



**City of Sebastopol**  
*Incorporated 1902*  
Planning Department  
7120 Bodega Avenue  
Sebastopol, CA 95472  
707-823-6167  
707-823-1135 (Fax)  
[www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us](http://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us)

Email: [dmorrison@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:dmorrison@cityofsebastopol.org)

## **APPROVED MINUTES**

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
SPECIAL MEETING  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF November 14, 2018

SEBASTOPOL CITY HALL  
CONFERENCE ROOM  
7120 BODEGA AVENUE  
4:00 P.M

### **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on November 08, 2018.

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Luthin called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

<b>Present:</b>	Ted Luthin, Chair Cary Bush, Vice Chair Lars Langberg, Board Member Gregory Beale, Board Member Christine Level, Board Member Ron Hari, Board Member
<b>Absent:</b>	None
<b>Staff:</b>	Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director Dana Morrison, Assistant Planner Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** October 17, 2018 Tree Board & Design Review Board

Board Member Level amended the Design Review Board minutes of October 17, 2018.

Vice Chair Bush made a motion to approve the Tree Board minutes of October 17, 2018 as submitted, and the Design Review Board minutes of October 17, 2018 as amended.

Board Member Beale seconded the motion.

AYES: Vice Chair Bush, Board Member Beale, Board Member Langberg, and Board Member Hari  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Chair Luthin and Board Member Level  
ABSENT: None

**4. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE ON MATTERS OF GENERAL INTEREST:**

Director Svanstrom provided the following updates:

- The City has advertised for three openings on the Design Review Board and two openings on the Planning Commission.
  - Encouraged the three incumbents (Chair Luthin and Board members Bush and Beale) whose terms are ending to reapply.
  - The deadline to apply is coming up soon, in the event that enough applications are not received, the deadline will be extended.
- The City Council recently adopted the new Zoning Ordinance which goes into effect tomorrow, November 15, 2018.
- Two Public Arts Committee meetings were held last week to hear from the finalists for the art piece in front of the library.
  - The maquettes for both pieces will be on display at the Sebastopol Library through the Thanksgiving weekend.
  - Comment cards will be available and collected.
  - Encouraged interested persons to stop by, check out the maquettes, and provide their input on a comment card.

Board Member Langberg, who serves on the Public Arts Committee as well, commented:

- After over twenty applicants, the Committee chose three finalists.
  - One of the finalists backed out.
  - The two remaining artists and proposals are very different.

Director Svanstrom updates continued:

- The Housing Fair that was held on Sunday, November 4, 2018 saw about 150 attendees. City staff, County staff, and other organizations were present to help residents who may be interested in accessory dwelling units, junior accessory dwelling units, and other home-sharing opportunities to try to address the housing needs of our community.

The Board had no questions for Director Svanstrom.

**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. PLANNED COMMUNITY POLICY STATEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW:** Review of the Policy Statement and Development Plan for a Planned Community referred to as the Davis Townhomes project. Project proposes to develop eighteen (18); 1,180 square foot, 2-bedroom, 1.5 bathroom, 2-story townhomes. The proposed development would occur on a vacant lot located at the end of Morris Street, south of Sebastopol Avenue/Hwy 12 (6737 Sebastopol Avenue).

Assistant Planner Morrison noted that an updated handout had been provided to the Board prior to the start of this meeting and presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of Assistant Planner Morrison as well as Director Svanstrom.

The Board asked questions of the applicant as well.

Chair Luthin asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Kathy Austin (Project Architect) introduced Parker Smith (Landscape Architect), Dan Davis and Mrs. Davis (Property Owners) and gave a presentation. She was available for questions.

Mr. Smith gave a brief presentation as well.

Ms. Austin made closing remarks and expressed that she, Mr. Smith, and Mr. and Mrs. Davis were available for questions.

The Board asked questions of the applicant.

Director Svanstrom made a clarifying statement on process.

The Board asked additional questions of Director Svanstrom and the applicant.

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

The property owner of 6681 Sebastopol Avenue commented:

- Her property abuts the property that is proposed for development.
- Uses this property as a rental.
- Brought her property at 6681 Sebastopol Avenue back to pristine condition after it was once a homeless encampment.
  - She did this specifically to earn money for her retirement.
- Expressed concern over the impacts that the lights from the parking lot may have on one or more of the units on her property.
  - Needs to have her units rented.
  - Spoke on the financial impact that not being able to rent one or more of her units could have.
  - Requested that the lights be adjusted so that they won't be shining on her property.
- Would like to have a solid fence, preferably not wood, between this project and her property for privacy.
- The proposed location for trash collection is very closer to the back of the fence.
  - Expressed concern over the amount of trash that will collect there with a total of eighteen units.
  - Requested that trash collection occur elsewhere, away from her fence line.
- Expressed concerns over the traffic that this project will bring.
  - Automobile lights from cars that are parking at night will shine through into her rental areas.
- Thanked the Board for hearing her concerns.

Board Member Beale asked a clarifying question of the public speaker.

Ms. Austin responded:

- Thanked the public speaker for her comments and encouraged her to get in touch with the property owner so he could coordinate with her as this project moves forward.
- Considering a concrete fence in the area but wants to work with the neighboring property owner to ensure that it meets what she would like to see.
- Wants to be good neighbors and wants to address concerns.

- Is considering using a light fixture that includes a baffle, so the light would not project backwards.
- With regards to the trash enclosure, the developer must work with the local trash hauler to confirm exactly what they want.
  - The proposal is consistent with what she has designed in the past for similar projects and is subject to change based on feedback from the trash hauling company.

The property owner of 6681 Sebastopol Avenue responded:

- Would appreciate the opportunity to discuss fencing.
- Because lighting is such a concern, she would like to see what the proposed light would look like and how it would project.

The Board asked clarifying questions of Ms. Austin.

Lynn Deedler, a resident of Sebastopol, commented:

- All in all, this is a good project.
- The proposed density of the project is very appropriate.
- The units are comprised of three large blocks which allows for a huge common area.
  - Perhaps the large blocks are an appropriate tradeoff for the big common area.
  - Goes back and forth on that.
- These units do tend to look a lot alike.
  - Painting them strong, different colors may or may not mitigate that.
  - Suggested architectural distinction.
- Considers the concerns he expressed to be minor but worth considering.
- In looking at the color samples, the colors are very appropriate for the environment that they are in with one exception.
  - The off-white with the gray looks very tract home residential and clashes with the surrounding environment.

An unidentified man commented:

- This is a very attractive project.
- This project is very needed in our town.
- Suggested factoring in the common area when calculating FAR.
  - Suspects that owners of the units will have an undivided proportionate ownership of the common areas.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Luthin closed the public comment period and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Chair Luthin spoke on process and asked to hear from the Board on the proposed Policy Statement.

The Board asked procedural questions of staff.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- Generally, the map, site plan, and density works and feels pretty good for the site.
- The Policy Statement seems accurate.
- Echoed Commissioner Fritz's comment on this project being able to be more dense.
- Doesn't have a problem with this development becoming more dense, however, it seems to work as proposed.
- Likes the common spaces and openness of the site.

- Has additional comments about the character and design of the project, orientation of buildings, etc., however, those are separate from the matter of the Policy Statement.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Feels the same as Board Member Langberg.
- The application is great.
- The proposal takes advantage of a rather narrow aperture.
- The project is well sited, has adequate circulation, and nice common areas.
- Would love for the project to have a denser quality as housing is such a huge need here.
- This is a good use for the site.

The Board asked clarifying questions of staff.

Board Member Level commented:

- Supports the proposed density.
  - It's nice to talk about higher density but we need to ensure that we have the infrastructure to support it first.
- The incorrect statement in the staff report on height needs to be clarified.
- Supports the 40' height as allowed in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Expressed being in support of the Policy Statement.

Board Member Beale commented:

- Sebastopol needs more housing, more density.
- This is a unique property.
- Adding more than the proposed amount of density could eliminate the character that has been carefully created by the applicant team.
  - What the applicant has come up with makes a lot of sense and shows their care for the community and town.
- Feels positive about what the applicant is trying to achieve here.

Board Member Hari commented:

- Concurs with Board Member Beale on the matter of density.
- Most people come to Sebastopol for a slight amount of open space.
  - People don't come to Sebastopol looking for high density development.
- Likes the proposal.
- Is a traditionalist in terms of style.
- Likes the traditional style of this project and thinks it fits well here.
- Hopes for a fairly high pitched roof.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Concurs with fellow Board Member comments.
- This is an appropriate project for where it is proposed.
- Going higher density with the intersection and easements would be very challenging and probably wouldn't fit the property.
- This project has been carefully crafted and he expressed being in support of it.
- Served on the General Plan Advisory Committee.
- Supports lower FAR in this case.
- Concurred with Board Member Level on height in that the applicant can go up to 40' if they wish.
- It is important to understand and respect the floodplain issues.
- The Downtown Core Planned Community chart that was provided was very helpful.

- The application itself is nicely organized and understandable.
- Reiterated his support for this project.

The Board asked a clarifying question of staff on item number four in the Policy Statement. Chair Luthin surmised the following:

- The timeline, as indicated in item number five, looks reasonable.
- The Board is unanimously in support of this project.
- The Board supports the lower FAR.
- The Board supports a height limit of up to 40' as allowed per zoning.

The Board concurred.

Board Member Level commented:

- The 30' height limit is self-imposed by the applicant.
- Zoning allows for a height of up to 40'.

Chair Luthin asked to hear from the Board on this project in terms of preliminary Design Review.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- Because this is a very unique site in Sebastopol it begs an opening to a different kind of architecture than can be seen elsewhere in Sebastopol.
- The proposed style of architecture, that can also be seen in our downtown, does not feel appropriate.
  - It will probably work and many people who like a more traditional style will be happy with it.
  - Trying to replicate the character of what we have in other parts of town feels like a missed opportunity.
- This site is wide open and has some very eclectic buildings and beautiful landscape around it.
- The pallet could be much looser and the design more wide open.
  - Encouraged exploration of that.
- Does not see individuality in these units.
  - The differences between each unit are much too subtle.
  - At first glance the units look pretty much the same to him.
  - The use of different colors will help some.
  - Color should not be leading the design intention, it should be enhancing and reinforcing it.
- Understands the bike path issue, but the hierarchy between the front and back of the units does not feel right.
- The common space is beautiful and open.
- The rear yard feels uninviting.
- The façades of the buildings out to the courtyard and to the Railroad Forest could be much more open and inviting.
  - The design should encourage community.
- The cluster of buildings around the courtyard is nice and feels good.
- A majority of the units don't have views of the Railroad Forest.
  - It would be nice if it could open up more in that direction.
- Ms. Austin's work at The Barlow combined styles (industrial, barn, agricultural) in a very interesting way.
  - Without replicating it, this project could go there in a smaller scale.
- Architecture wise, the proposed design doesn't really feel like what this site calls for.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Concurred with Board Member Langberg.
- This is a unique site which presents a great opportunity for something more inventive.
- This proposal includes three really big buildings that have a lot of ornamentation.
  - In looking at this from the perspective of somebody looking to buy an affordable home, the ornate details that are being proposed could really drive up the price.
- These seem like row houses.
- The proposal doesn't contextually fit the site.
- In looking at everything, the plan looks very busy.
  - It will be very hard to let your eyes settle into the space especially as an endemic connection to the Laguna.

Board Member Level commented:

- Doesn't see much differentiation between the units.
- These look like row houses.
- Concurred with Board Member Langberg and Vice Chair Bush on this being an opportunity for something more bold.
  - Thanked Board Member Langberg and Vice Chair Bush for their comments which were very well stated.
- Carports always seem to appear as an afterthought.
  - Would like the carports to tie-in to the buildings in some manner.
  - Does not want to see basic, prefabricated carports used here.
- Wants to see definite specifics when the applicant returns for Design Review that way the Board can be certain on what it's approving.

The Board asked clarifying questions of Ms. Austin.

Board Member Beale commented:

- Lots one through five that run parallel to Sebastopol Avenue provide noise and visual buffering, from the intersection down through the parking lot, for the courtyard which is a benefit.
- Concerned with lots ten through eighteen in terms of their relationship with Sebastopol Inn which is a two-story hotel.
- Likes that the project is more oriented towards the south and the Laguna.
- The fact that this site is in the Downtown Core while being removed from the main drag makes it unique.
- It makes sense to orient housing away from the downtown.
- This process is not intended to feel like an interrogation.
  - The fact that it has felt like an interrogation at times is not appropriate.
  - Understands the importance of being specific about what's critical, what's important, and what is not.
  - Asked fellow Board members to do things more positively.

Board Member Hari commented:

- Reiterated that he is a traditionalist.
- What the applicant is proposing will cost a lot of money.
- When thinking of affordable or moderate housing, it's hard to be creative and save money.
- This is not a very visible site.
  - If this site were highly visible, he may be more inclined to want to see it spiffed up a bit.

- The Board should not put anything extra on the applicant if this is what they've worked out because it will wind up costing them more money.
  - It's not appropriate for the Board to require changes that will wind up costing the applicant more money.

Board Member Beale commented:

- We're not designing and building the vineyard home on the top of a hill.
- There is a purpose behind this development.
  - The Board's input should be cognizant of that.
- This development will be seen most from the bicycle trail.
  - The fact that there is less of a wall of structure facing the bicycle trail is a positive.

Board Member Level commented:

- Does not object to the design if it is what the applicant wants to use.
- This is not an affordable housing project, this is a market rate housing project with the possibility of inclusionary units.
- What they decide to spend on this project will affect the future value.

Chair Luthin commented:

- The townhomes that are behind the historic homes on South Main Street totally make sense there.
  - That makes a little less sense here, in this location.
- Concurred with Board Members Level and Hari on some people being traditionalists, which is okay with.
- There is nothing objectionable about the proposal, if this is what the property owner wants.
- While he understands that people will want their private space, he expressed concern over the 6' fence that will be facing the common area on lots one through five.

Ms. Austin responded that the fence could be 4' solid with an additional 2' of lattice.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Likes the idea of 4' solid with 2' of lattice better than a solid 6'.
- Could support a 6' solid fence for the areas that do not face the common area.

The Board asked a clarifying question of Ms. Austin.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Interested in seeing a real rendering of what the units will look like with the proposed color scheme.
- In general, he does not like relying on color to give individual units distinction.
- These feel like miniature single family homes that are connected.
- Agrees are there missed design opportunities here, but there usually are.
- The design is not inappropriate for Sebastopol.
- Supports this project.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Two escaped exotic species are on the landscape plan which makes him nervous from a contextual and endemic standpoint being close to the Laguna.
- Some of the trees in the tree legend are short lived trees.
- The style of the homes is the applicant's decision.
- How the homes fit with the landscape is vital.

- Some of the roofing positions are awkward.
- The mass of the buildings, in terms of the whole profile, strikes him as a little less than consistent.
- Agrees with the rest of the Board in there being a project here.
- There's a lot going on here and the project will be pretty impactful.
- The huge long plant list will only contribute to the project being even more impactful.
- Suggested quieting the site down.
- As proposed, the maintenance of this project will be huge.
  - Easy maintenance is desirable.

Board Member Beale commented:

- With the landscaping plan, carports, and orientation of the different buildings, it's almost impossible in reality to stand at any given point and see the elevation the way it's being shown by the applicant in this submittal.
  - At best, you'll be looking down the face of the buildings more along it versus at it from most places.
- Encouraged the applicant to provide different perspectives when they return for Design Review.

Ms. Austin thanked the Board for their comments and asked a clarifying question of staff.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Luthin concluded Board discussion of this item.

Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m. for a brief break.

Chair Luthin reconvened the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

**B. DESIGN REVIEW, MAJOR:** This is a Major Design Review application, proposing a revision to the approved Design for the French Garden Inn (an Inn proposed to be located at 8060 Bodega Ave, next to the former French Garden [now Gravenstein Grill]). New owners have purchased the property and decided to proceed with changes to the proposed Inn, including reducing the number of hotel rooms from 18 to 11 and reducing the project to a one-story design.

Assistant Planner Morrison presented the staff report.

The Board asked questions of Assistant Planner Morrison as well as Director Svanstrom.

Chair Luthin asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

Gannon Tidwell, project sponsor/property owner, made a brief presentation and was available for questions. He also introduced co-sponsor/co-owner, Rich Springer.

Paul Nyulassie, project architect, made a brief presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Tidwell, Mr. Nyulassie, and Mr. Springer.

The Board also asked additional questions of staff.

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

Ila Benavidez-Heaster, a resident of Sebastopol, commented:

- The prior developer promised her that a hostel would be included.

- Requested consideration of a hostel here too.
- Encouraged incentives/discounts for guests who arrive on a bicycle.
- Understands the issues that may come with adding a hostel.
- Reiterated her request for consideration of a hostel within this project.
- Thanked the applicant for giving her request some thought.

Mr. Tidwell and Mr. Springer asked clarifying questions of Ms. Benavidez-Heaster and commented that they would consider the feasibility of adding a hostel room and giving incentives/discounts for guests who arrive on a bicycle.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Ms. Benavidez-Heaster made the same request for a hostel of the owners and operators of Hotel Sebastopol and they were able to add them into their project.
  - One of the reasons that they were able to include them was based on the tremendous number of bicycle tour groups, where unrelated people want to share a room, that stay at their other hotel, Hotel Healdsburg.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Luthin closed the public comment period.

Board Member Hari commented:

- Expressed concern over the last-minute nature of this request and the pressure that is being placed on the Board to decide on this project during this meeting.
  - While he doesn't object to the Board having to decide on the project during this meeting, it doesn't seem to make a lot of sense.
  - Doesn't object to this project at all, however, he does have several questions about this application.

Assistant Planner Morrison and Director Svanstrom responded on process. The applicant spoke on process and timing as well.

The Board asked clarifying questions of staff.

Chair Luthin asked for Board discussion on this application.

Board Member Beale commented:

- Concerned because the information that has been provided by the applicant has a lot of inconsistencies and some of them could present major issues.
- Loves this concept.
- This is a huge improvement from what was previously proposed.
- Really like this approach.
- Spoke on the difficulty of this process.
- This project may benefit from going through the complete process because at this point, if the Board were to approve this project, it would be based on a lot of assumptions or a humongous list of conditions.
- Works in the design and construction industry himself.
- As difficult as this process is making things for the Board it may also be doing a disservice to the applicant.
- Has additional, more specific comments on design which he will save until later.

Board Member Level commented:

- In addition to Board Member Beale's comments, trying to process this application in this fashion is a bit deceptive to the public as this is clearly not a revision to the prior proposal.

The Board asked clarifying questions of staff.

Board Member Level commented:

- There are a lot of issues with the thoroughfare fronting this project.
- There are members of the public that would want to comment on this proposal.
- Supports the basic proposal and concept in general.
- Concerned by internal inconsistencies over site, landscape and pathway issues.

The applicant asked a clarifying question of Board Member Level.

Board Member Level commented:

- Uncomfortable by the fact that this plan doesn't feel resolved or final and yet the Board is being asked to act on it.

Chair Luthin commented:

- In his recollection of the process for the prior application, the main issues were height and privacy (the neighbors behind the development were concerned due to the two-story height of the project).
  - In general, the neighbors were pretty supportive of the project.
  - Does not remember a lot of opposition.
  - Public sentiment could have changed between now and then.

Board Member Level commented:

- Concerns have to do with transparency.
- The public commented on the prior project, not on this one.
- Shouldn't give off the perception of favoritism.
- Not expecting a problem with this application.
- Not having a proper process could be a pitfall for the City.

The Board asked clarifying questions of staff.

Board Member Beale commented:

- What is unique here is the fact that the potential impact on load, use, and scale went down significantly but this is an entirely different project from what was originally approved.

Board Member Level commented:

- Issues could arise that could present liability issues for the City, particularly without there being management onsite 24/7.

Vice Chair Bush commented:

- Thanked the applicants for bringing this project to the Board.
- A lot of work has gone into this.
- The Board wants to make sure that they understand what they're being asked to approve and how it all relates to each other.
- While he understands where other Board members are coming from, he does not object to the applicant bringing this application forward at the last minute because they are following a set process.
- The proposal is not all that clear.
- The proposed edible garden will need a maintenance plan.
  - The reality of an edible landscape is that they can be really tricky.
- There is a huge ADA compliancy issue that comes with using crushed gravel/rock for the flatwork, if that is what the applicant wants to use.

- Would like to see a calendar of operations with regards to how this will all be maintained, not just when it comes to landscape.
- If landscape lighting is desired, that would be a huge component that the Board would also like to review.
  - Landscape lighting can add a great flavor for the type of client you're trying to attract.
- The plant legend looks great.
  - Does not like how the rosemary is shrubbed up around the buildings.
  - Almost all of the buildings are shrubbed up by various plantings.
  - Almost all of the plants that are around these buildings will reach up to the eaves.
  - The plant legend says that no pyrophytic plants are proposed but rosemary is a pyrophytic plant.
  - Water use is great.
- The plant legend does not reflect the look of what was presented in the rendering of the courtyard.
  - Prefers the open, airy feel of the courtyard in the rendering.
- Likes that smaller units, which people are starting to gravitate towards, are being proposed.
- Really likes this project.
  - This project is different, unique and inventive.
  - The applicant has created a place and that is what creates a really good project.
  - This looks like an exciting environment that could become a community space.
- Accessibility is important, all people have to be included.
- Approves of this project in general.
- The Board would have to attach a lot of conditions if it were to try to approve this project tonight.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- Vice Chair Bush's comments were well said.
- This submittal feels more like Preliminary Design Review.
- This application is not complete enough for the Board to approve it.
- Coming up with an extensive list of conditions would almost equate to the Board designing the project for the applicant which is not appropriate.
- In general, the project looks great and has a really nice feel to it.
- Having to come up with a long list of conditions in order to grant final Design Review approval of this application does not feel like what the Board is charged to do.

Chair Luthin asked if there was a part of the project the Board felt it could approve, like the buildings.

Board Member Langberg commented:

- The buildings cannot be approved without ADA.
- The windows are not decided.
- The lighting plan is incomplete.

Board Member Beale commented:

- While some this is final, much of what was submitted feels preliminary.

The Board asked procedural and clarifying questions of staff.

Board Member Hari commented:

- The Board is trying to do the right thing.

- The consensus of the Board appears to be that granting final approval tonight is premature.

Chair Luthin commented:

- There are too many unknowns here.
- The Board has nothing significant that it can approve at this time.
  - The site plan cannot be approved because it may need to change due to ADA.
  - The building architecture cannot be approved because there are missing details and it may change.
  - The landscape plan and renderings presented are incompatible and need to be synchronized to accurately reflect the proposal.
- Supports a continuance.
- Would like to see the following:
  - The buildings need to be resolved.
  - Specifics are needed.
  - The design of the fence.
  - Whole site elevations.
  - A reduction of the rear gate height.
  - Bicycle parking needs further thought and development.
  - Signage.
  - Accessibility.
  - Solar.
  - Mechanical.
  - Landscape.
- The Board is excited about this project.
- Expressed being totally on board with this project.
- Reiterated that the Board needs something that it can approve.
- The Board has approved vague applications before and oftentimes doing so has resulted in issues.

The Board concurred.

The Board discussed process.

The applicant asked clarifying questions of the Board and staff.

The Board was in consensus on continuing this application pending approval of a new Use Permit.

Board Member Beale commented:

- The fact that this is a reduced scale project seems to have unrightfully set expectations for the applicant's in terms of what the Board would be looking for in order to be able to approve this application today.

The Board concurred.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Luthin asked for a motion.

Vice Chair Bush made a motion to continue this application to allow the applicant to go through the standard Use Permit process and eventually return to the Board with additional details on the following:

- Landscape plan in coordination with the site plan,
- Site work (flat work and ADA compliance),

- Lighting,
- Signage,
- Fence and gate details and elevations,
- Whole site elevations with long broad perspectives,
- Bike parking,
- Solar placement,
- Mechanical equipment placement (anything exterior, including the HVAC condensing unit),
- Trash enclosures and shed,
- Deck details,
- Barn door details

The applicant asked clarifying questions of the Board.

Chair Luthin commented that interior matters are outside of the Board's purview.

Board Member Level seconded the motion.

Chair Luthin asked for discussion of the motion.

Hearing none, the Board voted on the motion as follows:

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Bush, Board Member Beale, Board Member Langberg,  
Board Member Level and Board Member Hari

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

**9. DISCUSSION ITEMS:** There were none.

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

**11. ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Tree Board/Design Review Board meeting will be held on December 05, 2018 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Dana Morrison  
Assistant Planner