

CITY OF SANTA ROSA
CITY COUNCIL

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: BILL ROSE, SUPERVISING PLANNER (PRESENTER);
SUSIE MURRAY, CITY PLANNER (AUTHOR)
SUBJECT: PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DETURK WINERY VILLAGE – APPEAL

AGENDA ACTION: TWO RESOLUTIONS

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended by the Design Review Board and Cultural Heritage Board that the Council, by resolution, deny the appeal and uphold the Boards' decision to deny Preliminary Design Review for the DeTurk Winery Village mixed use development.

It is further recommended by the Cultural Heritage Board that the Council, by resolution, deny the appeal and uphold the Board's decision to deny a Landmark Alteration Permit for the DeTurk Winery Village mixed use development.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is an appeal, filed by the applicant of the DeTurk Winery Village project (the Project), of two actions taken by the Design Review Board and Cultural Heritage Board (the Boards). The first was a joint decision of the Boards to deny Preliminary Design Review. The second was the Cultural Heritage Board's (CHB) decision to deny a Landmark Alteration (LMA).

The Project includes 185 apartments of which 15 would be designated for very low income occupants for a period of 55 years. This represents 6.7% of the City's 5-year goal for market rate units and 1.4% of the 5-year goal for very low income units. The Project would also retain approximately 20,000 square feet of existing commercial space.

The development site is located at 806 Donahue Street and 8 W. 9th Street, adjacent to the rail tracks. The General Plan and Downtown Station Area Specific Plan (DSASP) both target this site for high density residential development. The site is located within two recognized historic districts (West End and North Railroad) and is currently developed with the historic DeTurk Winery which is listed on the California Register of Historic Resources.

Should the Council grant the appeal and approve Preliminary Design Review and LMA, the Project will still require additional entitlements including Final Design Review, Density Bonus, and Vacation of Public Right-of-way. If the project moves forward, Final Design Review would be determined either by staff or by the Design Review Board, as Council may direct. Ultimately, the project would return to the Council for decision on the requested Density Bonus and Vacation of Public Right of Way, after consideration and a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Given that this proposal aligns with Council priorities to provide more housing, and specifically provides several on-site affordable units, the Council may wish to grant the appeal and allow the project to move forward to the next step. As such, staff has provided several options for the Council's consideration. Please refer to the Issues section of this report for further discussion.

SITE HISTORY

This section provides relevant site history that is not directly related to the current project:

- October 9, 2007 – The City Council adopted Resolution No. 26950 changing the land use designation to Transit Village Medium (25-40 units per acre).
- January 2008 – A 73-unit condominium and townhouse project was approved at this location. The entitlement package is still valid and is currently under staff review for a 12-month time extension.
- August 31, 2010 – The City Council adopted Ordinance No. 3951 reclassifying the properties within the boundaries of the DSASP. As a result of that action, the Project site was reclassified to TV-R-H-SA (Transit Village Residential, within both the Historic and Station Area combining districts).

PROJECT BACKGROUND

This section provides history directly related to the Project:

- November 5, 2015 – The first of two Joint Concept Design Review meetings was held before the Boards.
- February 24, 2016 – A neighborhood meeting was held at the DeTurk Round Barn to introduce this project. Approximately 20 neighbors attended.
- March 3, 2016 – The second Joint Concept Design Review meeting was held before the Boards.
- April 19, 2016 – The Council adopted Resolution No. 28768 stating its Intention to Consider Vacation of Public Right-of-way for a 18,725 square foot area along the east side of Donahue Street, between W. 8th Street and W. 9th Street.

- May 24, 2016 – The Project applications, including Design Review, Landmark Alteration, Density Bonus and Vacation of Public Right-of-way, were submitted to Planning and Economic Development.
- August 11, 2016 – In response to the Issues Letter dated June 21, 2016, the applicant submitted a revised set of plans.
- October 6, 2016 – The first of two joint public hearings before the Boards was held to consider Preliminary Design Review and LMA. Direction was given to the applicant and the meeting was continued to a date uncertain.
- November 3, 2016 – The second joint public hearing of the Boards was held. Both Preliminary Design Review and LMA were denied.
- November 10, 2016 – The applicant submitted an appeal application to the City Clerk.
- November 14, 2016 – A revised appeal application was submitted to Planning and Economic Development.
- December 2, 2016 – An amendment to the appeal application was submitted to Planning and Economic Development.

APPEAL STATEMENT

Pursuant to Zoning Code Chapter 20-62, appeals of decisions made by the CHB and/or the Design Review Board (DRB) shall be evaluated by the Council. The Council may consider any issue involving the matter that is the subject of the appeal, in addition to the specific grounds for appeal. With respect to the Preliminary Design Review and the Landmark Alteration Permit, the Council may then:

- Affirm, affirm in part, or reverse the action, the determination, or decision that is the subject of the appeal.
- Adopt conditions of approval, that may address issues or concerns other than the subject of the appeal.

The appellant has provided the following two grounds for the appeal. These are excerpts; the full appeal statement is provided as an attachment.

1. “This rejection fails on its own merits since the Boards, even after being told by staff that they were required to make “Findings” on reasons for rejection, failed to do this. The reasons for their rejections give no specific issues, reasons or findings as to what items rise to the level of rejections, even though they give a broad rejection comments basically stating, under the Landmark Resolutions, they can’t approve the Project. No specific items were raised in the rejection, no findings in any manner were presented in this rejection and not one comment on why they felt these items were unable to raise to a level of approval.”

Staff response to Appeal Ground #1: The Boards denied Preliminary Design Review because Board consensus could not be reached. The Cultural Heritage Board could

not make the following findings:

- The architectural design of the proposed development is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
- 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.

During the joint meeting held on November 3, 2016, the CHB requested additional analysis regarding the following points:

- The impacts of the proposed development both in terms of the relationship to the historic DeTurk Winery structures, and the West End Preservation District as a whole.
- Due to a conflict between the historic evaluation prepared by Susan Clark, dated September, 2016, and a letter from the Northwest Information Center, dated November 2, 2016, the Board requested confirmation as to whether or not the DeTurk Winery site or its structures are listed on the California Register of Historic Resources.
- The Board did not feel the historic evaluation prepared by Susan Clark adequately addressed The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Due to concerns about the overall massing of the proposed development, the applicant was asked to provide a more in-depth analysis.

Subsequently, the appellant has provided an addendum to the report, also prepared by Susan Clark, dated November 29, 2016, in which all these items are addressed. A copy of the report is attached.

2. “This rejection is seriously defective on the basis that under State Law, as to the concessions being taken, requires an extensive and pervasive and factual arguments to prove that these concessions cannot be claimed by the applicant. No such arguments or finding were brought forward thereby violating not only local regulations but more importantly State Law that has jurisdiction over this issue.”

Staff response to Appeal Ground #2: The purview of the Cultural Heritage Board is to review a project for its consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Processing Review Standards for Owners of Historic Properties. The Board felt that the Clark’s historic evaluation was missing a clear analysis of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, specifically regarding the impacts to the historic DeTurk Winery and the West End Neighborhood. The impacts have been addressed in the addendum to the historic evaluation.

The Appeal language references State Law with respect to Density Bonuses. As noted above, the requested Density Bonus is not before the Council at this time. (If the project moves forward, the Density Bonus and associated concessions will be considered by the Planning Commission at a later date, and, with the Commission’s recommendation, ultimately acted upon by the Council.)

The State Law was implicated, however, at the November 3, 2016 joint meeting, when the Cultural Heritage Board expressed concerns about the height and massing of the proposed development. The building height is a concession requested by the applicant under State law and the City Code as part of a request for Density Bonus for the provision of affordable housing. State law and the City Code allow for denial of requested concessions only under very limited circumstances, as further discussed below in Analysis, paragraph 4.

PRIOR CITY COUNCIL REVIEW

As referenced in the project background, on April 19, 2016, the Council reviewed the conceptual project in connection with its approval of a Resolution Stating Its Intention to Consider Vacation of Public Right of Way along Donahue Street for the Deturk Winery Village. Pursuant to the California Streets and Highways Code, Section 8320, the Resolution was the first step in the City's process of considering the applicant's requested vacation of 18,725 square feet of the public right-of-way. If the project moves forward, further proceedings regarding the requested vacation will be held at a later date.

ANALYSIS

A comprehensive analysis of the Project was prepared for the joint meeting of the Boards, dated October 6, 2016. For the Council's reference, that staff report is provided as an attachment to this report. New information received since the November 2016 meeting is discussed in the appropriate sections of this analysis.

1. Project Description:

DeTurk Winery Village is a proposal to develop a 3.45-acre area with a mixed use development that includes 185 residential apartment (rental) units, 15 of which will be designated for very low income occupants for a period of 55 years. The proposed development will also retain approximately 20,000 square feet of existing commercial space.

The site is located within two recognized historic districts: The West End Preservation District which is recognized locally, and the North Railroad District which is eligible for the National Register. The site is currently developed with the historic DeTurk Winery complex made up of the DeTurk Winery building and U.S. Bonded Warehouse, both listed on the California Register of Historic Resources. As proposed, the existing historic structures would be restored and incorporated into the Project design.

As noted above, in addition to the LMA and Design Review applications, which are the subject of this appeal, the Project also includes a request for Density Bonus and Vacation of Public Right-of-way. Those entitlements would be considered by the Planning Commission for recommendation and by the City Council for final decision at a later date, should the project move forward after the appeal. If approved, the Density Bonus would allow two concessions and a 35%

density increase. If the Vacation is approved, the 18,725-square foot area of public right-of-way vacated would be transferred to the applicant and would assume the same land use designation, Transit Village Medium, as the property with which it is merged.

2. General Plan

The General Plan land use designation for the site is Transit Village Medium which allows a density of 25-40 units per acre. This designation is intended to accommodate mixed-use development within one-half mile of the downtown SMART station. Residential uses are required and ground floor commercial uses are encouraged.

Transit Village Medium is the City's highest density residential land use designation; it was implemented to encourage higher density residential projects in proximity to the downtown SMART station. Pursuant to General Plan Policy H-F-4 (which provides for implementation of the City's Density Bonus Ordinance), the Project offers 15 units designated for very low income occupants and includes a request for Density Bonus. The request is consistent with State Law, which allows development at densities higher than allowed by the General Plan land use designation in return for affordable units.

3. Downtown Station Area Specific Plan

The DSASP is the result of a community based vision for downtown Santa Rosa. It is centered around the downtown SMART station and defines the framework for development. The subject property is located within the Railroad Corridor Sub-Area of the DSASP, and has been selected for high density residential development.

Goals and policies of the DSASP direct development towards transit-oriented development, with an emphasis on affordable housing, reduced parking and mixed use.

4. Zoning Code

The Project was reviewed by staff and has been found in compliance with the Zoning Code. A complete analysis is provided in the packets prepared for the Boards.

The development site is located within the TV-R-H-SA zoning district (Transit Village - Residential, and is within both the Historic and Station Area combining districts). This zoning district is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. This zoning district is applied to areas within approximately one-half mile of a transit facility that are considered appropriate for mixed use projects.

As a mixed-use project, combining residential and commercial uses, the Project is an allowed use within the TV-R-H-SA zoning district. The Project is generally consistent with the development standards for such use.

The Project includes a request for a Density Bonus which will be considered by the Planning Commission for recommendation and the Council for final action at

future meetings, pending the outcome of this appeal hearing. Pursuant to both Zoning Code Section 20-31.080(A) and Government Code § 65915 (State of California density bonus regulations), because this housing developer is electing to designate 11% of the maximum allowable units for very-low income occupants, the Project is entitled to two concessions and a 35% density increase. The applicant is requesting concessions for building height and parking. The proposed 185 residential units includes the full 35% density increase.

Zoning Code Section 20-31.080(B) requires the City to grant the concessions requested by the applicant unless the City can make a written finding, based on substantial evidence, that one or more of the following circumstances apply:

1. The concession is not required in order to provide for affordable housing costs or affordable rents.
2. The incentive or concession would have a specific adverse impact, as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5 of the California [Government Code](#), upon public health and safety or physical environment or any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and for which the City determines 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.
3. The incentive or concession would be contrary to State or Federal law.

With respect to the potential for a specific adverse impact on historical resources (number 2 above), portions of the project site, including the DeTurk Winery building and the U.S. Bonded Warehouse, are listed on the California Register of Historical Resources, as noted above. The historical analysis prepared by Susan Clark recognizes that space has been left between the historic and new structures so that key features of the historic structures remain clearly visible from the street, and the proposed height of Buildings A and D are similar to the historic winery building. The analysis concludes that, in terms of height, the proposed apartment buildings are compatible with the historic DeTurk Winery.

5. Design Guidelines

The Project is consistent with the City's Design Guidelines. As shown in the staff report dated October 6, 2016, the Project meets several goals and implementation measures.

In response to the DRB's comments during the November 3, 2016, joint hearing, the plans submitted for the Council's review include the following changes:

1. Added privacy/glare reduction on window for ground-floor units along Donahue Street.
2. Included layout and installation details of cementitious siding.
3. Provided updated landscape plans.

4. Added trash shoots to Building D to minimize the distance tenants travel to dispose of garbage.
5. Removed three of the suspended walkways on the 4th level of Building D.
6. Updated the planting plan to include Red Maple trees, which are more columnar than Magnolias, along Donahue Street.

6. Historic Preservation Review Standards

A detailed analysis of Historic Preservation Review Standards was provided to the Boards during the joint meetings, which is discussed in the staff report dated October 6, 2016.

During the November 3, 2016, joint hearing, the CHB raised some concerns prior to denying the LMA:

- a. Confirm the DeTurk Winery is listed on the California Register of Historic Resources.
- b. The historic evaluation did not adequately address the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
- c. New information provided from the Northwest Information Center, dated November 2, 2016, indicated the site is located within the boundaries of two recorded districts: The North Railroad District (determined eligible for the National Register) and the West End Preservation District (recognized locally).

Staff response: An addendum to the original historic evaluation was prepared by Susan Clark, date November 29, 2016. This report confirms that the DeTurk Winery is listed on the California Register and also addresses the ten Standards for Rehabilitation. The report concludes that "the Project, as proposed, is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and will not adversely affect, or decrease the significance, of the historic DeTurk Winery."

New information provided by the appellant includes a copy of the State of California Department Parks and Recreation Form 523, which confirms the existence of the North Railroad District. While this district is not recognized as a local preservation district, properties and structures identified with historic significance are recognized at the State level. As such, the properties/structures are eligible for the same protections identified by Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

The North Railroad District includes a strip of commercial and industrial buildings along the railroad tracks, of which three buildings on the DeTurk Winery campus are included. A copy of the report is attached.

7. Neighborhood Comments

During a well-attended neighborhood meeting held on February 16, 2016, several comments were made. Overall, those in attendance were in support of housing.

Throughout the review process, staff has received inquiries from neighbors. Copies of written correspondence are attached.

Staff response:

The following table summarizes neighborhood concerns and provides staff's response.

<u>Comment/topic</u>	<u>Staff response</u>
Parking	The Project meets parking requirements, however, Zoning Code Section 20-36.050(C)(1)(a) allows the review authority to increase the required number of parking spaces. As such, the applicant has requested a concession for parking.
Density	The requested density is allowed, and encouraged, through the Density Bonus regulations.
Building height	The Project qualifies for two concessions with the designation of 15 units for very low income occupants for a period of 55 years. The applicant has requested an increase in building height as one of those two concessions. Refer to the Zoning Code section of the staff report dated October 6, 2016 for thorough analysis.
Property values	No economic analysis was prepared for or reviewed by staff, nor should an economic analysis influence the decision on the Project.
Safety	The Project plans have been reviewed by City staff and conditioned appropriately for public safety.
Periods of construction	A condition of approval limits noise generating construction activities to Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 6:00 pm. With consideration to special events at the DeTurk Round Barn and nearby residential uses, no noise generating activities associated with construction are permitted on Saturday, Sunday or holidays.
Street improvements	The project plans have been reviewed by City staff and conditioned appropriately.
Architectural design	The applicant has responded to the direction of the CHB and DRB.
Short-term rentals	The City does not currently regulate vacation rentals as a land use separate and distinct from a residential land use.
Vacation of Public ROW	If approved, the vacated 18,725 square feet of public

right-of-way will allow for an additional 23 residential units, resulting in the proposed total of 185 units.

FISCAL IMPACT

Action on the appeal will not result in any significant fiscal impacts.

If the associated request for Vacation of Public Right-of-way is approved, it would convert 18,725 square feet of public ROW to taxable real property.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The Project has been found in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to the following CEQA Guidelines, as further outlined in the draft resolutions provided herewith:

- Section 15183 - Consistent with the General Plan, the DSASP, and zoning, for each of which an EIR was certified
- Section 15332 - In-fill Development
- Section 15330 - Involves cleanup of known contamination along Donahue Street
- Section 15331 - Involves restoration measures which have been found to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Project, due to its location, historic significance, inclusion of affordable housing, and request for vacation of public right-of-way is subject to several entitlements. The following matrix summarizes these entitlements and provides the corresponding review authorities and appeal bodies.

Entitlement	Review Authority	Appeal Body
Preliminary Design Review	Design Review Board and Cultural Heritage Board (Joint)	Council
Final Design Review	Director or Design Review Board	Council
Landmark Alteration (LMA)	Cultural Heritage Board	Council
Density Bonus	Recommendation from the Planning Commission; final action by the Council	N/A

Vacation of Right-of-way	Recommendation from the Planning Commission; final action by the Council	N/A
--------------------------	--	-----

The following summary represents a collaborative effort of the applicant, staff and the Boards to bring this project forward for consideration.

Joint Concept Review – Concept review is intended to provide an opportunity for non-binding comments from the Boards to the applicant and interested citizens, as to how an application may meet the City’s development priorities. Concept review is designed to offer advice and suggestions only, and shall not result in conclusions by the Boards. Both meetings were held in Council Chambers and televised.

- **1st Meeting, November 5, 2015** - The Boards provided feedback.
- **2nd Meeting, March 3, 2016** - Due to significant changes, a second concept meeting was necessary. The Boards provided additional feedback.

Joint Design Review – Because the Project is larger than 5,000 square feet and is within the -H combining district, both Boards jointly conduct the Preliminary Design Review, and project approval requires consensus between the boards. To achieve this, each Board must vote in favor of the project, independent of each other.

During both of the meetings referenced below, staff gave a presentation with a recommendation of approval, followed by a presentation from the applicant team.

- **1st Hearing, October 6, 2016** – During the public hearing, three members of the public spoke, two of which expressed opposition to the Project. This hearing resulted in a motion to continue Preliminary Design Review for the applicant to consider 13 items.
- **2nd Hearing, November 3, 2016** – Four members of the public spoke during the public hearing, one in support of the Project and three opposed. A motion to grant Preliminary Design Review with 14 points of consideration failed with the DRB voting unanimously in favor and the CHB being unanimously opposed. Discussion with applicant ensued about a continuance.

With the applicant’s concurrence, a second motion was made by the CHB to deny Preliminary Design Review. The CHB vote carried 5-0-2, and the DRB vote carried 4-1-2, allowing the applicant to appeal to Council.

Landmark Alteration Permit – The LMA was considered at the same public hearing as the Preliminary Design Review, but was at the sole discretion of the CHB.

An LMA is required for changes to be made to the exterior appearance of any structure within a preservation district. The focus of the review is on historic preservation of the site and the surrounding environs. This review process also requires a public hearing.

- **1st Hearing, October 6, 2016** - The item was continued for more information and project revisions. The appellant was given instruction to reconsider the industrial design based on the period of significance for the district.

- **2nd Hearing, November 3, 2016** - Rather than continue the item to a later date, and at the approval of the applicant, a motion was made by the CHB to deny LMA, allowing the applicant to appeal to Council.

ISSUES

As discussed previously in this report, the Project was brought before the Boards for two joint meetings as required for Preliminary Design Review. The Project location is challenging. The site is located within the boundaries of the Downtown Station Area; it falls within the boundaries of two recognized historic districts; and it is listed on the California Register of Historic Resources. Project characteristics, including the fourth level, reduced parking requirement, the increased density and addition of affordable units adds to the challenge.

At both meetings, staff brought the Project forward with a recommendation of approval. Staff based its recommendation on the following:

- The development area is designated by the General Plan land use diagram as Transit Village Medium (25-40 units per acre) which is the highest density residential land use designation in the City. This land use designation was assigned due to the site's proximity to the Downtown SMART Station; it is intended for high density residential development.
- The Council has developed five Council priorities, of which housing is one, making this project eligible for expedited review. In an accelerated review process, City staff worked closely with the applicant to resolve issues that shaped the Project so it could be supported.
- With the requested Density Bonus, the maximum number of residential units is 185, as proposed. Without the density increase, the site could be developed with a maximum of 137 units.
- The site is home to the historic DeTurk Winery facility. During the Concept Design Review meeting held on March 3, 2016, the applicant received direction from both Boards, summarized as follows:
 - The CHB emphasized the importance of preservation of the historic buildings and encouraged the applicant to simplify the design of the new structures. The Board suggested looking at local, existing industrial buildings for context.
 - The DRB encouraged the applicant to bring an industrial character to the new buildings to celebrate the old while incorporating the new; let the historic buildings be historic.

The applicant responded to the Boards' comments from the aforementioned Concept meeting with a simplified residential structure that incorporates industrial materials. The proposed design was supported by the historic evaluation that concluded the materials are consistent with the historic DeTurk Winery and would not detract from the

residential streetscape of the West End neighborhood. The report also concluded the Project was consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

During the Joint Design Review meeting, held on November 3, 2016, support of the Project with relatively minor modifications was indicated by the DRB with a unanimous vote in favor of granting Preliminary Design Review. The CHB, on the other hand, voiced continuing concerns and indicated opposition with a unanimous vote denying the entitlement. After some discussion, and the realization that Board consensus could not be made, the motion to deny was passed to allow the applicant an opportunity to appeal.

At the same meeting, the CHB acted independently voting unanimously with a 5-0-2 vote to deny the LMA. Concerns raised include:

- A conflict between information received from the Northwest Information Center and historic evaluation, prepared by Susan Clark, dated September 2016, in terms of whether or not the site/structures are included on the California Register of Historic Resource. In the subsequent addendum to that report, also prepared by Susan Clark, dated November 29, 2016, she confirms that the structures are, in fact, listed.
- The CHB did not feel that impacts to the surrounding neighborhood were adequately assessed. The addendum to the historic report, prepared by Susan Clark, dated November 29, 2016, discusses the differences of the small, wood-framed residential buildings that make up the residential portion of the West End neighborhood; notes that the inclusion of the industrial Winery in the predominantly residential district is awkward; and acknowledges the fact that the winery has never reflected the same character of the homes.

Staff has considered the additional information provided in terms of the historic analysis that are specific the issues raised by the CHB, and minor design modifications now offered by the applicant in response to changes requested by the DRB. Staff finds that the applicant has sufficiently addressed the Boards' concerns.

COUNCIL OPTIONS

The Council has options in terms of how to proceed as follows:

- Deny the appeal and uphold the Boards' decisions to deny Preliminary Design Review and Landmark Alteration.
- Grant the appeal and approve Preliminary Design Review and Landmark Alteration.
 - Require the Project to return to the Design Review Board for Final Design Review.
 - Delegate Final Design Review to the Director of Planning and Economic Development.

If the Council grants the appeal and approves both Preliminary Design Review and Landmark Alteration, the project will still require additional review by both the Planning

Commission and the Council for the requested Density Bonus and Vacation of Public Right-of-way.

NOTIFICATION

- November 10, 2015 – A Notice of Application for the Intent to Vacate Right-of-way was mailed to property owners within 400 feet of the site.
- May 26, 2016 – A Notice of Application for the Project was mailed to property owners within 400 feet of the site.
- September 2016 – Pursuant to Zoning Code Chapter 20-66, a Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to property owners within 400 feet of the subject site, a Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Press Democrat, and three public hearing signs were erected on site announcing the October 6, 2016, Joint DRB and CHB meeting.
- October 2016 - Pursuant to Zoning Code Chapter 20-66, a Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to property owners within 400 feet of the subject site, a Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Press Democrat, and three public hearing signs were erected on site announcing the November 3, 2016, Joint DRB and CHB meeting.
- January 2017 - Pursuant to Zoning Code Chapter 20-66, a Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to property owners within 400 feet of the subject site, a Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Press Democrat, and three public hearing signs were erected on site announcing the January 31, 2017, Council meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 - Disclosure Form
- Attachment 2 - Location and Neighborhood Context Map
- Attachment 3 - Appeal Application, Revised Application, and Amendment to Application
- Attachment 4 - Project Plans and Elevations
- Attachment 5 - Technical Reports (Historic Evaluation, Addendum to Historic Evaluation, DPR Primary Record, Northwest Information Center site history, DPR Form 523 for North Railroad District, Traffic and Parking Study and Light Specifications)
- Attachment 6 - Council Meeting Minutes & Resolution, April 19, 2016
- Attachment 7 - DRB/CHB Concept Meeting Minutes (November 5, 2015 & March 3, 2016)
- Attachment 8 - DRB/CHB Meeting Minutes and Staff Report (October 6, 2016)
- Attachment 9 - DRB/CHB Meeting Minutes, Board Memo, and Resolutions (November 3, 2016)
- Attachment 10 - Applicant Correspondence
- Attachment 11 - Public Correspondence
- Resolution 1 - Grant Appeal (Preliminary Design Review)

DETURK WINERY VILLAGE – APPEAL

PAGE 15 OF 15

- Resolution 2 - Grant Appeal (Landmark Alteration)
- Resolution 3 - Deny Appeal (Preliminary Design Review)
- Resolution 4 - Deny Appeal (Landmark Alteration)

CONTACT

Susie Murray, smurray@srcity.org, 707-543-4348