

**SANTA ROSA  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD/CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD  
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING MINUTES  
CITY HALL, 100 SANTA ROSA AVENUE  
NOVEMBER 3, 2016**

**5 P.M. (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS)**

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Burch called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

**Design Review Board**

Members Present: Chair Michael Burch, Katharine Anderson, Joel Grogan, Kris Sunderlage, Scott Kincaid (Arrived 5:17). Absent: Warren Hedgpeth, Kevin Zucco (Abstained prior)

**Cultural Heritage Board**

Members Present: Chair Stacey DeShazo, Margaret Purser, Mark Debacker, Cappie Garrett, John Murphey. Absent: Ann Galantine, Laura Fennell

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**August 18, 2016 Special Joint Meeting Minutes** (Cultural Heritage Board Only. Approved by Design Review Board on September 1, 2016.) The Cultural Heritage Board approved the minutes as corrected.

John Murphey- Concerned about wording emphasis to explore using real brick or brick cladding along front façade. -change administratively – approve as amended

**October 6, 2016 Special Joint Meeting Minutes** (Design Review Board and Cultural Heritage Board)

The Cultural Heritage Board approved the minutes as corrected.

The Design Review Board approved the minutes as corrected.

Check roster/roll call – empty – approve ad amended

**October 20, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes** (Design Review Board Only)

The Design Review Board approved the minutes as submitted.

**3. BOARD BUSINESS – Statement of Purpose**

# DRAFT

## 4. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Duane DeWitt: Spoke regarding the removal of parking spaces in Copenhagen, Denmark and related it to a similar application to hundreds of US cities and prospectively the City of Santa Rosa. Referenced the book “life between buildings.”

(Board Member Kincaid arrived at 5:17pm)

## 5. STATEMENTS OF ABSTENSION BY BOARD MEMBERS - None

## 6. SCHEDULED ITEMS

### 6.1 LANDMARK ALTERATION & PRELIMINARY & FINAL DESIGN REVIEW DETURK WINERY VILLAGE

#### 8 W 9<sup>TH</sup> ST & 806 DONAHUE ST – FILE NO. PRJ16-012

BACKGROUND: This project proposes to construct a mixed-use campus consisting of 185 attached residential units, 15 of which shall be designated for very-low income occupants. The project will retain 20,000 square feet of existing commercial space. The project also includes a restoration component for the existing historic structures.

- Susie Murray, City Planner, presented the staff report.
- Rick Deringer, the applicant, gave a presentation.
- Kevin O’Malley, the project architect, gave a presentation to address action items.
- Nicolas Radkey, Historical Consultant, gave a presentation.
- Architect Paul Harris, the landscape architect, gave a presentation to address action items.

Chair Burch opened the public hearing:

- Gina Statler-Calhoun: Disapproved of 4<sup>th</sup> floor change aesthetics, and requested parking directional changes and locust trees; she asked for a non-reflective surface on the west side of the building.
- Duane DeWitt: Advocated for more housing and supported the project. He asked the boards to not be concerned with building height, to decrease parking stalls, and to consider enclosed bicycle stalls.
- Linda Hiskind: Concerned about her tenants if the project is approved. The project is too large and disrespectful of neighborhood, based on Cultural Heritage Board/Design Review Board neighborhood guidelines.
- Paul Sequeira – Lives near the project and advocated that this is an ideal urban family neighborhood. Welcomes more development, but is concerned about the enormity of the project.

Seeing no one else step forward to speak, Chair Hilberman closed the public hearing.

# DRAFT

Chair Burch adjourned the meeting for a break at 8:33p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:55 p.m.

Following Design Review Board discussion, it was MOVED by Board Member Anderson, seconded by Board Member Kincaid to waive reading of the text and adopt:

**RESOLUTION ENTITLED:** RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA GRANTING PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE LOCATED AT 806 DONAHUE STREET AND 8 W 9TH STREET IN THE WEST END PRESERVATION DISTRICT, APNS: 010-091-001 AND 010-091-007, FILE NO. PRJ16-012

Board Member Debacker made the following friendly amendment:

1. To strike the language in Finding No. 1 of the draft Resolution which reads: "...the City's Design Guidelines, architectural criteria for special areas, and other applicable City requirements (e.g., City policy statements and development plans);
2. To strike Finding No. 4 in its entirety. (Finding No. 4 reads: "The architectural design of the proposed development is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. In response to comments from both the Cultural Heritage Board and Design Review Board at a Joint Concept Design Review meeting held on March 3, 2016, the proposed project incorporates heavy materials in keeping with the industrial history of the DeTurk Winery complex. In a Historic Evaluation prepared by Susan Clark, M.A., Architectural Historian, the DeTurk Round Barn and neighborhood park provide an adequate buffer between the predominately single-family residential West End neighborhood and the subject site, making it possible for the proximity of these two types of development;")
3. To strike the following verbiage from Finding No. 5: "and its neighbors" To take the boards' overt approval out of the equation.

Executive Secretary Bill Rose clarified that the Findings are required language and cannot be removed from the resolution, and suggested that staff analysis is the appropriate section to edit.

Board Member Debacker withdrew the friendly amendment.

# DRAFT

Following discussion, Chair Burch outlined Advisory Conditions:

1. Provide a maintenance and preservation plan for the historic brick façade.
2. Provide peer review or updated, complete historic resource evaluation - include the following sections which are currently missing from the report:
  - a. A full comprehensive, historic context;
  - b. A survey and evaluation based on the neighborhood;
  - c. The association of the building in context with the neighborhood and similar buildings; and
  - d. Include the standard compliance review discussion item per the Secretary of Interior standards.
3. Consider operational characteristics of the project:
  - a. Provide the same level of materials and finishes for affordable units;
  - b. Provide a monitoring program to maintain the materials and finishes during remodels;
  - c. Car share and unbundled parking should run with the lifetime of the development.

Chair Burch outlined Board Member comments:

1. Consider more privacy and glare reduction for at-grade units on Donahue Avenue, which currently have full-height windows.
2. Provide layout and installation details of hardy-plank siding.
3. Provide an updated landscape set with color board for landscape design materials and furnishings, and ensure that the landscape plans are keyed correctly.
4. Provide updated lighting package with recommendations on photometric, number of fixtures, and fixture selections.
5. Consider providing alternative light sources to improve light and circulation for the living spaces in Building A.
6. Provide a complete color board.
7. Consider direct access to the ground floor units of Building D from the garage.
8. Consider variety of building railings on Buildings A and D.
9. Consider the location of trash areas and installation of garbage chutes to minimize the distance tenants travel to dispose of trash.
10. Consider reducing the number of suspended walkways on 4<sup>th</sup> level of Building D.
11. Provide a more columnar, faster-growing tree along Donahue Street.

# DRAFT

Board Member Kincaid made a friendly amendment to add the advisory conditions and board conditions to the Motion.

Board Member Anderson accepted the friendly amendment.

### **Cultural Heritage Board Vote:**

The motion was LOST 0-5-2 (Board Members De Shazo, Debacker, Garrett, Murphy, and Purser voting No, and Board Members Fennell and Galantine absent).

### **Design Review Board Vote:**

The motion CARRIED 5-0-2 (Board Members Burch, Kincaid, Sunderlage, Anderson, Grogan voting Aye, and Board Members Hedgpeth and Zucco absent).

The **MOTION FAILED** due to lack of consensus by the Design Review Board and Cultural Heritage Board.

Following Design Review Board discussion, it was MOVED by Board Member Kincaid to deny Preliminary Design Review approval, and to memorialize the advisory and Board Comments for appealing bodies to consider. The Motion was Withdrawn.

Following discussion, it was MOVED by Board Member Debacker seconded by Board Member Garrett, to introduce a **RESOLUTION TO DENY PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE** based on noncompliance with Findings 4 and 5:

4. The architectural design of the proposed development is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. In response to comments from both the Cultural Heritage Board and Design Review Board at a Joint Concept Design Review meeting held on March 3, 2016, the proposed project incorporates heavy materials in keeping with the industrial history of the DeTurk Winery complex. In a Historic Evaluation prepared by Susan Clark, M.A., Architectural Historian, the DeTurk Round Barn and neighborhood park provide an adequate buffer between the predominately single-family residential West End neighborhood and the subject site, making it possible for the proximity of these two types of development; and
5. The design of the proposed development will provide a desirable environment for its occupants, visiting public, and its neighbors through the appropriate use of materials, texture, and color, and would remain aesthetically appealing and be appropriately

# DRAFT

maintained. During a Joint Design Review meeting held on March 3, 2016, the Cultural Heritage Board and Design Review Board directed the project applicant in terms of design and materials, with the intent to celebrate the historic industrial use while introducing the new residential use. Those recommendations have been incorporated into the project.

And due to noncompliance with: Processing Review Procedures Part 2, Guidelines Section 1G – New Construction, City Goals 4.7 3G, and noncompliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation Sections – New Buildings and District/Neighborhood.

### **Cultural Heritage Board Vote:**

The motion to deny Preliminary Design Review CARRIED 5-0-2 (Board Members De Shazo, Debacker, Garrett, Murphy, and Purser voting Aye, and Board Members Fennell and Galantine absent).

### **Design Review Board Vote:**

The motion to deny Preliminary Design Review CARRIED 4-1-2 (Board Members Burch, Kincaid, Anderson, Grogan voting Aye, Board Member Sunderlage voting no, and Board Members Hedgpeth and Zucco absent).

The Design Review Board left the meeting at this time.

Following Cultural Heritage Board discussion, it was MOVED by Board Member Purser, seconded by Board Member Murphey, to Continue Landmark Alteration review to a date uncertain. Following further Cultural Heritage Board discussion, Board Member Purser Withdrew the Motion.

Following Cultural Heritage Board discussion, it was MOVED by Board Member Debacker, seconded by Board Member Purser, to adopt:

**RESOLUTION ENTITLED:** RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA DENYING A LANDMARK ALTERATION PERMIT FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE LOCATED AT 806 DONAHUE STREET AND 8 W. 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET IN THE WEST END PRESERVATION DISTRICT, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS 010-091-001 AND 010-091-007, FILE NUMBER PRJ16-012) FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- Due to the Cultural Heritage Board's inability to make findings A, C, D, E and F, on the basis of Processing Review Procedures Part 2, Guidelines Section 1G – New Construction, City Coals 4.7 3G, and Secretary of

# DRAFT

Interior Standards for Rehabilitation Sections – Site: New Buildings and District/Neighborhood.

The motion CARRIED 5-0-2 (Board Members De Shaza, Debacker, Garrett, Murphy, and Purser voting Aye, and Board Members Fennell and Galantine absent).

7. **BOARD MEMBER REPORTS** - None
8. **DEPARTMENT REPORT** - None
9. **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING** – Chair Burch adjourned the meeting at 12:00 a.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting of November 17, 2016.

PREPARED BY:

---

Patti Pacheco Gregg, Recording Secretary

PREPARED BY:

---

Mike Maloney, Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

---

Bill Rose, Executive Secretary

---

Patrick Streeter, Executive Secretary

APPROVED:

---

Chair, Michael Burch

---

Chair, Stacey De Shazo



## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** October 17, 2016

**TO:** Chair De Shazo and Members of the Cultural Heritage Board  
Chair Burch and Members of the Design Review Board

**FROM:** Susie Murray, City Planner

**CC:** Bill Rose, Supervising Planner  
Clare Hartman, Deputy Director - Planning

**SUBJECT: DeTurk Winery Village**

On October 6, 2016, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards (the Boards) considered Preliminary Design Review and a Landmark Alteration permit for the DeTurk Winery Village project. The meeting was continued to a date uncertain and the applicant was given thirteen (13) action items pertaining to the Design Review and two (2) action items pertaining to the Landmark Alteration permit.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65915(d)(1)(A-C), when a application for density bonus is received, the applicant may request specific concessions depending on the number of units proposed for very low-, low- or moderate-income occupants. The city shall grant the concession(s) requested by the applicant unless the city can make a written finding, based on substantial evidence, of any of the following:

- A. The concession is not required in order to provide for affordable housing costs as defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, or for rents for the targeted units to be set as specified in subsection (c);
- B. The concession would have a specific adverse impact, as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households.
- C. The concession would be contrary to state or federal law.

The applicant has requested a Density Bonus and, as designed, the project is allowed two concessions; one for height and one for parking. The Density Bonus will be acted on by the Planning Commission. What is the impact in terms of the Design Review and Landmark Alteration entitlements?

- Both entitlements have been conditioned to require the approval of the associated Density Bonus;



- In terms of the Design Review and Landmark Alteration entitlements before the Boards, consideration of building height and parking are not within the purview for the decision.
- The staff report (attached) discusses the first concession which will be taken for building height; and
- The second concession, which is not discussed in the staff report, will be taken for parking. Please take note that the project, as proposed, meets parking requirements.

Planning and Economic Development recommends the following actions:

- The Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards grant Preliminary Design Review;
- The Design Review Board grant Final Design Review; and
- The Cultural Heritage Board approve the Landmark Alteration.

Attachments:

- Attachment 1 – Action items from the October 6, 2016, joint meeting
- Attachment 2 – Staff report from the October 6, 2016, joint meeting
- Attachment 3 – Revised plans stamped received on October 24, 2016
- Attachment 4 – Historic Evaluation dated September 2016
- Attachment 5 – Supplement comments from Susan Clark, stamped received October 24, 2016
- Attachment 6 – Memo to the Boards (from the applicant), stamped received October 24, 2016
- Attachment 7 – Applicant's response to action items (memo from Kevin O'Malley), stamped received on October 24, 2016
- Attachment 8 – Public correspondence received after the October 6, 2016, joint meeting.

The October 6, 2016 public hearing and Board packet information can be viewed on the Design Review Board website, at:

[http://santa-rosa.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=20&clip\\_id=828&meta\\_id=93021](http://santa-rosa.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=20&clip_id=828&meta_id=93021).

RESOLUTION NUMBER 323

RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA DENYING A LANDMARK ALTERATION PERMIT FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE LOCATED AT 806 DONAHUE STREET AND 8 W. 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOS. 010-091-001 AND 010-091-007, FILE NUMBER PRJ16-012

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2015, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards conducted the first of two Joint Concept Design Review meetings; and

WHEREAS, on February 24, 2016, a Neighborhood Meeting was held at the DeTurk Round Barn to introduce the conceptual project plans to the surrounding neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2016, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards conducted the second Joint Concept Design Review meeting at which point the Boards provided direction, in terms of project design and materials, to the project applicant; and

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2016, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 28768 stating its Intention to Consider Vacation of Public Right-of-way for an 18,725 square-foot area along the east side of Donahue Street, between W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street and W. 9<sup>th</sup> Street; and

WHEREAS, on May 24, 2016, the DeTurk Winery Village project applications were submitted to Planning and Economic Development; and

WHEREAS, on October 6, 2016, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards of the City of Santa Rosa held a duly noticed public hearing; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Boards considered Preliminary Design Review, at which time they received written and oral reports of staff, testimony, and other evidence presented by all those who wished to be heard on the matter; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Design Review Board cited 13 (thirteen) action items and the Cultural Heritage Board cited two (2) action items and the meeting was continued to a date uncertain; and

WHEREAS, on November 3, 2016, the Cultural Heritage Board and Design Review Board of the City of Santa Rosa held a duly noticed continued public hearing to consider Preliminary Design Review for the DeTurk Winery Village project; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Boards received written and oral reports of staff, testimony, and other evidence presented by all those who wished to be heard on the matter; and

WHEREAS, on November 3, 2016, the Cultural Heritage Board of the City of Santa Rosa considered the Landmark Alteration Permit, at which time it received written and oral reports of staff, testimony, and other evidence presented by all those who wished to be heard on the matter; and

WHEREAS, the Cultural Heritage Board of the City of Santa Rosa, after due consideration, investigation, and study made by itself and on its behalf and due consideration of all evidence and reports offered at said hearing denies the Landmark Alteration Due to the Cultural Heritage Board's inability to make findings A, C, D, E and F [show below], which are required in granting approval of a Landmark Alteration Permit, on the basis of Processing Review Procedures Part 2, Guidelines Section 1G – New Construction, City Goals 4.7 3G, and Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation Sections – Site: New Buildings and District/Neighborhood:

- A. The proposed DeTurk Winery Village is consistent with the original architecture style and details of the existing building including colors, textures, materials, fenestration, decorative features and details with the time period of the building's construction and/or adjacent structures.
- C. The proposed DeTurk Winey Village is compatible with adjacent or nearby landmark structures or preservation district structures.
- D. The proposed project is consistent with applicable standards from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
- E. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable guidelines from the Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties.
- F. Granting the Landmark Alteration Permit for DeTurk Winery Village would not constitute a nuisance or be injurious or detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare, or materially injurious to persons, property, or improvements in the vicinity and zoning district in which the property is located.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Cultural Heritage Board of the City of Santa Rosa does hereby deny the Landmark Alteration Permit for DeTurk Winery Village located at 806 Donahue Street and 8 W. 9<sup>th</sup> Street based on the plans stamped received on October 24, 2016.

REGULARLY PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Cultural Heritage Board of the City of Santa Rosa on this 3rd day of November, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: (5) De Shazo, Debacker, Garrett, Murphy, Purser

NOES: (0)

ABSTAIN: (0)

ABSENT: (2) Fennell, Galantine

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Stacey De Shazo, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick Streeter, Secretary

RESOLUTION NUMBER 16-944

RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA DENYING PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE, LOCATED AT 806 DONAHUE STREET AND 8 W. 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET, FILE NO. PRJ16-012

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2015, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards conducted the first of two Joint Concept Design Review meetings; and

WHEREAS, on February 24, 2016, a Neighborhood Meeting was held at the DeTurk Round Barn to introduce the conceptual project plans to the surrounding neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2016, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards conducted the second Joint Concept Design Review meeting at which point the Boards provided direction, in terms of project design and materials, to the project applicant; and

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2016, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 28768 stating its Intention to Consider Vacation of Public Right-of-way for an 18,725 square-foot area along the east side of Donahue Street, between W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street and W. 9<sup>th</sup> Street; and

WHEREAS, on May 24, 2016, the DeTurk Winery Village project applications were submitted to Planning and Economic Development; and

WHEREAS, on October 6, 2016, the Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards of the City of Santa Rosa held a duly noticed public hearing; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Boards considered Preliminary Design Review, at which time they received written and oral reports of staff, testimony, and other evidence presented by all those who wished to be heard on the matter; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Design Review Board cited 13 (thirteen) action items and the Cultural Heritage Board cited two (2) action items and the meeting was continued to a date uncertain; and

WHEREAS, on November 3, 2016, the Cultural Heritage Board and Design Review Board of the City of Santa Rosa held a duly noticed continued public hearing to consider Preliminary Design Review for the DeTurk Winery Village project; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Boards received written and oral reports of staff, testimony, and other evidence presented by all those who wished to be heard on the matter; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the joint Cultural Heritage and Design Review Boards of the City of Santa Rosa, after due consideration, investigation, and study made by itself and on its behalf and due consideration of all evidence and reports considered a motion to approve

Preliminary Design Review, however the motion was lost due to lack of consensus between the two boards with the Design Review Board voting unanimously in favor of granting Preliminary Design Review and the Cultural Heritage Board voting unanimously opposed to granting Preliminary Design Review; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, a second motion was made by the Cultural Heritage Board to deny the project, which was carried by the Cultural Heritage Board 5-0-2 (Board Members De Shazo, Debacker, Garrett, Murphy, and Purser voting Aye, and Board Members Fennell and Galantine absent) and by the Design Review Board 4-1-2 (Board Members Burch, Kincaid, Anderson, Grogan voting Aye, Board Member Sunderlage voting no, and Board Members Hedgpeth and Zucco absent); and

WHEREAS, the Cultural Heritage Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does make the following finding to deny the DeTurk Winery Village project:

1. Based on noncompliance with Findings 4 and 5, which are required in order to approve Design Review, as stated below:

Finding 4: The architectural design of the proposed development is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Finding 5: The design of the proposed development will provide a desirable environment for its occupants, visiting public, and its neighbors through the appropriate use of materials, texture, and color, and would remain aesthetically appealing and be appropriately maintained.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Cultural Heritage Board and Design Review Board of the City of Santa Rosa do hereby deny Preliminary Design Review of the DeTurk Winery Village project.

DULY AND REGULARLY ADOPTED by the Cultural Heritage Board of the City of Santa Rosa on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: (5) De Shazo, Debacker, Garrett, Murphy, Purser

NOES: (0)

ABSTAIN: (0)

ABSENT: (2) Fennell, Galantine

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Stacey De Shazo, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick Streeter, Secretary

DULY AND REGULARLY ADOPTED by the Design Review Board of the City of Santa Rosa on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: (4) Burch, Kincaid, Anderson, Grogan

NOES: (1) Sunderlage

ABSTAIN: (0)

ABSENT: (2) Hedgpeth, Zucco

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Burch, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Rose, Executive Secretary