

**CITY OF SONOMA  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
March 26, 2013  
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West**

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Tippell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

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

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** Carol Marcus asked if any type of review was required for the feather signs in front of Safeway, as she feels they're not appropriate and look cluttered. Associate Planner Atkins noted that this type of sign is currently not prohibited and is like a banner sign, which is allowed for 15 days. She has spoken with the store manager and they will be taking them down.

**COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:** None.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Late mail for Item #5.

---

**ITEM #1 – SIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of four window signs for a convenience store (7-Eleven) located at 194 West Napa Street. Applicant: Igbal Lodhi.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Barnett noted that there are additional window signs that are not mentioned in the application and asked if they had been removed. Comm. McDonald stated the signs on the poles were still present.

**Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.**

Owen Smith, division facilities manager for 7-Eleven, was present to address the application. With regard to the temporary windmaster and pole signs, Mr. Smith had them removed as soon as he became aware of the situation. He would like to continue to use the temporary banners. The three window banners and the ATM and lottery signs would not exceed the 20 percent aggregate allowed. He noted that 7-Eleven has monthly promotions, and that means advertising. Their window promotions are most important. Mr. Smith noted that if allowed to keep the ATM and lottery signs, he would be willing to move them to the far corners of the window on each end.

Comm. Barnett asked the applicant if the lottery signs could be redone to meet the size requirements. The applicant stated he would like to use up to three individual signs.

Comm. Baptista asked the applicant if there was a compelling reason why he cannot comply with the number of signs. The applicant stated he currently has two permanent signs (ATM and lottery), although he has no preference for either one. He would like to keep at least one of them. More importantly, he would like to post up to three window banners each month. Associate Planner Atkins stated that each business is allowed two signs without a variance. 7-Eleven currently has a permanent monument sign and a sign on the building. They are asking for three additional promotional signs, as well as the lottery and ATM signs, for a total of five signs beyond what is normally allowed.

**Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.**

Comm. Barnett appreciates the applicant discussing and removing the pole sign and wind-driven sign as soon as he was informed they were not allowed. He would not have as much of an issue with the signage if not for the location. He is open to granting a variance for the number of signs, and would like to encourage the owner to consider a new monument sign.

Comm. Baptista concurred with Comm. Barnett with regard to the new, externally illuminated monument sign. He would be in support of the two signs permanently there, as well as the three smaller promotional signs.

Comm. Tippell concurred with her fellow Commissioners regarding the ATM sign. She is in favor of the signage.

Comm. McDonald commented that this is a unique business off the Plaza and is more oriented toward autos than pedestrians. The signs would be more acceptable if this was more of a highway setting. He believes the applicant should comply with the sign regulations and would not promote a variance for this use; however, additional thought should be given in this matter as the property has two street-side frontages (West Napa and First Street West). He would be in favor of the three smaller promotional signs, but could not support the ATM and lottery signs. He is not a proponent of advertising a commercial entity's ATM.

Comm. Baptista made a motion to approve the three promotional window signs (with the condition that the window signs not cover more than 20 percent of the aggregate area of each window). Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried. Ayes: Baptista, Barnett, Tippell. Noes: McDonald. Absent: Anderson, Randolph. The "Citibank" and "lottery" signs were denied.

---

**ITEM #2 – SIGN REVIEW:** Consideration of a freestanding sign for a commercial property (Cinnamon Bear Creekside Inn) located at 19455 Sonoma Highway. Applicant: Sonoma Signs/Cinnamon Bear Creekside Inn).

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Rose Jagar, representing Sonoma Signs, was present to discuss the application.

**Chair Tippell opened and closed the public hearing with none received.**

Comm. Baptista commented this is an attractive sign and he has no issues with the design or illumination, and it is a vast improvement over what currently exists. Comms. Barnett and Tippell concurred.

Comm. Tippell made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Anderson and Randolph absent.

-----  
**ITEM #3 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Design review for a vacation rental located at 20079 Broadway. Applicants: Byron Jones and Julie Morrison.

Comm. McDonald recused from this item, as he owns vacation rentals in the City of Sonoma.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.**

Carol Marcus, architect, was present to discuss the application. Byron Jones, applicant, was also present. This is a reuse of an existing commercial building with a 350 sq. ft. addition at the rear and no height variances being requested. Color boards were provided. The base of the building would be sage green, with terra cotta and eggplant as the accent colors. The windows are raised for privacy. The front planters will be of cast concrete or similar materials, and there will be four recessed lights in the exterior soffit to light the entry space.

Comm. Barnett asked the applicant if she had shared the design with neighbors. Ms. Marcus said yes, and she had received positive feedback.

**Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.**

Comm. Baptista liked the application and could support it. He asked the applicant if the color scheme is common. The applicant stated the proposed colors are common in nature, and cited the Hospice Building and Sonoma Museum of Art as examples of structures incorporating a bold color palette.

Comm. Barnett generally thinks it's a great application, but it doesn't seem like it fits here (a modern interpretation of an existing building). He is open to discussion of the colors, but is generally supportive. Comm. Baptista concurred, noting that it seems like a strong color palette for the area.

Comm. Tippell likes the playful colors, and the modern architecture and loft concept is a different twist that suits the space. She would recommend taking the purple

accent color down a step to something more in the “plum” range. This is a very nice application and project.

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

Comm. McDonald returned to the dais.

---

**ITEM #4 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Design review of a new awning for a commercial building (R2 Wine Company) located at 654 Broadway. Applicant: R2 Wine Company.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff’s report.

Comm. McDonald asked the gauge of the metal pipe frame and if it is hollow or solid.

Comm. Tippell drove by the property and saw that the awning is already installed. Associate Planner Atkins stated that the application came in retroactively and was submitted in response to code enforcement.

**Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.**

Roger Roessler, owner of R2 Wine Company, was present to discuss the application. The awning was installed to help with the heat buildup on the front patio and also provide more room to utilize for seating. They initially tried to use large umbrellas, but this was an issue on windy days. The awning is removable and constructed of hollow metal tubing of a fairly heavy gauge and has done well in the wind. Since the awning was added, it’s been a nice enhancement to the overall look of the building and attracts clientele. The red color of the awning matches their signage.

Comm. Barnett asked if this building and site are part of the expansion of the hotel behind it. Mr. Roessler said it was initially slated to be, but that project was put to rest and the property is now for sale. He has a three-year lease.

Comm. McDonald asked how much the awning and posts cost. Mr. Roessler stated about \$1600.

**Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.**

In general, Comm. Barnett does not have any issues with the application and understands the need for it. It would have been better if the applicant had come before the Design Review Commission prior to installation of the awning.

Comm. McDonald commented that the awning has changed the complexion of the building. Although he is not against having some sort of covered area in the front, the awning on the white poles takes away from the improvements on the property and does not relate to the buildings around it. The awning and poles don’t do justice to the building/signage/landscaping. He feels some sort of wood trellis structure would

be warmer and more compatible with the architecture, as well as be more compatible with the sign at the front. It could also be softened with vines in order to blend in with the landscape, instead of standing out. In his opinion, the existing awning looks very temporary. He would like to see it replaced with something more permanent. He suggested something made of wood utilizing the existing awning material be considered.

Comm. Tippell concurred with Comm. McDonald's comments about the awning. In a perfect world, she would like to see something nicer, but since this is only a temporary lease, she would support as submitted. She would prefer to pull in an orange or plum color, as that would tie in better with the monument sign; the red stands out too much.

Comm. Baptista commended the applicant on the tenant improvements to the property and would be supportive of the application as submitted.

Comm. Baptista made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-1, Comm. McDonald dissenting, Anderson and Randolph absent.

The applicant, Roger Roessler, thanked Comm. McDonald for his well taken comments. If the opportunity presents itself, he would be open to replacing the existing awning structure with one constructed of wood.

---

**ITEM #5 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Design review of a proposed remodel and addition to a single-family home located at 298 First Street West. Applicant: Victor Conforti, Architect.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.**

Vic Conforti, architect, was present to discuss the application. Peter Bacot, project architect, was also present. Comm. McDonald asked if there was a landscape plan; the applicant replied in the negative. Comm. McDonald is feeling sensitive about the location of the garage and new driveway from the street and the park. He is wondering if, after grading and construction, there will be fencing and landscaping or any sort of screening of the new structures. Mr. Conforti stated they have not gotten that far on the overall design, but may upgrade the fencing; however, this has not been discussed with the property owners.

Comm. Baptista asked if the siding and windows will be redone. Mr. Bacot noted that most of the remodeling will take place on the interior of the structure. The house was remodeled approximately seven years ago, and the windows and roof have been recently replaced.

Patricia Cullinen complimented the architect for maintaining the one-story structure and some of the design elements. She said it would be nice if the siding of the new structure could be distinguished from the siding on the old structure. In addition, on page 6 of the historic resource evaluation, the evaluator stated that the property does qualify as significant under criteria 1 and 2 because it lacked integrity since it was moved. According to the Secretary of Interior Standards, a building can be moved without impacting its integrity. She suggests the historic evaluation be peer reviewed

The property owner noted they have been careful to maintain the appearance of the structure in its original form since it was moved. The redwood siding is original and was preserved during the last remodel. They are willing to consider any alternatives for the addition about how it should appear and will attempt to make it look similar to the existing structure.

Mr. Conforti stated the approach on design was to respect the Secretary of Interior guidelines. One difference between those and the City's Development Code is that the materials proposed should match those existing. The Secretary of Interior guidelines wants materials to be distinguished from one another. He discussed this with the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation and followed the City's Development Code, as opposed to the Secretary of Interior guidelines.

Robert Garrant, Board member for the League, noted the League reviewed this project at a full board meeting and it was unanimously approved it as submitted.

Karla Noyes, citizen, commented that since Sonoma is going to become a CLG, she would like to suggest that this might be an opportunity to act as if we already were and follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for how things are evaluated and how things can change.

**Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.**

Comm. Barnett was excited when he saw this project and was glad to see the historical resource report provided and that the League supported the application. It seems like the applicant has taken great pains to retain the historic integrity of the structure and treat it with respect. He would support the application.

Comm. McDonald is happy to see the structure in its proposed form with the profile of the building one-story, low-profile roof, and the addition set back. This is an elegant addition and not out of scale. He would like to see clarification on the proposed siding. In addition, he would like to see a landscape plan, particularly if fencing is to be installed, and what type of screening/landscaping is planned to screen the three-car garage from the street.

Comm. Baptista commented that the applicant has done a wonderful job and the proposed plan supports the historic nature of the structure and suits the applicants' needs. He would be in support of the project. Comm. Tippell concurred.

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

---

**ITEM #6 – DESIGN REVIEW:** Design review of a new awning and new paint colors for a commercial building (Perle) located at 124 West Napa Street. Applicant: Robert Sanders.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.**

Robert Sanders was present to discuss the application. He confirmed that no other signage is proposed.

Comm. Baptista asked if there were multiple locations for this women's clothing store; the applicant replied in the negative.

**Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.**

Comm. McDonald commended the applicant for the subtle and tasteful application. The proposed color scheme, awning, and signage are compatible with the building and the surrounding buildings. He would be in support of the application. Comms. Baptista and Barnett concurred.

Comm. Tippell made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Anderson and Randolph absent.

---

**ISSUES UPDATE:** None.

**COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:** Comm. Barnett requested clarification on the vote and conditions for Item #1.

Comm. Tippell stated she attended the ethics training last night confirmed that if recusing from an item, the reason must be stated.

**COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:** None.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, April 16, 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