

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE RECORD OF ACTION**

Item No.2 Time: 3:05 File: PLP16-0058  
 Applicant: MidPen Riley Weissenborn Staff: Melinda Grosch  
 Cont'd from: Not Applicable  
 Env. Doc: Exempt per Section 15183  
 Proposal: The "Roseland Village Neighborhood Center" is a public/private partnership project between MidPen Housing and the Community Development Commission, and integrates several elements within a cohesive neighborhood improvement plan. The proposed project includes a 6-lot Subdivision, Design Review, Use Permit, and Density Bonus for a mixed-use planned development. The project includes 75 Type A affordable units, 100 market-rate units, and 4,000 square feet of commercial space, 25,600 square feet of civic space, a 12,700 Square foot Mercado, and a one-acre public plaza on two parcels, 0.59+/- acres and 6.96+/- acres respectively.

Location: 655, 650, 665, 759, 761, 765, 777, 779, and 883 Sebastopol Road, Santa Rosa  
 APN: 125-101-031 and 125-111-037 (and 125-101-048 ?) Supervisorial District: 5  
 Zoning: PC (Planned Community), LG/SRV (Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan), and VOH (Valley Oak Habitat); R3 B613 (High Density Residential District), LG/SRV (Sebastopol Road Urban Vision Plan), and VOH (Valley Oak Habitat)

Public Hearing: No

Design Review Committee: Don MacNair, Jim Henderson, Karin Theriault  
 Staff: Melinda Grosch & Kimberly Nguyen  
 Applicant: Scott Johnson, Keith McCoy, & Riley Weissenborn for MidPen Construction,  
 Others: Kevin Kellogg- Project Architect

PROJECT DESIGN: [ ] Final Review [ ] Referral [X] Preliminary Review

ACTION:	Project Design Needs Revision (see attached comments)	Project Design Approved (subject to comments and conditions attached)	Bring Back on Consent Prior to Issuance of Building Permit	Project continued to:	Bring Back to Staff Prior to Issuance of Building Permit
Site Plan	X				
Architecture	X				
Parking	X				
Landscaping	X				
Signs	X				
Grading	X				
Exterior Lighting	X				
Fence Design	X				

VOTE: Don McNair: X Jim Henderson: X Karin Theriault: X

Ayes: 3

Noes: 0

Absent: 0

Abstain: 0

**DESIGN REVIEW RECORD OF ACTION SHEET  
COMMENTS & CONDITIONS May 17, 2017**

**Applicant:** MidPen Riley Weissenborn **File:** PLP16--0058  
**Address:** 655, 650, 665, 759, 761, 765, 777, 779, and 883 Sebastopol Road, Santa Rosa  
**Date:** May 17, 2017

NOTE: the applicant is urged to respond under each comment as to how plans have been revised. If a recommended change is not made, please indicate why. Please submit your responses with plans for Final Design Review.

**SITE PLAN**

1. Resolve shared parking issues with the adjacent parcel to the east.

Response: Sonoma County Counsel is addressing the Reciprocal Parking Agreement.

2. Consider adding another clear access/linkage to the shared parking areas on the adjacent parcel to the east.

Response: Sonoma County Counsel is addressing all issues related to off-site access and agreements.

3. Consider including solar charging stations throughout the site.

Response: Our intent is to include solar charging stations in the Parcel A and B shared parking areas (up to four total).

4. Ensure good pedestrian and vehicular circulation is maintained throughout the site.

Response: This goal is being carried forward in the design.

5. Ensure pedestrian elements are incorporated throughout the site.

Response: This goal is also being carried forward in the design.

6. Consider relocating the food trucks off of Sebastopol Road and move them either directly inside of the Plaza (parallel to Sebastopol Road) or, move them directly north and adjacent to the Plaza and Mercado area.

Response: We are refining our approach to integrating food trucks, including queuing, and power/ pedestrian safety requirements.

7. Provide more trash enclosures throughout the site.

Response: In general, trash receptacles are proposed in proximity to building entrances, where regular trash pick-up and receptacle maintenance can be easily monitored.

8. Request all final project concessions to ensure the final design of the project.

Response: Pending final Conditions of Approval.

**ARCHITECTURE:** Building Elevations, Colors, Materials, etc.

1. Break up the mass of proposed Buildings A & B.

Response: The Roseland Team is studying breaking up the mass of proposed Buildings A and B to better reflect the scale of the adjacent neighborhood.

2. Revise the proposed white color for the proposed residential buildings (Buildings A & B) so they: 1) blend better with the proposed Library/Boys & Girls club and proposed Mercado, and 2) fit better within the cultural theme of the area.

Response: In deference to the cultural theme of the area and local context, color is being added to the building elevations.

3. Consider a more muted color palette for the proposed residential buildings (Buildings A & B).

Response: Softer colors will be mixed in.

4. Consider how the proposed building colors (at the pedestrian and human scale) will continue the culture of adjacent parcels in the area.

Response: Color is being modified to harmoniously ground Roseland Village in the community.

5. Consider re-orienting the residential ground-floor stairs so they face towards the street (similar to a Brownstone stair design).

Response: Done

6. Consider increasing the size of the ground-floor residential porches.

Response: Done

7. Building A storefront needs refinement; consider adding awnings, revising the color, and creating smaller window areas.

Response: We are adding awnings, revising the color and crafting smaller windows, consistent with the Urban Vision Plan.

8. The east elevation of Building A and the southwest entry at Building B look too retail; these areas need more character and the vertical band needs more refinement.

Response: Commercial storefronts are being modified to be subordinate to the building massing.

9. Provide information where the solar panels will be located on the site and/or on the proposed buildings.

Response: Our intent is to locate solar panels on the roofs of Buildings A, B and C.

10. Consider relocating the trellis further into the Plaza area so that it doesn't function as a barrier at the southern (Sebastopol Road) property line.

Response: We are considering alternative locations for the trellis and will confirm the preferred siting with residents in a public meeting.

11. Consider redesigning the trellis at the Plaza so the columns fan out.

Response: We are looking at options to eliminate some support columns.

13. The new Mercado may result in the need for additional benches in the adjacent Plaza area.

Response: We are studying additional seating adjacent to the Mercado.

14. Consider adding a water element/feature in the Plaza area.

Response: A water feature is cost prohibitive and there are also liability issues.

15. Consider involving the community in the creation of: 1) public art for the Plaza area, 2) Plaza bench designs and, 3) consider the possibility of community wall mural design(s) on the proposed Mercado building and proposed Library/Girls & Boys Club building.

Response: The community will be involved in the creation of public art.

16. Provide trash enclosures designs for review and approval.

Response: Trash enclosure designs will be provided as part of final Design Review.

**LANDSCAPING:** Design, Plant Types and Sizes, Irrigation, etc.

1. Consider staggering the tree plantings in Plaza area so they appear more natural in the setting.

Response: Staggering the trees to create a more natural appearance is being studied and the revised design will be brought back to the community for review in a public meeting.

2. Provide more landscaping at the ground-floor residential areas.

Response: More detailed landscaping designs will be provided as part of final Design Review.

3. Consider modifying the line between the hardscape and lawn at the Plaza area so that it appears less "forced".

Response: We are studying modifications to the line between hardscape/ lawn and the revised design will be brought back to the community for review in a public meeting.

4. Consider installing narrower canopy trees throughout the site- if planting trees very close together.

Response: Our landscape architect is reconsidering the canopy tree selections.

5. Consider how much grass area is needed in the Plaza and ensure all of the proposed landscaping complies with WELO (Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance) requirements.

Response: Done

6. Consider using a hybrid (moderate water use) grass for the Plaza area.

Response: Done

7. Consider planting a double row of trees at Sebastopol Road.

Response: Our landscape architect is studying a double tree row in conjunction with the trellis relocation.

## **SIGNS**

1. Provide signage information.

Response: Signage designs will be provided as part of final Design Review.

2. Include signage at Joe Rodota Trail.

Response: Signage at the Joe Rodota Trail will be incorporated into the plan and designs will be provided as part of final Design Review.

## **GRADING**

1. Provide grading information.

Response: Grading is shown on sheet 3 of 4 in the Tentative Map.

## **EXTERIOR LIGHTING**

1. Provide more exterior lighting information.

Response: More information on exterior lighting will be provided as part of final Design Review.

2. Ensure all new exterior lighting is Dark-Sky compliant.

Response: All exterior lighting will be dark-sky compliant.

3. Consider installing in-ground low lighting at the sidewalk edges for better pedestrian visibility.

Response: Developer will make certain that sidewalks and building entries are well lit as part of our approach to pedestrian safety.

4. Consider installing low-lighting at trellis area for better pedestrian visibility.

Response: Our landscape architect is studying lighting in conjunction with the trellis relocation.

5. Provide lighting in the Plaza and Mercado areas.

Response: Dark-sky lighting is included in Plaza/ Mercado areas and the specifications will be provided as part of final Design Review.

## **FENCE DESIGN**

1. Provide fencing information.

Response: Fencing information will be provided as part of final Design Review.

2. Consider installing a classic-designed fence at the property frontage (at Sebastopol Road) to ensure children using the Plaza area remain safe and stay out of the street.

Response: Our landscape architect is studying pedestrian safety in conjunction with the trellis relocation, food truck options and modifications to the Plaza.