

**CITY OF SONOMA  
DESIGN REVIEW AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
May 20, 2014**

**Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West, Sonoma, CA**

**MINUTES**

Chair Tippell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

Present:	Chair Tippell, Comms. Anderson, Randolph, Barnett, Johnson (Alternate)
Absent:	Comm. McDonald
Others Present:	Planning Director Goodison, Associate Planner Atkins, Administrative Assistant Morris

Chair Tippell stated that no new items would be heard after 10:30 p.m. unless the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission so decides. Any decisions made tonight can be appealed within 15 days to the City Council. She reminded everyone to turn off cell phones and pagers.

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** Robert Demler, League for Historic Preservation, was pleased with the workshop sponsored by States Parks for Certified Local Governments and stated that League was happy to work with the DRHPC to arrange additional presentations.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the Minutes of March 18<sup>th</sup>. Comm. Johnson seconded. The motion unanimously carried. Comm. Randolph made a motion to approve the Minutes of April 15<sup>th</sup> with the noted corrections. Comm. Johnson seconded. The motion was unanimously carried.

**CHANGES TO AGENDA ORDER:** Comm. Barnett made a motion to switch Item #7 and # 8.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Late mail was received for Items #2, 5, 6 (color photos), 7 and 10, Training workshops for Certified Local Government announcement.

---

**Item #1 – Consideration of a modification to a sign program ( Sonoma Valley Center) for a commercial business( Pet Food Express) at 500 West Napa Street, Suites 502-510**

**Applicant: McDaniel and Associates**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

David Assajian, applicant, noted no changes to the other proposed signs since the last presentation. The sign features will mimic the other signs in the center.

Comm. Barnett confirmed with staff that the DRHPC approved white backgrounds for the tenant roof signs.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comms Barnett, Johnson, Anderson and Chair Tippell are satisfied with the changes to the sign.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the sign with the exception that the tenant roof signs shall have a white background. Comm. Randolph seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

---

**Item #2 – Consideration of a new wall sign and a new monument sign for a bank (Wells Fargo) at 445 Second Street West.**

**Applicant: David Ford**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

David Ford, the sign contractor representative, reconsidered his proposal and withdrew the variance request.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comms. Barnett and Johnson stated preferences for a wood type sign.

Comm. Randolph suggested incorporating some of the building features into the sign.

Comm. Anderson that the sign's scale is appropriate for the property.

Chair Tippell hoped that sign variance submittals become more of the "exception than the rule".

Comm. Anderson appreciated the simplicity of the sign.

Comm. Anderson made a motion to approve the sign with a condition that the maximum aggregate sign area shall be reduced to 26 square feet for both signs. Chair Tippell seconded. The motion was approved 4-1 (Comm. Barnett opposed).

---

**Item #3 –Public Hearing –Consideration of a new monument sign for a medical building (Sonoma Valley Community Health Center) at 19270 Sonoma Highway**

**Applicant/Property Owner: Sonoma Valley Community Health Center**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Anderson disclosed that he is member of the Sonoma Valley Community Health Center Board with no financial interest.

Robert Sanders, Robert Sanders & Company, noted that the new branding of blue on white features illuminated the lettering. He presented a display board for illustration.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Robert Sanders, Robert Sanders & Company, stated that the sign will appear smaller than 19 square feet per side. The proposed sign is consistent with the rebranding of the Sonoma Valley Community Health Center. The sign is proposed to be illuminated daily from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comm. Johnson stated that the existing sign is outdated.

Comms. Barnett, Johnson and Randolph endorsed the design elements and are only concerned with the size of the sign.

Comm. Anderson felt that the new sign is an improvement.

Associate Planner Atkins confirmed with Mr. Sanders that if the size of the sign is less than 32 square feet a variance would not be required.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the sign as submitted. Comm. Randolph seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

**Item #4 — Public Hearing — Consideration of a new sign program for a shopping center (Sonoma Bowl Center) at 19310 and 19312 Sonoma Highway.**

**Applicant/Property Owner: Old Bowl Center LLC**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Randolph noted a reference in the staff report that was clarified by Ms. Atkins.

Robert Sanders, Robert Sanders & Company, reviewed the issues that the proposed new sign program is attempting to address. The back building tenants have not been found easily. The hospital physical therapy and administration tenants requested a way finding sign program for consistency. The new signs will be internally illuminated signs illuminated from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. Additional directional signs are proposed to make it easier to navigate through the center. In addition, he wanted the flexibility for additional signs if any of the existing tenant space is split up. The front sign has been changed to be more consistent with the back directory sign (powered coated rust color instead of a gold color).

Comm. Randolph confirmed that the tenant signs would not contain all capital letters.

Chair Tippell confirmed that the new monument sign would be the same height as the existing sign.

Comm. Johnson confirmed that potential activity for future uses in the center has been accounted for in the sign application.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Mary Martinez, Member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, suggested another color rather than burgundy, since in her opinion it is over used in Sonoma.

Robert Demler, League for Historic Preservation Board Member, supported the sign proposal since it should resolve the difficulty of navigating in and out of the facility.

Rochelle Zatzkin, Architectural Signs and Associates, wanted more consideration given to the internal illumination of the sign in regards to consistency with the sign program at the center. She would also like to see fewer signs included in the sign program.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comm. Barnett agreed that the center needs an improved sign program, but he is not a proponent of internally illuminated monument signs and feels that the current proposal is overkill with respect to the number of proposed signs and total sign area. He feels that the character of the area will be compromised and suggested a reference to the history of the Old Bowl.

Comm. Johnson agreed with the need for wayfinding sign replacements. He questioned the need for illumination since elderly clients do not visit the center at night.

Comm. Randolph and Barnett suggested more identity to the history of the Old Bowl site.

Comm. Anderson and Chair Tippell viewed the sign program as an enhancement to the commercial space.

Chair Tippell approved of the red brick color and noted that it is not a true burgundy.

Chair Randolph made a motion to approve with a condition of approval that the illumination is between the hours of 7-10 p.m. and the removal of signs T1A and T1B. Comm. Anderson seconded. The motion carried 4-1. (Comm. Barnett opposed).

---

**Item #5 — Public Hearing— Consideration of a new awning and a new wall sign for a retail store (Bossa Nova) at 524 Broadway**

**Applicant: Architectural Signs and Associates**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

Comm. Randolph confirmed that the awning sign and wall sign are two different colors.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Debbie Harder, business owner, proposed a new smaller awning and sign with compatible colors that would be visible from across the street.

Mary Martinez, Member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, is concerned that the new color for the awning may not complement the existing building's paint color and suggested

that an aquamarine color might be a better selection. She urged the Commission to carefully review applications in order to safeguard the historical character of Sonoma.

Rochelle Zarkin, Architectural Signs and Associates, strongly believes that the awning needs to have visible signage.

**Chair closed the item to public comment.**

Comms. Barnett and Johnson supported the proposal as submitted.

Comms. Randolph and Chair Tippell liked the color combination.

Comm. Anderson appreciated the applicant requesting a smaller sign.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the awning and wall sign as submitted. Comm. Randolph seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

---

**Item # 6- Public Hearing- Consideration of sign review and design review for a retail store (G's General Store) at 19 West Napa Street**

**Applicant: Sonoma Signs**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Rose Jager, Sonoma Signs Design & Fabrication, noted that the existing roof tiles will not be replaced and a classic two tone paint was selected for the exterior.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comm. Barnett is pleased that the new design incorporated so well into the building,

Comms. Johnson, Randolph and Anderson were impressed with the quality of the presentation.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to approve the sign as submitted. Comm. Randolph seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

---

**Item # 7- Consideration of a new exterior paint colors for a bed and breakfast - facility (An Inn to Remember) at 171 West Spain Street.**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Darci Reimund, Darci Reimund Designs, represented the new owners that are re-branding the Hotel with exterior paint changes and new furnishings.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comms. Barnett, Johnson, Randolph, Anderson and Chair Tippell supported the new color scheme.

Comm. Randolph made a motion to approve the new exterior paint colors as submitted. Comm. Anderson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

---

**Item # 8- Discussion Item- Consideration of the design of Building 1, within the Mission Square development, a mixed use project featuring 3,514 sq. ft. of office space, 14 apartments, and associated parking and improvements at 165 East Spain Street.**

**Applicant: Marcus and Willers Architects**

Planning Director Goodison presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Lori Bremner, Managing Agent for the property owner, said that the changes made by the owners to the design of Building 1 were based on public comments and Planning Commission input. The owners are experienced with retrofitting historic buildings around the Plaza. Option 1 is a response to public comments that was gathered in Planning Commission meetings and open houses hosted by the tenants of the Pinelli Building, which the owners feel is the most representative of what they are trying to accomplish. They also like option 2, but prefer option 1.

Carol Marcus, project architect, Marcus and Willers Architects, noted that the evolution of the Plaza is the fabric of the historic downtown. The new development intends to respect the historic buildings through the customized design features, while maintaining a low-key presence. She is of the opinion that simplicity should not necessarily be equated with ordinary and leading up to this point the owners have incorporated public comments and Commissioners input in redesigning the site to become acceptable to the community at large.

Chair Tippell confirmed that the rafter tails would be natural reclaimed wood, the same as the post and beams and column aid.

Mary Martinez, Member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, confirmed with staff that the building height will be slightly higher than the Blue Wing Inn. She is concerned with the landscaping on the west side of the driveway planning strip and suggested that different plants be considered when the landscaping plan is reviewed.

Barbara Wimmer, Sonoma League of Historic Preservation President, feels the latest design is an improvement, but does not contribute to the enhancement of that historic landscape and she would like to see further revisions.

Robert Demler, resident, appreciated Marcus & Willers Architects keeping him updated as the project unfolded over the years and still hoped for more discussions and revisions. Although he appreciates the intent, he feels the current proposal is reflective not of a 2014 architectural style but that of 1914 when the architectural style was in his opinion very boring.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comm. Barnett asked whether there was interest in continuing the item in order to obtain drawings depicting the suggestion for wrap-around porches.

Comm. Johnson is prepared to make a decision.

Comm. Randolph is partial to option 2 as full balconies could intrude into neighbor's private space She also appreciates the extra windows on the second floor.

Comm. Anderson commended the collaboration with the community, owners, neighbors and The League for Historic Preservation. He favored option 1, as he felt that the detailing in that option provided a refined look.

Chair Tippell prefers option 3 and that it is her opinion is option 3 is very reflective of the architecture around the Plaza.

Lori Bremner, managing agent for the property owner, clarified that the owner's preference is option 1, while the architects prefer option 2.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to option 2 as submitted. Comm. Johnson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

---

**Item # 9 - Design Review- Design Review of a proposed addition to a residence at 830 Broadway.**

**Applicant: Victor Conforti, Architect**

Chair Tippell and Comm. Anderson recused and left the room. Comm. Barnett is acting Chairman.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Barnett opened the item to public comment.**

Victor Conforti, applicant, stated that the building will be restored to its original construction.

Comm. Johnson confirmed with the applicant that there is some neighborhood support.

Patricia Cullinan, resident, mentioned that there was a baseline consulting report done in which the Architect accepted the property as a significant building. She does not oppose the proposal.

**Chair Barnett closed the item to public comment.**

Planning Director Goodison noted that a follow-up analysis of the building, prepared by a qualified consultant, had determined that the building constructed outside of the period of significance used on the Caltrans study, and therefore should not be considered significant. He had researched the process associated with delisting the property and while this process could be pursued, it would be quite lengthy, and nothing would change in term of the current proposal.

Comm. Randolph made a motion to approve as submitted. Comm. Johnson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Tippell and Comm. Anderson returned to the dais.

---

**Item # 10- Design Review - Design review of a proposed addition to a residence at 563 Second Street East.**

**Applicant: Wade Design Architects**

Comm. Randolph recused and left the room.

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Luke Wade, applicant, responded to the opposition concerns in the late mail from a neighbor through Vicki Beard about this home possessed historic significance. Mr. Wade communicated the homeowner's desire to create an addition to the Ralph Murphy craftsman-style residence that respected the distinctive features of the home. He distributed a letter to the DRHPC from Vicki Beard, which stated that while Ralph Murphy is locally important, this particular home is not of special importance. The applicant is not proposing to change the face or the side facades of the building, only to remove an addition from the rear of the structure and build something new.

Paul Rozanski, Rozanski Design (landscape architect for the project), supported the project. He noted a number of trees will be preserved on the site and feels that the hedge adequately provides privacy for the neighbor's yard.

Keith Hughs, owner, explained his desire to increase the area of the existing residence. He received a favorable response from his neighbors on either side of the home and offered to be flexible with any resident concerns.

Alice Duffee, Historic Preservation Planner, disagreed with the conclusion of the cultural; resources report, as she believes that the bungalow is historically significant and eligible under criterion #2 because of its association with Ralph Murphy (a prominent builder and developer in Sonoma during the first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century). This particular bungalow was his private residence for a time. She also felt that the bungalow would be eligible under criterion #3, which addresses architecturally distinction. It is a representation of what a developer would do unencumbered by the taste and desires of the client. The fact that it remains relatively intact and it is a physical example of the impact that Ralph Murphy had on the east side of Sonoma renders this building eligible for the California Register. If the building is found to be eligible, she believes the proposed addition could have an adverse significant effect on the resource, thereby requiring further evaluation under CEQA.

Comm. Anderson confirmed that the adverse effects have to do with affecting the integrity of scale, feeling, and setting.

Mr. Wade stated that the addition is somewhat of a stealth building from the street and the addition will be compatible with the existing structure it is just had to visualize that at this point in the project. The marriage of the landscape and architecture will be important to this project.

Patricia Cullinan, read a letter on behalf of a neighbor across the street, stating they challenge the report and are willing to pay for an additional report/study. They do not support the remodel/addition.

Mr. Wade noted that he and his client had followed all of the City's rules in providing a cultural resources analysis prepared by a qualified consultant, listed on the CRIS database. He is concerned that the Commission is being asked to change the rules as they go along, which could create a bad precedent. In his view, projects should be considered on their own merits and evaluated independently.

Adrian Martinez, resident, has no objection to the addition in the back but is concerned that changes are being proposed to the front facade.

Mr. Wade responded that there are no changes are proposed to the front façade and that the building elevations presented to the Commission accurately document the fact that fact.

Mary Martinez, resident, does not support the new contemporary addition and is concerned that it would be visible from the street.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comm. Barnett disagreed with the conclusions with respect to criteria 2 and 3 in the Historic report. He was glad that Alice Duffee made a presentation and he agreed with her comments. He is of the opinion that this is a historically significant structure. He also noted that that he was open to reviewing a proposed addition, but that he felt the evaluation should be based on a finding that the building is historically significant.

Comm. Johnson is satisfied that the structure would not infringe on the block and would not be visible from the street.

Comm. Anderson is not comfortable making a decision tonight and recommended treating this review as a study session.

Chair Tippell agreed with Comm. Anderson. She stated she has concerns about the scale of the addition. She would like to continue the project to a future meeting.

Comm. Barnett asked about the Commission's options with respect to making a finding that the building is historically significant.

Planning Director Goodison noted that the determination of whether a building is historically significant is ultimately up to the DRHPC. However, that determination needs to be based on facts in the record. At this time, the DRHPC is facing a disagreement among experts. He suggested that one option would be to have the City commission a peer review of the historic evaluation, which would be paid for by the applicant. The process does not dictate an outcome. Deciding the historic significance of the property is a necessary first step because that establishes the criteria by which staff and the DRHPC will evaluate the project.

Mr. Wade would like some clarity with regard to the next steps.

Planning Director Goodison stated that the DRHPC has three options:

1. The current historic evaluation is a report pursuant to the City's application requirements. The historic evaluation was prepaid by a consultant on the CRIS list. It meets the City's standards and one option is to accept the conclusions of the report that the structure as not historically significant. By accepting the conclusion, this does not mean that the DRHPC will not look closely at the proposed addition, but it does set the stage for using the guidelines in the Development Code as a basis for evaluation the proposal.
2. Conduct a peer review of the historic evaluation, which would require a continuance.
3. Declare that the structure is historically significant and eligible for listing on the State Register. This action would also necessitate a continuance, as the staff evaluation of the project would need to be updated.

Planning Director Goodison expressed concern with option 3, as it is not clear to him that there is sufficient evidence before the Commission to support that determination.

Comm. Barnett made a motion to continue the item to a future meeting to allow time for a peer review of the historical analysis provided and accept the conclusions. Comm. Anderson seconded. The motion carried 3-1 Comm. Johnson opposed.

---

**Item # 11 - Design Review- Consideration of revised building elevation details and exterior colors and materials for a mixed-use building (Williams-Sonoma) at 599 Broadway**

**Applicant: Bud Cope c/o Williams-Sonoma**

Associate Planner Atkins presented staff's report.

**Chair Tippell opened the item to public comment.**

Max Crime, applicant, noted that the proposed changes would preserve additional elements of the original construction of the building.

**Chair Tippell closed the item to public comment.**

Comms. Barnett, Johnson, Randolph and Anderson appreciated the changes and liked paying homage to Chuck Williams' legacy.

Chair Tippell made a motion to approve the revised building changes. Comm. Anderson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

---

**Associate Planner Atkins reported the following:**

**Comments from the Audience:** Planning Director Goodison confirmed that one of the DRHPC's top three priorities is to develop design guidelines for the different planning areas in the City. The first priority is the Downtown District. The Central-East area will most likely be reviewed next year.

Chair Tippell made a motion to adjourn. Comm. Anderson seconded. The motion was carried unanimously.

**Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 11:37 p.m. to the next regular meeting scheduled for 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 17 , 2014.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted at a regular meeting of the Design Review and Historic Preservation Commission on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2014.

Approved:

---

Cristina Morris, Administrative Assistant