

**CITY OF SONOMA
DESIGN REVIEW AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
December 17, 2013
Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West**

MINUTES

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

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

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the minutes of November 19, 2013, with a minor correction. Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Randolph absent.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the minutes of November 5, 2013, as submitted. Comm. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Randolph absent.

CORRESPONDENCE: Late mail for Item #5 (two items).

ITEM #1 – CONTINUED SIGN REVIEW AND DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of new awnings, new awning signs, and new signs for a real estate company (Coldwell Banker Brokers of the Valley) located at 34 West Spain Street. Application: Bill Dardon.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.

Bill Dardon, applicant, was present to discuss the application. He noted that the blue Coldwell Banker awning was approved by the Planning Commission in 1995. He is asking the Commission to take this into consideration, as blue is the color of choice for Coldwell Banker. He provided four alternate awning colors to match the building.

Comm. Barnett noted that the blue awning at 9 East Napa was approved 19 years ago. He also clarified that the four alternate awning colors are numbered in order of preference.

Comm. McDonald asked the overall length of that awning compared to what is being proposed here.

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

Comm. Barnett stated he has no issue with the application in terms of the variance for the number of signs and the aggregate sign area. He noted that the proposed awning is larger than the smaller blue one approved 19 years ago and likes the new colors being proposed.

Comm. McDonald thanked the applicant for returning to the Commission and providing alternative color options for review. With regard to the colors, he prefers #1, as the length and size of the awning dominate the building's frontage and he would like to see something more neutral.

Comms. Johnson, Anderson, and Tippell concurred with their fellow Commissioners, and noted that the blue color is a little dated.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the following conditions:

- 1) The approved awning color will be option #1 (beige).
- 2) The projecting signs shall provide an overhead clearance of at least seven feet.

Comm. Barnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Randolph absent.

ITEM #2 – CONTINUED DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of design review of a proposed addition to an historic residence located at 663 Second Street East.
Applicant: Sidney Hoover.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report and noted that an historic evaluation was completed and submitted.

Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.

Sidney Hoover, applicant, was present to discuss the application. At the last meeting the Commission requested he provide additional information on the house, and that has been done.

Holly Carlson, neighbor, complimented the applicant on a very commendable job on the project. She stated she is a previous DRC member and reviewed the project file today at City Hall. She confirmed the structure will be painted white with white trim, and the only color will be on the shutters. She noted there are three houses in the neighborhood in close proximity to subject property that are painted stark white. She hopes the applicant may consider a change of color. Associate Planner Atkins noted that the color of the residence is not under the purview of the Commission. Color is only reviewed by the Commission for commercial or mixed-use developments. The applicant noted that with regard to the color, when he was exploring parts of the house, he found the old original siding and it was white, as white was basically the only color

back then. Comm. Anderson commented that redwood was not the most prized building materials in the 1800's, and white paint was used to disguise the type of wood.

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

Comm. McDonald thanked the applicant for returning to the Commission and feels the design is extremely sensitive to the existing structure and respectful to the neighborhood. He has no issues with the application, but hopes the applicant will consider a color for the exterior. Comm. Johnson concurred.

Comm. Barnett echoed the comments of his fellow Commissioners. He thanked the applicant for taking the extra step in obtaining the historical evaluation, as this is one of the most important homes in Sonoma

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

ITEM #3 – SIGN AND DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a projecting sign, four awnings, four awning signs, and two wall signs for a commercial business (Schein & Schein Old Maps) located at 149 East Spain Street. Applicant: Schein & Schein Old Maps.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Tippell confirmed that all the signs are being reviewed tonight, but the majority are already installed.

Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.

Jim Schein, applicant, was present to discuss the application. He is a resident of Glen Ellen and also has a store in San Francisco that deals in old maps and antique books. This is an underutilized space and he would like to create a presence there. He feels the building needs some identity, and the awnings emulate the building color.

Chair Tippell asked about the business hours. The applicant stated the business will be open Friday through Sunday, from 11:00 to 6:00. In the winter they will be open on Saturday and Sunday from noon to 5:00. Comm. McDonald asked if the compass is the company logo. The applicant replied in the affirmative.

Mary Martinez, neighbor, complimented the applicant on the signage and encouraged the Commissioners to approve this type of signage in the historic district. She reminded the Commission that they are not only the design review commission, but also historic preservation. Facades are meant to be historically respected. She pointed to his application as an example of integrity of signage in the historic district.

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

Comm. Barnett feels this is a great use of the site and he has no issues with the application.

Comm. McDonald concurred. The handcrafted and painted logos are fitting for the type of building and the historical Plaza district. He has no issue with the number of signs, and the awnings are small and minimal. The logos are really almost an architectural statement rather than a corporate logo. He would prefer having the logo sign facing East Spain rather than an A-board. He has no issues with the application. Comms. Anderson and Johnson concurred.

Chair Tippell concurred with her fellow Commissioners. The signage is extremely attractive and looks great on the building. The logo is clever and architecturally appropriate.

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

ITEM #4 – SIGN AND DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of a painted awning, a new awning sign, and new exterior paint colors for a commercial building (Grandma Linda's Ice Cream) located at 408 First Street East. Applicants: Troy and Dawn Marmaduke.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.

Troy Marmaduke, applicant, was present to discuss the application. He noted they had received approvals for the awning and signage six years ago when they first opened as Ben and Jerry's, and they are duplicating what was approved then. The pink color is a tribute to his mother, as it was her favorite color. It will also attract the public, as the crepe myrtle tree in front of the building blocks the façade. The white trim will tone down the pink. They are proposing to paint the awning and are awaiting the fire spread rating information from the paint manufacturer.

Comm. Barnett confirmed that the awning will be taken down and painted elsewhere.

Comm. Anderson verified that the width of the storefront is fairly narrow, approximately eight feet.

Chair Tippell questioned the location of the violet color. The applicant stated the violet color will be the awning stripes and valance. The white trim will just be on the inside of the window frames, but can be increased if desired. Comm. McDonald pointed out that the violet color is also on the edge of the face sign.

Comm. Barnett questioned what kind of ice cream will be sold. The applicant replied the ice cream brand is Umpqua from Oregon.

Tyler Marmaduke, son of the applicant, has worked at the ice cream store for three years. From April through October the crepe myrtle tree at the front of the building blocks the entire front of the store, and asked that the Commission please take this into consideration.

Dawn Marmaduke, wife of the applicant, stated she has been in Sonoma since 1968. They are local people and proud of their spot on the Plaza, even though it has been a struggle at times.

John Wainwright, painting contractor, stated he has received nothing but compliments about the color and has received not one negative comment about it.

Mary Martinez presented a photo taken earlier this afternoon. She noted that this building is located in Sonoma's historic district. Under Section 4 of Certified Local Government, this Commission is now charged with historic preservation and design review. She feels it is critically important that the findings of the Commission respond appropriately to the environmental features. She noted the adjacent buildings have been recently restored and the terra cotta roof tile is an orange color. The Pinelli Building is Sonoma plumstone, the only plumstone on the Plaza. Pink is fine for the interior, but she personally doesn't see how it can work on the exterior, as there is too much plum color in the stone. She is a little upset about the sign variance request and has not seen any illuminated signs on that building other than on the inside. She pointed out that the project is within 100 feet of the historic district and the Sonoma Mission. She is calling for restraint, as this façade is the most important part of the history on the Plaza. She submitted her written comments.

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

Comm. McDonald recalled when the original Ben & Jerry's signage and colors were approved. The applicant had originally wanted a solid color awning, but the Design Review Commission requested that stripes be added. He has no issue with the color of the door paint or the face and blade sign, as they will not alter the look of the historic building. The awning is too much. While he has no issue with the colors on the awning top, he would prefer the valance be white, rather than pink. In addition, he would also prefer to see the fascia of the building around the windows and the trim be painted white. He feels the Plaza deserves better than a painted awning, but realizes this would be a financial hardship for the applicant. While he has no issue with the increased amount of signage, he is unsure about the illuminated ice cream sign in the window.

Associate Planner Atkins clarified that the previously approved signs for Ben & Jerry's were a wall sign, projecting sign, awning and the illuminated ice cream sign. This application proposes a larger awning sign than what was previously approved. She noted the signage is not up for review at this time, with the exception of the awning sign.

Comm. Barnett is excited about this project and finds it very attractive. He has no issues with it and could approve as submitted.

Comm. Johnson is struggling with the color and the historic significance of the building. He would be open to the suggestion from Comm. McDonald to narrow in the pink color. He asked Associate Planner Atkins if there were other painted awnings; she could not recall any. He feels there is a certain standard for businesses on the Plaza, and some of the color should be toned down.

Comm. Anderson noted some of the suggestions made are good ones Overall, this is a rich Victorian color and he has no objections.

Chair Tippell thinks the door color is fine and she has no issue with it; however, the whole area around it, as well as the awning, is too much pink. She concurs with Comm. McDonald's suggestion of either the inverse or other color (softened violet) for the stripe, which would actually play with the glass color above the door. This is a very old, historically relevant building with beautiful stone. She appreciates the applicant wanting to pull that color out. She questioned whether the applicant would be willing to alter the awning with regard to the Commissioners' suggestions.

The applicant stated he would prefer the purple color come down with white lettering. The pink door color and cream/white trim is acceptable. He would like to have the band across the bottom of the window remain pink, as it would get dirty if it was white.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the face and blade signs as proposed, with a modification to the awning sign that it be painted pink/white/lavender on the top, with the valance color to be white with pink ice cream type or lavender with white ice cream type. The door and band between the windowsill and sidewalk shall be painted pink, with the remaining area of fascia/trim painted white.

Comm. McDonald restated the motion to approve the face and blade signs as proposed, awning with top as proposed, with the exception that the valance be violet with white type or white with pink type. With regard to painting of the fascia, the pink color only on the door, door frame, and small strip between the windowsill and sidewalk, with the remainder to be painted white. Associate Planner Atkins confirmed the locations on the picture.

Chair Tippell reopened the public hearing.

John Wainwright, painter, clarified that the inside of the window frame would be painted white, including the windowsill, but not below the sill.

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

Comm. Anderson amended the previously made motion to state that from the awning down, the wood door, window above, wood frame from the concrete up to the bottom side of the awning will be painted pink (as submitted).

The applicant prefers the second option.

Comm. McDonald made a motion to approve the signage as proposed, with modification to the valance being violet with white type or white with pink type, with option #1 for the window and door frames. Chair Tippell seconded the motion. Ayes: Johnson, McDonald, Tippell. Noes: Anderson, Barnett.

ITEM #5 – DESIGN REVIEW: Consideration of site design and new exterior colors for a drive-through coffee facility (Dutch Bros. Coffee) located at 711 Broadway. Applicant: RJF Enterprises, Inc. dba Dutch Bros. Coffee.

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

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. McDonald could not recall being asked to approve colors for fire lanes or safety curbs/barricades. Associate Planner Atkins noted the applicant included them in the application.

Chair Tippell noted that in the existing photo, it already shows red. Comm. McDonald pointed out the controversial window trim area. Associate Planner Atkins stated that the applicant has removed the white color from the proposal (see late mail) and no white trim is now being proposed.

Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.

Robert Fulton, applicant and owner of Dutch Bros. Coffee, was present to discuss the application. He apologized for the lateness of the revised sketch. The existing building color is a sand stucco and currently houses Hot Shots. The other section of the building is a florist shop. Architecturally, they are two different buildings with no connection between the two. He wants the paint colors to be complementary and identify each of the two businesses. The building Van Deusen Blue trim color proposed would be on the fascia/trim and on the protruding overhang and the four-inch flashing on top of the stucco building. The awnings and signage will be presented at a later date.

Comm. Barnett confirmed that in terms of removing the door and replacing it with a window, it will be a more traditional drive-up service. Patricia Cullinen is glad to see the proposed color is darker than what was on the staff report. She noted that when the street lights were installed in 1992, CalTrans evaluated all the properties along Broadway and made a registered district. This corner is an important contribution to the Plaza national landmark and it's important to understand the context of Broadway in the bigger picture of Sonoma's history.

Mary Martinez complimented the applicant for toning down the color to be more appropriate for this district.

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

Comm. Barnett appreciated the revised color brought in, as it is an improvement over the previous submittal. In general, this is a use that compliments the area and he has no issues with the application.

Comm. McDonald has no issue with the changes proposed, but would encourage the installation of the awning with the logo so it doesn't look so much like a service station. The objective is to make it much more appealing.

Chair Tippell and Comm. Johnson concurred with their fellow Commissioners.

Chair Tippell made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the late mail revision received on December 17. Comm. McDonald seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, Anderson and Randolph absent.

Comm. Anderson returned to the dais.

ITEM #6 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Review of California Environmental Quality Act confirmation for 157 West Spain Street.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report. Confirmed the project did not require historic evaluation and met CEQA guidelines. She explained why an historic evaluation was not required and why the Planning Department administratively approved the new residence and not bring it back to the Design Review Commission.

Comm. Barnett stated what concerned him was that the building in front was not part of the historic review. Comm. McDonald noted the front building is over 50 years old and in an historic district. Associate Planner Atkins noted the structure is not currently on the DPR list to be eligible for the State registry.

Comm. McDonald commented that when there is an historic district and buildings that are contributable that that historic district, when you add any sort of piece to that puzzle, any new building should be held up to certain standards. Our ordinance does not address this. He feels it is important to complete the survey and identify which buildings are contributors, and set standards for any new or in-fill projects.

Associate Planner Atkins noted that under the new regulations that went into effect December 4, 2013, if a new residence is located in an historic district, it will require the applicant to submit a historic evaluation to determine if the structure is a historic resource and if the proposed modifications met the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Chair Tippell opened the public hearing.

Patricia Cullinen noted the front building was listed on the League's Historic Survey. If a house is over 50 years old, it is considered historic by CEQA. This project was part of an historic property and adjacent an historic home. She took exception of staff's analysis of the project. An example would be a property with an historic home on an Indian burial ground. Unless an historic resource evaluation was done, there would be no way of evaluating the project because that wouldn't be known. Sonoma needs a cultural resource planner to help with the process. She noted that the historic districts/properties along Broadway were evaluated by CalTrans.

Comm. McDonald commented that the protections are in place, but we need to rethink about how any new buildings are looked at.

Associate Planner Atkins stated that when writing this memo, it was determined that the existing house on the property was, in fact, over 50 years old. In the survey done by the League, there was no evaluation of the structure. There was no way to link the existing house with the new structure, and nothing in CEQA was triggered. There is a difference of opinion between Planning Department staff and the City Historian.

Comm. Barnett stated that perhaps this item should be continued in case it could be exempted by CEQA. The City Historian agrees that it's a gray area. If he was asked to look at a property for historic evaluation, he also reviews the adjacent property; we don't do that. He questioned whether there would be any discretionary way for the City to mandate an historic evaluation.

Associate Planner Atkins stressed the need to be consistent. This discussion should be put on a future agenda in order to establish a policy.

Patricia Cullinen feels there is conflict over the interpretation. She feels if the structure is not categorically exempt, then it should trigger an historical evaluation or an initial study. The historic evaluation would have found the house and property historic. The League did not do evaluation of every property in Sonoma. When a house is over 50 years old, cannot just go to survey and say it's not listed.

Comm. McDonald asked if an initial study had been done, would the Commission have required the applicant to make significant changes to the design of the building? Associate Planner Atkins noted this is not the end of this discussion. This item will be put on a future agenda to discuss the policy of what is required of applicants in relation to historical applications. Ms. Cullinen will send documents on the existing districts (Federal, State, and City overlay).

Chair Tippell closed the public hearing.

ITEM #7 – DISCUSSION ITEM: Review of the project review changes related to Certified Local Government and recent Municipal Code revisions.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report and outlined the expectations of a Certified Local Government (CLG) and the resulting changes in the Municipal Code the City Council approved in November that went into effect December 4, 2013. All changes were made in the Municipal Code, including the name change of the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission. The other two changes that went into effect were the following: 1) a process was created to designate a locally-significant historic resource and districts; and, 2) additional findings for approval were added to Architectural Review projects located in the Historic Overlay Zone or a local Historic District and projects involving historically significant resources.

Comm. McDonald noted it's going to be a long time in the making to have an approved district boundary that has all the safeguards to have a protected historic district. The City needs to have its own guidelines in place.

Associate Planner Atkins stated the City does not need approval from the State to create a district, and suggested agendizing this discussion to a future meeting and have the City Historian attend.

Chair Tippell opened and the public hearing with none received.

ISSUES UPDATE: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION: None.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m. to the regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 2014.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Design Review Commission on the 18th day of February 2014.

Robin Evans, Administrative Assistant