that may have historical value because of their age (usually more than 50 years old), and their contribution to the overall historic character of the community due to their unique architectural scale and style, use of design details, form, materials, proportion, as may be documented through listing on the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's inventory of historic structures. Such structures shall only be eligible for adaptive reuse if located within the Historic Overlay zone.
- B. *Allowable Use.* The following uses may be considered in an application for the adaptive reuse of a historic structure:
1. Residential uses and densities:
 - a. Allowable residential uses. Single- and multi-family dwellings and residential condominiums.
 - b. Allowable residential densities. The allowable residential density within the Historic Overlay District may exceed the normally allowable density under the subject General Plan designation and zoning district, subject to the approval of the Planning Commission.
 2. Nonresidential uses:
 - a. Bed and breakfast inns;
 - b. Hotels;
 - c. Limited retail;
 - d. Mixed-use (residential over commercial) developments;

- e. Professional and service-oriented offices;
 - f. Restaurants (with or without outdoor dining facilities); and
 - g. Wine tasting facilities.
- C. *Retention of residential character, scale, and style.* Adaptive reuse projects shall retain a residential character, scale, and style (e.g., off-street parking areas would be prohibited in the front and street side setbacks, new construction would have a residential appearance, signs would be limited, etc.). The guidelines set forth in [Section 19.42.030](#), below, shall be considered by the Planning Commission in applications for adaptive reuse.
- D. *Compliance with parking standards.* The above listed uses shall be provided with suitable parking, in compliance with [Chapter 19.48 \(Parking and Loading Standards\)](#) .
- E. *Findings and Decision.* The Planning Commission shall approve, with or without conditions, the ~~alteration or~~ adaptive reuse of an historic structure, only if all of the following findings can be made, in addition to those identified in [Section 19.54.040 \(Use Permits\)](#). The alteration or adaptive reuse would:
1. Enhance, perpetuate, preserve, protect, and restore those historic districts, neighborhoods, sites, structures, and zoning districts which contribute to the aesthetic and cultural benefit of the City;
 2. Stabilize and improve the economic value of historic districts, neighborhoods, sites, structures, and zoning districts;
 3. Preserve diverse architectural design reflecting phases of the City's history, and encourage design styles and construction methods and materials that are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood(s); and
 4. Promote and encourage continued private ownership and utilization of structures now so owned and used;
 5. Substantially comply with the applicable Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties as well as the applicable requirements and guidelines of this Chapter.

19.42.040 Guidelines for Preservation and Adaptive Reuse

- A. *Purpose.* The purpose of these guidelines is to implement General Plan policies related to the preservation and adaptive reuse officially designated historic structures throughout the City and of structures having potential historical value within the City's Historic Overlay zone.
- B. *Applicability.* These guidelines are to be utilized during the development/design review process as criteria against which to review new construction within the Historic Overlay District requiring discretionary approval and adaptive reuse projects.
- C. *Preservation and rehabilitation of existing structures.* In general, preservation and rehabilitation efforts should aim toward protecting the essential architectural features of a structure that help to identify its individual style and thereby further its contribution to the historic character of the surrounding neighborhood.
1. General rehabilitation principles.
 - a. Historic structures should be recognized for their own time and style. Rehabilitation should not try to create a preconceived concept of history, but should reuse existing or appropriate features.
 - b. Rehabilitation of historic structures should try to retain and restore original elements first. If damage or deterioration is too severe, the element should be

recreated using original materials to match the color, design, texture, and any other important design features.

- c. When replacement is necessary and original material cannot be obtained, substitution material should incorporate the color, design, and texture that conveys the visual appearance of the original material.
2. Doors.
 - a. Older structures almost always had solid wood doors that fit the particular style of the structure. The front door of the structure was the most ornate with secondary doors usually more utilitarian in appearance. The shape, size, and style of doors are an important feature of all historical architectural styles and the original design/type should be maintained.
 - b. Original doors should be repaired in-place whenever possible. When replacement is necessary, the replacement door should match the original design and materials as close as possible.
 - c. If the original door is missing, appropriate design and materials should be selected by studying the doors of similar structures in the surrounding neighborhood or consulting books on architectural styles. Many older style panel doors are still available from material suppliers and may match the original doors very closely.
 3. Exterior materials.
 - a. The original exterior building materials should be retained whenever possible. It is not desirable to use mismatched materials of different finishes, shapes, sizes, or textures.
 - b. Structures with original wood siding should not be stuccoed in an attempt to modernize their appearance. Likewise, plastic shingles should not be used to replace wood siding or shingles.
 - c. Replacing wood siding with aluminum siding of the same shape and size as the original siding can be an alternative, but care shall be taken to use siding of the appropriate size.
 - d. Brick surfaces should not be sandblasted in an attempt to remove old paint. Sandblasting would damage the natural fired surface of the brick, and cause it to lose its water repellent qualities. Also, mechanical grinders should not be used to remove mortar as this can damage the brick surrounding the joint.
 4. Ornamentation and trim.
 - a. Most often it is the authentic decoration and trim on a structure that lends character and identifies the structure with its particular architectural style. Original ornamentation should be preserved whenever feasible.
 - b. If the material needs to be removed to be repaired or copied, determine how the piece is attached and carefully plan the work to be sensitive to the material. Any prying action should be slow and careful, with a minimal amount of force.
 - c. If the ornamentation or trim is comprised of several layers of materials, it is helpful to sketch the components as they come apart to ensure proper reassembly. If the pieces are beyond repair, a skilled finish carpenter should duplicate the original work.
 5. Porches and stairs.
 - a. During rehabilitation efforts, the design integrity of the front porch should not

be compromised. Front porches should not be enclosed with walls or windows.

- b. If enclosing the porch is the only viable means of adding needed space, care should be taken to use decoration(s), doors, siding materials, trim details, and windows that match the facade of the structure surrounding the porch.

6. Roofs.

- a. Roofs are important both functionally and aesthetically. Great care should be taken to ensure that roofs are water-tight and that roofing materials are compatible with the original style of the structure. Often times roofs only need repairs but when replacement is necessary roofing materials should be selected that are appropriate to the structure's architectural style.
- b. It should be recognized that fire safety requirements may preclude re-roofing a structure in its original material. The determination of what material to use for the replacement of wood shingles or shakes in historic structures should be based on compatibility with the colors and materials used elsewhere on the structure.

7. Windows.

- a. Most older/historic structures had wood framed windows that were either casement, double hung, or fixed. The shape, size, and style of windows are an important feature of most architectural styles and the original type window should be maintained.
- b. When window replacement is necessary, it is preferred that the new window be an exact match of the original.
- c. An alternative to special milling may be the use of an "off-the-shelf" standard window that closely matches the original.
- d. Aluminum or plastic frame windows should not be used as replacements on any part of a historically valuable structure without justification. The use of such materials is highly visible and the contrast of materials and styles can permanently affect the architectural integrity of the structure. The use of traditional materials is preferred.

D. *Additions to existing structures.* Additions to historically valuable structures may be necessary to ensure their continued use. Modifications (e.g., additions, new entrances and exits, parking facilities, handicap facilities, and seismic strengthening) should be made with care so as not to compromise a structure's historically valuable features, finishes, or materials.

1. Site plan considerations. Additions should be carefully placed to minimize changes in the appearance of the structure from the public right-of-way. Whenever possible, additions should be placed to the side or rear of the structure and should not obstruct the appearance of the structure from the public right-of-way.
2. Architectural compatibility.
 - a. Additions to historically valuable structures should incorporate the distinctive architectural features of the original structures including:
 - (1) Door and window shape, size, and type;
 - (2) Exterior materials;
 - (3) Finished floor height;
 - (4) Roof material, pitch, and style; and
 - (5) Trim and decoration.

- b. Refer to the rehabilitation guidelines Subsection D. (Preservation and rehabilitation of existing structures), above for discussion of appropriate exterior doors, porches, wall materials, windows, etc.
- 3. Roof pitch and style.
 - a. The roof of a structure, especially its pitch and style, is an important architectural element that should be taken into consideration when planning an addition.
 - b. Whenever possible, the pitch and style on the addition should match the original.
 - c. Roof materials should also match as close as possible.
- 4. Second story additions.
 - a. Because adding an additional story to an existing structure will always change the structure's proportions, such additions should be carefully designed to follow similar two-story examples of the particular style that may be found in the surrounding neighborhood.
 - b. Integrating the new second story addition into the original design of the structure may be easier if the addition is set back from the front facade so that it is less noticeable from the public right-of-way.

19.42.050 Guidelines for Infill Development

- A. *Purpose.* These guidelines are intended to encourage new infill development in the Historic Overlay District to be compatible in scale and treatment with the existing, older development and to maintain the overall historic character and integrity of the community. At the same time, these guidelines are intended to promote the visual variety that is characteristic of Sonoma, to allow for contemporary architectural designs, and to provide reasonable flexibility in accommodating the tastes, preferences and creativity of applicants proposing new development, especially individual single-family homes. As stated in the 2020 General Plan, "*Sonoma should continue to be characterized by variety in terms of land uses, building types, and housing, and this diversity should be consistent with preserving the town's small-scale and historic character.*"
- B. *Guidelines for Compatibility.* The single most important issue of new infill development is one of compatibility, especially when considering larger structures. When new structures are developed adjacent to older single-family residences, there are concerns that the bulk and height of the infill structures may have a negative impact on the adjoining smaller-scale structures. The following considerations are intended to address this concern.
 - 1. Site plan considerations.
 - a. New development should continue the functional, on-site relationships of the surrounding neighborhood. For example, common patterns that should be continued are entries facing the public right-of-way, front porches, and garages/parking areas located at the rear of the parcel.
 - b. Front setbacks for new infill development should follow either of the following criteria:
 - (1) Equal to the average front setback of all residences on both sides of the street within 100 feet of the property lines of the new project; or
 - (2) Equal to the average front setback of the two immediately adjoining structures on each side of the new project.

- c. In cases where averaging between two adjoining existing structures is chosen, the new structure may be averaged in a stepping pattern. This method can work especially well where it is desirable to provide a large front porch along a portion of the front facade.
2. Architectural considerations.
 - a. New infill structures should support the distinctive architectural characteristics of development in the surrounding neighborhood, including building mass, scale, proportion, decoration/detail, door and window spacing/rhythm, exterior materials, finished-floor height, porches, and roof pitch and style.
 - b. Because new infill structures are likely to be taller than one story, their bulk and height can impose on smaller-scale adjoining structures. The height of new structures should be considered within the context of their surroundings. Structures with greater height should consider providing greater setbacks at the second story level, to reduce impacts (e.g., blocking or screening of air and light, privacy, etc.) on adjoining single-story structures.
 - c. The incorporation of balconies and porches is encouraged for both practical and aesthetic reasons. These elements should be integrated to break up large front facades and add human scale to the structures.
 - d. The proper use of building materials can enhance desired neighborhood qualities (e.g., compatibility, continuity, harmony, etc.) The design of infill structures should incorporate an appropriate mixture of the predominant materials in the surrounding neighborhood whenever possible. Common materials are brick, horizontal siding, shingles, stone, stucco, and wood.
 - e. Color schemes for infill structures should consider the color schemes of existing structures in the surrounding neighborhood in order to maintain compatibility and harmony. Avoid sharp contrasts with existing building colors.
 3. Single-family Residences.
 - a. The design of an individual single-family residence is typically of great significance to the homeowner. Changes required through the design review process should be the minimum necessary to achieve compatibility with the overall character of the Historic Overlay District.
 - b. Historic architectural styles (e.g, craftsman, Victorian, bungalow, etc.) are not mandated. However, contemporary architectural treatments proposed for new residences should complement and not detract from the qualities of the Historic Overlay District and the neighborhood setting of the proposed development.
 - c. To the extent that a proposed residence is not readily visible from a public street or other public vantage point, greater design flexibility should be allowed.
 4. Sustainable Construction Techniques.
 - a. Building forms that reduce energy use may be radically different than traditional architectural types. Careful and sensitive design is required in order to produce a contrast that is pleasing rather than jarring. The use of appropriate colors and textures on exterior materials is one method of linking a contemporary building design to a traditional neighborhood context.
 - b. Roof gardens, solar panels, and other sustainable construction features should be fully integrated into the design of new construction, rather than applied at the conclusion of the design process.
 3. Accessory structures.

- a. New accessory structures (e.g., garages, second units, sheds, etc.) that are visible from the public right-of-way should incorporate the distinctive architectural features (e.g., color, materials, roof pitch and style, etc.) of the main structure.
- b. Design features should be applied with less detail on the accessory structure so that it does not compete with the main structure and is clearly subordinate to it.

19.54.080—Site Design and Architectural Review

- A. Purpose.** This section establishes the review procedures necessary to ensure that all applicable development projects comply with the required standards, design guidelines and ordinances of the City; minimize potential adverse effects on surrounding properties and the environment; implement General Plan policies regarding community design; and promote the general health, safety, welfare, and economy of the residents of the City. Therefore, it is the purpose of this section to:
1. Protect and enhance historic buildings and the City’s historic character;
 2. Encourage the orderly and harmonious appearance of structures and property within the City along with associated facilities, landscaping, parking areas, and streets;
 3. Recognize the interdependence of land values and aesthetics and provide a method by which the City may implement this interdependence; and
 4. Ensure that new developments, including residential, institutional, commercial, and industrial developments built on the City’s character and do not have an adverse aesthetic impact upon existing adjoining properties, the natural environment, or the City in general.
- B. Applicability.** The review of project site planning and architectural design is an integral part of the development approval process. Therefore, each project that requires approval of a Building Permit, unless exempted as set forth below, shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission and/or the Design Review Committee (DRC), as applicable, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit or the commencement of any work on a new structure, or improvements to alter, enlarge, remodel, repair, or otherwise change the exterior of an existing structure.
1. **Residential development.** Design review shall be required for new residential development, the alteration and enlargement of existing residential structures, and residential accessory structures, as set forth in the following table.

Design Review Requirements for Residential Development		
Development Type/Condition	Design Review Requirement	
	Inside Historic Zone	Outside Historic Zone
1. New Development		
Single-family development, fewer than five units, and associated accessory structures.	Yes	No
Single-family development, five or more units.	Yes	Yes
Duplex, and associated accessory structures.	Yes	No
Triplex, PUD, or other multi-family, and associated accessory structures.	Yes	Yes
2. Existing Development		
Maintenance, repainting, in-kind replacement of exterior materials.	No	No
Re-roofing.	No	No
Interior remodeling.	No	No
Exterior alterations for which no building permit is required.	No	No

3. Existing Residential Development, Constructed Prior to 1945		
Alterations to existing structures that increase floor area by 10% or 200 square-feet, whichever is greater.	Yes	No
Alterations to existing structures requiring a Building Permit that result in substantive changes to a primary or street-side building elevation.	Yes	No
Other exterior alterations or additions for which a building permit is required.	No	No
Building relocation.	Yes	Yes
Change in roof design (e.g., alterations in pitch and height).	Yes	No
4. SFD/Duplexes, Constructed in 1945 or Later		
Additions.	No	No
Exterior alterations (including change in roof design).	No	No
Relocation.	No	No
5. Multi-family, Constructed in 1945 or Later (Including Planned Unit Developments)		
Alterations to existing structures that do not increase floor area by more than 10% or result in substantive changes to a primary or street-side building elevation.	No	No
Other exterior alterations or additions that require a Building Permit.	Yes	Yes
Change in roof design (e.g., alterations in pitch and height).	Yes	Yes
6. Other		
Detached residential accessory structures developed in conjunction with an existing primary residence.	No	No
Landscape modifications, existing single-family residences and duplexes.	No	No
Significant alterations to approved landscaping plan, existing multi-family development/PUDs (private yard areas excepted).	Yes	Yes

2. **Commercial and mixed-use development.** Design review shall be required for new commercial and mixed-use development (including public and quasi-public facilities) and the alternation and enlargement of existing structures, as set forth in the following table.

Design Review Requirements for Commercial Uses and Mixed Uses	
Development Type/Condition	Design Review Requirement
New construction and building additions	Yes
Maintenance and in-kind replacement of exterior materials.	No
Exterior building modifications for which a building permit is required.	Yes

Repainting, except when the existing color scheme is substantially retained.	Yes
Improvements to existing parking facilities with 10 or less spaces.	No
Improvements to existing parking facilities with 10 or more parking spaces.	Yes
Lighting of parking areas.	Yes
Landscaping for a new development or significant alteration to an approved landscape plan (excluding private yards).	Yes
Accessory structures not in public view.	No

3. **Demolitions.** Demolitions shall be regulated as provided for under Section 19.54.090 (Demolition Permit).

4. **Signs.** Signs shall be regulated as provided for under Title 18 of the Sonoma Municipal Code.

5. **Use Permits.** Notwithstanding the exemptions identified in subsection 1 and 2, above, the Planning Commission may impose design review as a condition of use permit approval.

C. **Application requirements.** Any person proposing to construct, alter, enlarge, remodel, or otherwise change a new or existing structure subject to Site Design and Architectural Review in compliance with this Chapter, shall make application for project review prior to the application for a Building Permit in compliance with Section 19.52.040 (Application Preparation and Filing). It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide evidence in support of the findings required by subsection G. (Findings, decision), following.

D. **Review responsibility.** Certain types of projects are subject to review by both the Planning Commission and the Design Review Commission, while other types of projects are subject to review by only one commission. The responsibilities of the two commissions with regard to Site Design and Architectural Review are as follows:

1. **Non-discretionary Projects.** Projects subject to Site Design and Architectural Review, as set forth in Subsection B., but which are not otherwise subject to discretionary review by the Planning Commission (e.g., Use Permit review), shall be reviewed by the Design Review Commission only.
2. **Discretionary projects.** For projects subject to discretionary review by the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission shall be responsible for reviewing and acting upon the project site plan, building massing and elevation concepts to the extent it deems necessary. Subsequent review by the Design Review Commission shall be limited to elevation details, colors and materials, landscaping (including fences and walls), lighting, site details (such as the placement of bike racks and trash enclosures), and any issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission.
3. **Single-family development of five or more units.** For new single-family development of five or more units, except in conjunction with a Planned Development Permit, the Planning Commission shall be responsible for reviewing and approving design guidelines to ensure an appropriate variety of unit types and styles. Design guidelines may include building heights and mix of stories, setbacks, architectural concepts, elevation details, building materials, and landscaping. The topics and level of detail required for the review of a particular project shall be as deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission.

Review by the Design Review Commission shall not be required, except as referred to the Design Review Commission by the Planning Commission.

E. Review Procedures. Each application for Site Design and Architectural Review shall be reviewed by the City Planner to ensure that the application is consistent with the purpose and intent of this Section and with applicable requirements of this Development Code. The review authority shall hold a public meeting, and may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the application for Site Design and Architectural Review in compliance with this Section.

F. Factors to be considered. In the course of Site Design and Architectural Review, the consideration of the review authority shall include the following factors:

1. The historical significance, if any, of the site or buildings or other features on the site;
2. Environmental features on or adjacent to the site;
3. The context of uses and architecture established by adjacent development;
4. The location, design, site plan configuration, and effect of the proposed development.

These factors shall be considered in relation to the development standards and design guidelines of this Development Code, other applicable ordinances of the City, and applicable General Plan policies.

G. Findings, decision. The review authority may approve, approve subject to conditions, or disapprove an application for Site Design and Architectural Review. The review authority may approve an application, with or without conditions, only if it first makes the findings set forth below.

1. Basic findings. In order to approve any application for Site Design and Architectural Review, the review authority must make the following findings:
 - a. The project complies with applicable policies and regulations, as set forth in this Development Code (except for approved Variances and Exceptions), other City ordinances, and the General Plan;
 - b. On balance, the project is consistent with the intent of applicable design guidelines set forth in this Development Code; and
 - c. The project responds appropriately to the context of adjacent development, as well as existing site conditions and environmental features.
2. Projects within the Historic Overlay District or a Local Historic District. In addition to the basic findings set forth in paragraph 1, above, the review authority must make the following additional findings for any project located within the Historic Overlay District:
 - a. The project will not impair the historic character of its surroundings; and
 - b. The project substantially preserves the qualities of any significant historic structures or other significant historic features on the site.
 - c. The project substantially complies with the applicable guidelines set forth in Chapter 19.42 (Historic preservation and Infill in the Historic Zone).

d. The project substantially complies with any applicable preservation plan or other guidelines or requirements pertaining to a local historic district as designated through section 19.42.020.

These findings shall not apply to demolitions associated with a project which have been approved under Section 19.54.090 (Demolition Permit).

3. Projects Involving Historically Significant Resources. In addition to the basic findings set forth in paragraph 1, above, the review authority must make the following additional findings for any project on which site is located a resource that is listed or eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Resources or that has been designated as a local historic resource pursuant to section 19.42.020:

a. The project substantially preserves the qualities of any significant historic structures or other significant historic features on the site.

b. The project substantially complies with the applicable guidelines set forth in Chapter 19.42 (Historic preservation and Infill in the Historic Zone).

c. The project substantially complies with the applicable Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

These findings shall not apply to demolitions associated with a project which have been approved under Section 19.54.090 (Demolition Permit).

H. Expiration. If a Building Permit has not been applied for and issued within one year of Site Design and Architectural Review approval, the approval shall become void, unless an extension is approved in compliance with Chapter 19.56 (Permit Implementation, Time Limits, Extensions).