



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

---

**ITEM #2 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of a landscape plan for a single-family residence located at 236 Second Street East. Applicant: The Land Collaborative.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.**

Brett McPherson of The Land Collaborative, applicant, was present to discuss the application. The goal of the application is a feeling of a country cul de sac. They will utilize olive trees to tie in with those already existing and utilize permeable pavement. The hog wire fence will be covered with plant materials to blend in. Comm. Randolph asked what type of plants will be used. Mr. McPherson stated hedges, lavender and grasses will be utilized for a very soft effect.

Chair Anderson questioned whether there will be a non-climb fence for the pool area. Comm. Tippell asked what type of citrus and fruit trees are proposed. Mr. McPherson stated that lemons and limes will be espaliered on the side of the house closest to The Patch.

**Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.**

Comm. Barnett complimented the applicant on a great presentation. He has no objections to any of the plantings and likes the hog wire fencing. Comms. Tippell and Randolph like the design and are impressed with the whole property, noting it will be a nice addition to the area.

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

---

**ITEM #3 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of new building colors and a landscape plan for a restaurant located at 137-139 East Napa Street. Applicant: Sam Turner.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Anderson noted there was no signage proposed with this application. Associate Planner Atkins stated that any proposed signage will be subject to administrative review or will go before the Design Review Commission.

**Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.**

Sam Turner, applicant, was present to discuss the application. The new owners are excited about purchasing the property. This is a lovely historic building that is in need of deferred maintenance. The goal for the building is a pristine, muted feeling utilizing a conservative color palette. There will be more refined landscaping from the front,

with a dappled view of the structure through the landscaping. No changes are proposed to any historic elements or details of the building.

Comm. Tippell confirmed that Rin's will cease to operate in that location and the tenant will be a new restaurant. In addition, there will be no additions or alterations to the building, and only the paint colors and landscaping will change. Comm. Barnett asked if this darker color palette was common for that time period. Comm. Baptista confirmed that the exterior lighting will remain in the same locations and only the fixtures will change.

Mr. Turner noted there are darker color tones in the nearby buildings that are faced with stone. The gate material at the front of the structure and the perimeter trellis material are period appropriate. The olive trees and foliage at the front will largely obscure the building from the street. Andrea Cochrane, landscape architect, noted the olive trees will be beautifully sculpted and pruned, creating a filtered view, and will be a focal point.

Mary Martinez, resident, commented that many people are allergic to olive trees and some cities have actually outlawed olive trees.

Nicki Naylor, resident, loves the landscape plan and the position of the olive trees. There is currently a lot of space between the building and sidewalk and it's not very attractive. Integrating the landscape plan into the building will give a sense of an entrance.

Comm. Randolph verified with Mr. Turner that any reroofing necessary would be the same material. There is currently dark gray composite slate on the street-side elevation and composition shingle on the non-visible elevations.

**Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.**

Comm. Randolph thanked the applicant for the presentation and is comfortable with the application as submitted.

Comm. Tippell appreciated the presentation. She feels the color combination is way too dark with this style of architecture and the historical nature of the building with the Victorian gingerbread. She suggested a taupe color be used. She would have a hard time approving the application as submitted without an amendment to the colors. The proposed colors don't allow the character of the house to show. In addition, the lighting looks like a hodge-podge. It would be better to try and get them more in the same family.

Comm. Barnett concurs with Comm. Tippell. This is a classic historical gingerbread house and it should be painted in an appropriate fashion. He would prefer a lighter color palette.

Comm. Baptista has no issues with the exterior details or the landscaping. He would like the applicant to reconsider the lighting plan. The number of fixtures adds to visual light pollution, especially on the driveway side. He feels shorter fixtures would be more attractive.

Chair Anderson likes the overall look, but the dark colors tend to be foreboding. The light fixtures could be chosen to be more consistent with the time period of the building. He suggested that this be considered as a study session, as there doesn't sound like there would be a vote to approve.

Mr. Turner thanked the Commission for their comments and clarified this is not a lighting plan, but what currently exists. His client wants a cohesive theme throughout the project. When Victorians such as this were originally built and finished, they did not have high contrast trim and body colors. He won't be returning with a "painted lady." Comm. Barnett requested that the applicant bring examples of buildings from that time period with similar color palettes. He would like to relay the Commission's comments to his client and continue this item to the next meeting in order to address the concerns raised.

---

**ITEM #4 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of design review of a proposed remodel and addition to a single-family residence located at 248 France Street. Applicant: John Malick & Associates.

Comm. Randolph recused due to proximity and left the dais.

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

**Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.**

John Malick, architect, was present to speak on the owner's behalf. This structure started out as a smaller house and has undergone many changes and is a muddling of many different styles. The primary asset is the rear garden. The size of the house only increases due to enclosing the existing loggia; the actual footprint of the building is not actually getting larger. The structure will be reduced at the street side and the porches moved back from the street. The existing landscaping will be retained. They are trying to develop some ways to overcome the large garage door to make it feel more like something before the auto was the dominant transportation mode. The architect also showed a diagram of adjacent homes in the neighborhood, which are a mixture of one- and two-story, to relate size. An alternative was then presented with a 2.5-foot reduction in the peak height of the roof element over the proposed family/living room (current loggia area).

Chair Anderson confirmed that under the alternative, the pitch of the proposed family/living room roof element will change, but they will maintain the existing plate height of the loggia.

Comm. Barnett asked if there was a colorboard. Senior Planner Gjestland noted that as a remodel project, the exterior materials are up for consideration, but not the colors. The architect stated the house will be white or off-white, with a darker gray standing-seam metal roof, a red front door, and red stain for the garage. The stucco chimney will be clad in brick.

**Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.**

---

Comm. Baptista likes the proposal and would approve the application, but with the lower roof height presented in the alternative to provide more scale for the neighbors.

Comms. Barnett and Tippell concurred.

Comm. Baptista made a motion to approve the project, subject to the condition that the ridge height of the family/dining room roof element be lowered +/- 2.5 feet consistent with the alternative presented by the architect. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Randolph and McDonald absent.

Comm. Randolph returned to the dais.

---

**ITEM #5 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of design review and a landscape plan for two commercial properties located at 143 West Spain Street and 138 Church Street. Application: Three Sticks Wine.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.**

Bill Price, owner, was present to discuss the application and was very excited to present the plan. They spent quite a bit of time responding to neighbors' concerns. This is an important adobe, built by Vallejo for his brother. It will be used for business and incorporates a parking lot. They have taken on reconstruction elements of the adobe that were not historically correct. This project will enhance the neighborhood,

Sydney Hoover, architect, commented that this is an opportunity to unify the entire length of the street in this area. There will be a large, sliding gate of reclaimed wood with iron fittings and a pedestrian gate to the garden. They will not be altering any of the historic adobe building parts. The new storage building and wall along Church Street will be constructed of 16-inch thick adobe bricks. The kitchen addition to the adobe currently has two different kinds of siding, which will be replaced with vertical board and batten siding.

Peggy Magrane, landscape architect, discussed ADA compliance in moving from the auto court through the garden. There will be a permeable gravel surface in the auto court for drainage and decomposed granite under the shade ramadas. The east court garden will have a more substantial wall water feature with more volume and a sound buffer for the alleyway.

Karla Noyes, citizen, is also allergic to olive trees. She asked if anybody had considered the fruit drop from the olive trees. She participated in an archeological dig in the yard (which will be the parking lot) and it was like time travel. She encouraged the owners to donate anything found and cautioned the applicants not to over-beautify the building.

Mary Martinez, citizen, knew the original owner who restored this adobe and was passionate about adobes. While still alive, the owner gave an easement to the League for Historic Preservation. She feels the Commission should require the strictest

requirements be adhered to for this historically significant building. She noted the design team has done a magnificent job with the application, but a study is needed to show that all criteria have been met.

Robert Demler, previous owner of the adobe, stated that the City Historian had supervised the dig on the property, as did representatives of the Native American tribes of the area. The City Historian, George McKale, has those items to use for exhibits. He noted that the original garden was designed in 1948 and the new owners have taken into account the historic nature of the adobe and are respecting and preserving it. With regard to the easement, it does not require Dept. of Interior Standards, but gives the League the right/responsibility to review. The easement is broadly written and is not on preliminary title. He is ecstatic that someone is willing to take on the responsibility and expense to maintain this structure, and commends the new owners in maintaining one of Sonoma's treasures.

Loyce Haran, citizen, is a member of the League, but is not on the Board. What the applicants have presented is fantastic, but she has a problem with the process. An easement is an easement. The League owns three easements in the City and last year hired an easement lawyer to make sure the easements are in order. The easements need to have the proper people review them and give a recommendation.

Prema Behin, CFO of Three Sticks, noted that two plans are being presented tonight: 1) demolishing the garage; and, 2) remodeling the garage. The City Council preferred demolishing the garage. Three Stick's will be meeting with the League tomorrow to review the options. She has reviewed the Secretary of Interior requirements and guidelines and believes the project is consistent with the requirements. She has a relationship with the City Historian and he will monitor the project. She noted that last week she had the League board members screen the plans and walked the property with them.

**Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.**

Regarding the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation easement and the historic evaluation report, Chair Anderson asked staff to elucidate. Would it be putting the cart before the horse to do a Commission evaluation of this project before the League chimes in? Associate Planner Atkins stated that the easement is a separate process and does not involve the City.

Chair Anderson is concerned about the timing and sequence of events with regard to the outcome of the meeting with the League regarding the easement, as well as the historic evaluation report. He asked if there was any possibility that any further review tonight would be overturned by either of those conditions.

Associate Planner Atkins noted that the Commission could choose to require a historic evaluation to determine that the modifications are consistent with Secretary of Interior standards.

Chair Anderson likes what he's seeing, but he is not an architectural historian. He inquired about the possibility of turning tonight's review into a study session, and then review the results of the meeting with the League regarding the easement.

Mr. Price understands the complexity of this project. The League could want to see what the Design Review Commission has to say regarding a historical review of the three changes to the adobe.

Mr. Demler agrees with Associate Planner Atkins's observation that these are two parallel processes. The League is aware of these proposals and the League Board members are all interested that a decision be made. He believes it would be a good idea to give an approval providing that an historical evaluation be prepared.

Mary Martinez feels this is such a significant property that it needs evaluation by a professional historian. She is concerned about the olive tree at the corner of the driveway, as it screens the street view of the historic adobe.

**Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.**

Chair Anderson noted there are two ways to approach the application tonight: 1) fabricate approval tonight by coming back and revisiting decisions predicated on the League's easement and historic evaluation resource report, or 2) postpone and use this as a study session and have the applicant return after obtaining an historic evaluation report. How best to proceed?

Comm. Barnett commended the architect and landscape designer on their presentations and thanked the current and former owners for their good stewardship of the adobe. He feels an historic resource report is needed, as well as the League's approval of the easement. More information is needed to make the right decision. Tonight's meeting should be a study session. Comms. Baptista, Randolph, and Tippell concurred.

Chair Anderson stated that if there were to be a vote tonight, there would be a certain degree of unfairness to the other process. Rather than a vote, the applicants can consider this a study session and return to the Commission with a report from the League regarding the easement and historic evaluation. This additional information is needed before moving forward.

Mr. Price will return to the Commission in 30 days with the requested information.

---

**ITEM #6 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of elevation details, exterior colors and materials, lighting and landscaping for a wine tasting room on a commercial property (JAQK Cellars) located at 134 Church Street. Applicant: Eisenmann Architecture.

Senior Planner Gjestland presented staff's report.

**Chair Anderson opened the public hearing.**

Stacy Eisenmann, project architect, and Nina Mullin, landscape designer, as well as the property owners, were present to discuss the application. Color and material boards were presented. They are hoping to be respectful to the historic nature of the building. The business will be pseudo-industrial in nature, but residential in scale. They would like to bring in additional materials to reference that, such as elements of metal (trellis, light fixtures). Fiberglass windows are proposed as recommended by the

Historical Consultant. There are two alternatives for the landscape design that differ in treatment of the parking lot – pavers or decomposed granite with stabilizer treatment to allow for ADA access. They are looking for feedback from the Commission on this element of the project. They are more interested in pursuing the use of decomposed granite and like the idea of an impressionistic approach with plants coming out of the decomposed granite, which seems more appropriate for the site. They are trying to create a permeable landscape.

Nina Mullin, landscape designer, is adhering to the WELO ordinances and noted there are some drainage issues on the site, necessitating the need for a French drainage system. The boardwalk on the southern side is a slightly raised wooden structure for ADA and to accommodate the French drains beneath. The existing privet and large orange tree will remain. They plan on utilizing plants that work in this climate and bring in a sense of seasons in a subtle way. There will be texture and color in the foliage, but not a lot of flowering.

Ms. Eisenmann mentioned the possibility of adding a skylight over the office area and asked if the Commission would be amenable to this modification.

Chair Anderson noted that the business intends to draw pedestrian traffic from the Plaza via the easement but the parking and front of the building is on the west side of the site toward Church Street.

Ms. Eisenmann confirmed that is the intent and emphasized that the parking would be reserved for staff and the disabled only.

Patricia Cullinen, citizen, complimented the applicants on their presentation and the completeness of their submittals to both the Planning Commission and Design Review Commission. She is pleased with the historic evaluation, which found that the structure is a contributing building to the National Landmark District rather than a non-contributing building as currently listed.

**Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.**

Comm. Tippell liked the application, particularly the landscape and boardwalk designs, as well as the use of decomposed granite. With regard to the color schemes, she prefers option #2. Her fellow Commissioners concurred.

Comm. Baptista made a motion to approve the application as submitted, including the landscape planting palette and fence/gate detail presented at the meeting, with the clarification that the fence and gate would have a height of five feet (solid material) on the east property line. In addition, the DRC supported installation of a skylight over the office area and expressed a preference for exterior Paint Selection Set 2 and Landscape Plan Scheme 1. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, McDonald absent.

---

**ISSUES UPDATE:** Associate Planner Atkins stated there will be a special meeting of the Design Review Commission next Tuesday, March 26, at 6:30 p.m. in the Community Meeting Room.

**COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:** Comm. Barnett thanked Associate Planner Atkins for her prompt attention to the feather signs at Safeway that have all been removed.

Comm. Randolph requested that the historic evaluation requirement be added to the Design Review Commission Submittal Suggested Guidelines and Projects in the Historic Overlay Zone to avoid problems for properties that have historical significance. Associate Planner Atkins noted that this is already a requirement.

**COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:** None.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m. to the special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 26, 2013.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Design Review Commission on the 21<sup>st</sup> day of May 2013.

---

Robin Evans, Administrative Assistant