

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
February 19, 2013
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Anderson called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Comms. Anderson, Barnett, McDonald, Randolph,
Tippell
Absent: Baptista (Alternate)
Others Present: Associate Planner Atkins

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: Associate Planner Atkins notified the Commission that Jeff Baptista has been selected as the new Design Review Commission alternate member, but he was unable to attend the meeting this evening.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Chair Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes of January 15, 2013, with the minor modification noted. Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE: None.

ITEM #1 – CONSENT CALENDAR: Request to install banners on Plaza light standards – Sonoma International Film Festival.

Comm. Barnett noted that “welcoming” is misspelled on one of the banners. The applicant thanked him for catching the error. Comm. Tippell thinks the design is excellent and likes the incorporation of food, wine and film. Chair Anderson concurred.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Randolph seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #2 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a pole sign, four window signs, and a portable freestanding sign for a convenience store (7-Eleven) located at 194 West Napa Street.

Associate Planner Atkins stated that the applicant had requested this matter be continued to the next meeting.

ITEM #3 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a refaced monument sign, an awning sign, and a wall sign for a restaurant (Peet’s Coffee and Tea) located at 591 Broadway. Applicant: Chris Konecny.

Associate Planner Atkins stated the applicant has requested this matter be continued to the next meeting.

ITEM #4 – SIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a new sign program for a hospital (Sonoma Valley Hospital) located at 347 Andrieux Street. Applicant: Sonoma Valley Hospital.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff’s report and confirmed the application is for 12 freestanding signs and four wall signs.

Comm. McDonald asked if this is a first phase of signage, and if additional signage can be expected in the future.

Regarding sign EX02 (the emergency sign), Comm. Randolph asked if the entire sign will be lighted from the inside, or only the word “emergency.” Associate Planner Atkins stated that only the lettering for the word “emergency” will be lit from within.

Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.

Deanne Splinter of Nochtan-Lewis Architects and Pablo Salty from Hackley Architectural Signs were present to answer questions. Mr. Salty noted that this Phase 1 for signage. Phase 2 signage may be submitted at a later date when some of the departments move into the new wing. Phase 2 signage will also include wayfinding signs, directional arrows, building signage for entrances, etc. Chair Anderson expressed concern that the Commission is not looking at the project in its entirety.

Comm. McDonald asked if any illuminated roof or parapet signs are planned for the future. Kimberly Drummond, construction project coordinator for the hospital, stated there are no plans to put signage on the roof. The name will be under the entrance canopy.

Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.

Comm. McDonald thanked the applicant and hospital for putting together a complementary signage plan compatible with the color scheme of the buildings and the landscaping. He was pleased to hear the signage will be local rather than corporate.

Comm. Tippell noted the application is pretty straightforward and it’s a great sign program. Comms. Barnett and Randolph concurred.

Comm. Tippell made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Randolph seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #5 – DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of elevation details, exterior materials, and colors for a new residence and detached second unit located at 236 Second Street East. Applicant: Robert Baumann.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.

Robert Baumann, project architect, was present to discuss the application. The proposed design is a new style of residential design empathetic to historic Sonoma farm buildings. The new property owner liked the style and materials of the neighboring houses on either side. Mr. Baumann noted that this lot is the most challenging of the four lots in this subdivision due to the small buildable area. This property was the most impacted due to drainage implementation recorded when the subdivision was first developed, and it also has the detention pond and drainage swales that benefit the entire subdivision. The process to get the drainage design altered would be monumental. In addition, the access driveway runs across north side of lots one and two, and on the south side there is a right-of-way easement that could potentially be used for a driveway on the east side of the subdivision. The arborist's report indicated which trees had to be preserved. Mr. Baumann managed to incorporate all goals and meet the requirements. The League for Historic Preservation appreciated the design.

Mr. Baumann stated he had met with all the neighbors, who had no issues with the design. The neighbor to the east had two concerns: the large oak tree on the southwestern property line near the second unit and access to the garage of the second unit from the end of the access road. Mr. Baumann noted that the drilled pier foundation at the southwestern corner will have no effect on that tree. With regard to the access to the garage of the second unit, it is the property owner's right to access from that turnout. Mr. Baumann stated he had met separately with four Design Review Commission members.

Comm. McDonald noted that part of the previous design involved removal of a tree in the southeastern portion of the lot. Mitigation of this tree removal was the planting of four live oaks. Planning staff indicated they would not have to go to Tree Committee if the previous design were adhered to. He also had questions about the eight-foot-high fence along the right-of-way easement. Associate Planner Atkins noted that the landscape plan for this project will be at the next DRC meeting. Comm. McDonald also expressed concern about the height of the building and how the site will be graded and the elevation of the finished building. Mr. Baumann noted the exact elevation of the building pad is yet to be determined. The house is all going to be slab on grade, with the intent of having the living level at walk-out level to the pool and patio. Comm. McDonald complimented Mr. Baumann on the architecture and design.

Brent McPherson, landscape architect, noted that the fencing along the property line with The Patch will be eight-foot hog wire fence with landscaping. He would be open to solid board fence if preferred. The landscape plan along The Patch side will soften the building (olive trees). The hedge along the fence will be six-to-seven feet high.

Comm. Randolph asked if the corrugated roofing material would patina. Mr. Baumann stated that it would, over time. Mr. Baumann also noted that there are two different

color options for the clad windows – white and linen. Comm. McDonald asked if there were plans for the use of solar; Mr. Baumann stated not at this time.

Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Randolph visited the site and thinks this is a spectacular project that will enhance the area. Comm. Barnett concurred and has no issues, but expressed surprise that the second unit and attached garage are not included in the floor area ratio (FAR). Associate Planner Atkins noted that second units are encouraged.

Comm. McDonald thanked the applicant for a stellar plan and for getting a tentative landscape plan together prior to the hearing. He is pleased there are no solid fences. He would hope that City staff points to this architecture and design detail for future projects. Chair Anderson concurred.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #6 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Continued review of the Architectural (Design) Review Application Handout.

With regard to projects in the historic overlay zone, Comm. McDonald suggested a list be made of certain items that the Design Review Commission would typically want to see: fencing, gates, fenestration, door details, cross-sections of windows, gutters, etc. Comm. Tippell will come up with a specific list and forward on to Associate Planner Atkins so it can be included in the revised draft handout.

Chair Anderson commented that the scale of a person next to a sign, as in the sign application for Sonoma Valley Hospital, was very helpful. He would encourage applicants to show human scale, as it gives a quick spatial relationship of what is being reviewed.

Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.

Patricia Cullinen complimented Associate Planner Atkins on the work she is doing. She reminded the Commission that the City is in the process of obtaining certified local government (CLG) status. One of the criteria is how historic buildings are judged. One Planning Commissioner suggested the City use the Secretary of Interior Standards as accepted procedure, as this would make the process more consistent.

Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.

Associate Planner Atkins will revise the handout and return to the DRC.

ISSUES UPDATE: With regard to the 500-foot noticing radius, Associate Planner Atkins stated this is a State requirement and cannot be changed. The City Historian has offered to assist with language in regard to demolitions and is still working on it.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: Comm. McDonald expressed concern with the portion of the zoning code relating to how floor area and percentage of lot coverage are calculated. All floor area is calculated on gross square footage of the lot, not net. This point was brought up at the General Plan update. Comm. Barnett concurred, and was amazed that a structure up to 800 sq. ft. could be allowed for a second unit.

Comm. Barnett noted that the issue of signage at 7-Eleven was brought up in August, and thanked Associate Planner Atkins for her diligence in pursuing a solution. He asked if the City has any leverage to get them to take down some of the signs until they're approved, and what are the repercussions if they fail to comply. Associate Planner Atkins stated that the Sonoma Valley Economic Development Partnership encourages the City to work with business owners to avoid the administrative hearing process. Comm. Barnett also noticed a lot of rebranding of Chase Bank utilizing their bright blue branding. He commended the Commission on Chase's Plaza location that has been redone.

Comm. McDonald asked if any business can put an ATM on their property. He questioned where we draw the line at the number of ATMs and associated signage. Associate Planner Atkins noted that if the signage creates more than two signs for one business, it would be subject to design review. An actual ATM on a storefront façade would go to design review. Comm. Tippell noted it was unlikely that ATMs from two competing banks would be present on one property.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 19, 2013.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Design Review Commission on the 19th day of March 2013.

Robin Evans, Administrative Assistant