

- Review of a Use Permit application for Southpoint Storage to expand their facilities by operating out of the Aubergine facility.

Board Member Beale disclosed that he was in negotiations for the Aubergine building as well.

The Board asked questions of Assistant Planner Morrison.

5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC REGARDING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA: There were none.

6. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST: There were none.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR: There were none.

8. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. MINOR SIGN REVIEW: This is a Minor Sign Review application requesting approval to replace, redesign and relocate the existing monument sign for the Fairfield Inn and Suites (Marriot). The current sign is sitting on top of PG&E equipment and they have requested that the sign be relocated to address the issue. The applicant is using this as an opportunity to reface the sign as well.

Assistant Planner Morrison presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of staff throughout their discussion.

On behalf of the applicant, Jason Brandolino, provided a brief presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Brandolino throughout their discussion.

Vice Chair Bush asked if members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Hearing none, Vice Chair Bush closed the public hearing and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- This submittal is pretty straight forward.
- The biggest question, as raised by Board Member Langberg during questions of staff, is on clarifying the height exception that is being requested.
- It appears as though a 2' 8 ½" exception is being requested.

Board Member Beale commented:

- This is a unique property.
- Proportionally this does not feel large or out of place at all.
- The sign could be easily obstructed if it were any lower.
- The height and mass of the hotel in general allows for a sign like this.
- In making a determination on this application, the Board should have on record the height from the lowest point of grade.
- Regardless of height, what the applicant has presented looks great.

- This will be an improvement.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- Expressed being in agreement with Board Member Beale.
- The proposed sign is fine being bigger given the site and the building.
- The City should have required a complete drawing that shows the heights from the applicant if the Board is being asked to make a determination based on a number.
 - While it isn't really a big issue for this particular application, there is ambiguity in the submittal which he has an issue with.
 - In the future, clarity would be helpful.
- For this application, the scale works fine.
- If the Board is being asked to grant an exception for more than 8', it would be good to know what that height is exactly.

Board Member Level commented:

- The sign appears to be about 14' tall and at least 10' back from the back of the sidewalk.
- The proposed sign is suitable for this location.
- Expressed having no problem with the proposed sign.
- We already have a precedent for approving these taller signs.
- Commends level of detail in the application.

Board Member Hari commented:

- Likes the proposed sign.
- The sign will look fine.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- With the exception of grades, appreciates the level of detail that was provided by the applicant.
- The sign is really nice, fits well with the style of architecture and mass of scale, and has good continuity in general.
- This will be a great improvement to the building.
- Supports this application.

Board Member Level commented:

- The size of the sign proportionally is not going to read as a really big sign.
- The proposal is appropriate.

Board Member Beale commented:

- Could support approving this application as submitted, however, the Board should have the greatest downhill height documented administratively.
 - Documentation is an important part of the process.
- The sign doesn't feel that big overall.

After some additional discussion, Board Member Level made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

Board Member Beale seconded the motion.

AYES: Vice Chair Bush and Board Members Level, Beale, Hari and Langberg
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS: There were none.

10. REPORTS FROM THE BOARD/STAFF: There were none.

11. ADJOURNMENT: Vice Chair Bush adjourned the meeting of the Design Review Board at 4:44 p.m. to the next Design Review Board meeting to be held June 06, 2018 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Dana Morrison
Assistant Planner