



**Design Review Board/Cultural Heritage  
Board  
Regular Meeting Minutes - Draft**

---

Thursday, June 20, 2019

6:00 PM

---

**1. 6 PM CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Vice Chair Hedgpeth called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

**Present** 7 - Vice Chair Warren Hedgpeth, Board Member Eric Goldschlag, Board Member Adam Sharron, Board Member Drew Weigl, Board Member Laura Fennell, Board Member John McHugh, and Board Member Margaret Purser

**Absent** 3 - Chair Scott Kincaid, Board Member Stacey Deshazo, and Board Member Mark DeBacker

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 May 15, 2019 Draft Minutes (Cultural Heritage Board)

The May 15, 2019 Minutes were approved as amended.

**3. BOARD BUSINESS**

Vice Chair Hedgpeth read aloud the Statement of Purpose: Zoning Code Chapter 20-52.030F. Project Review.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comments.

**5. STATEMENTS OF ABSTENTION**

Board Member Kordenbrock abstained from Item 6.2.

**6. SCHEDULED ITEMS**

6.1 PUBLIC HEARING - DETURK WINERY VILLAGE - LANDMARK ALTERATION - 55W 8TH ST - FILE NO. LMA18-029  
BACKGROUND: Major Design Review and Major Landmark Alteration Permit for DeTurk Winery Village, a modification to a previously approved project (File No. PRJ16-012). Modifications include removing all residential units out of the Building C, Expand Building A to incorporate residential units previously located in Building C; Convert

approximately 2,400 square feet of commercial space to a parking garage, retaining approximately 18,600 square feet; Addition of a fourth-story on Building B with a height of 46 feet, Minor elevation changes to Buildings A and B located at the stairwells.

Project Planner: Ross

Vice Chair Hedgpeth gave a brief outline of meeting procedures.

City Planner Adam Ross gave the staff presentation and answered Board Members' questions.

Architect Kevin O'Mally gave a presentation and responded to Board Members' questions.

Vice Chair Hedgpeth opened the public hearing at 7:51 pm.

Thomas Ellis - Supported the project, and asked for vertical trellis gardening, especially on the north elevation.

Vice Chair Hedgpeth closed the public hearing at 7:57 pm.

**A motion was made by Board Member Goldschlag, Seconded by Chair Edmondson, to adopt as amended: RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARDS OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA GRANTING PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE, LOCATED AT 806 DONAHUE STREET AND 8 W. 9TH STREET, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS 010-091-001 AND 010-091-007, FILE NUMBER PRJ18-087 with the following conditions: 1. Consider bathroom locations in the units to allow natural light. 2. Consider the use of more historic brick/brick colors for pavers and plaza areas. 3. Consider photosynthesis for all plants for their survival, and consider a local native plant palette, 4. Consider leaving arch lintels off of the new building. 5. Consider a more subdued color palette. 6. Shall redesign the north facade of Building D, per Design Review Standards, specifically regarding 4-sided architecture. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 9 - Vice Chair Hedgpeth, Board Member Goldschlag, Board Member Sharron, Board Member Weigl, Board Member Fennell, Board Member McHugh, Wix, Kordenbrock and Edmondson

**Absent:** 4 - Chair Kincaid, Board Member Deshazo, Board Member DeBacker and Murphey

Board Member Kordenrock recused himself from the meeting at this time.

Meeting went into Recess at 8:30 pm.

Meeting Reconvened at 8:31 pm.

Meeting went into Recess at 8:31 pm.

Meeting Reconvened at 8:37 pm.

**A motion was made by Board Member McHugh, Seconded by Vice Chair Purser, to adopt as amended: RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA APPROVING A LANDMARK ALTERATION PERMIT FOR DETURK WINERY VILLAGE LOCATED AT 806 DONAHUE STREET AND 8 W. 9TH STREET IN THE WEST END PRESERVATION DISTRICT, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS 010-091-001 AND 010-091-007, FILE NUMBER PRJ18-087. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Yes:** 10 - Chair Kincaid, Vice Chair Hedgpeth, Board Member Goldschlag, Board Member Sharron, Board Member Weigl, Board Member Fennell, Board Member McHugh, Wix, Kordenbrock and Edmondson

**Absent:** 3 - Board Member Deshazo, Board Member DeBacker and Murphey

**6.2** STUDY SESSION - DOWNTOWN STATION AREA SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE - PHASE 1 SUMMARY AND ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS  
BACKGROUND: The City has initiated an update to the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan, which was originally adopted in 2007. This study session will provide the Design Review Board and the Cultural Heritage Board with a recap of the now concluded "outreach and opportunities" phase and provide a forum for feedback and guidance on potential plan alternatives.

Project Planner: Streeter

Senior Planner Patrick Streeter gave the staff presentation and answered Board Members' questions. (8:37 pm)

Vice Chair Hedgpeth opened public comments at 8:53pm.

Thomas Ellis - Encouraged rooftop gardens.

Kristen - Resident of West Santa Rosa, works Downtown. Supports the plan as a solution to those who want to work and live downtown. Create connections, areas for outdoor dining, and other creative solutions. Look for opportunities to connect 4th Street, Courthouse Square and Railroad Square. Look for food and cultural opportunities. If we do not know the feasibility of what can be done, there may not be a strong reason to limit building heights.

Vice Chair Hedgpeth closed public comments at 9:01 pm.

Design Review Board:

Encouraged 4th Street connection through the mall; recommended adding alternatives for playgrounds and children's activities. The Board asked about use for Maxwell Court. The bicycle and pedestrian improvements are appreciated and encouraged. The Village Centers alternative could cause fragmenting at the expense of Downtown; show how Village Centers would be connected. Encouraged de-emphasizing cars in the Downtown by adding park-lets for outdoor dining. Do outreach to more stakeholders for input. Skate parks do not generate income for surrounding businesses, and they attract graffiti and other problems. Before implementing the Trolley, figure out where it does or does not work, and why. Create a plan with developers, to make it work. Currently, 63% of SR Downtown workers commute from outside Santa Rosa. Explore impact fees, partnerships, i.e., reintegration of a performing arts center/housing related to higher education. Consider different development and building-type options.

Cultural Heritage Board:

Alternative 1 is preferred, to keep development to the Courthouse Square area, rather than impact historic districts. Use Santa Rosa Avenue as a gateway, as per 2007 discussions. Retail and pedestrian areas are preferred for Downtown, as opposed to highrise apartment complexes. Make Juilliard Park a central part of Downtown. Support increased housing (including adapting business buildings as housing) on College Avenue.

Consider hidden opportunities in the historic fabric of the City. The transit pattern presented is similar to the 19th century (1896) trolley pattern, when neighborhoods were connected by trolley lines. Blending Alternatives 1 and 3 could work, because it stretches north/south and includes as much west of the freeway as east. Connect neighborhoods to the core area via inexpensive/frequent transportation. The patterns set now will replicate out through the north/south corridor and to the west. Increase pedestrian connectivity and safety. Decentralize enough services so that people all over the City can walk to, or take the bus the grocery store, not waiting 2.5 hours to go half a mile. Concentrate as much housing as possible. Consider where children in Downtown high-rises would go to school. Make every choice within the two alternatives to increase pedestrian connectivity, and to emulate a grid, and make as many underpasses under the highway as possible. Neighborhood character is more than architecture; Historic neighborhoods played a role: working people lived and worked, doing daily routines without having to commute. Fourth Street, as a pedestrian-only promenade, could make it possible to have units that people can afford, without the expense of a car and the need for private open space. Light Industry is not the best use of the land south of Highway 12 - concentrate as much housing there as possible. Create safety for pedestrians and bicyclists on College Avenue, a major danger zone. Be cognizant of the need to both spread out and create high density Downtown. Create a bold plan to correct destructive decisions and mistakes of the past.

- 6.3** REPORT ITEM - SB35 DESIGN STANDARDS ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT - REZONING TEXT AMENDMENT - 0 CITYWIDE - FILE NO. REZ19-009  
BACKGROUND: The purpose of this project is to create objective standards for multifamily development that qualifies for streamlined and ministerial approval under Senate Bill 35.  
Project Planner: Nicholson
- Board Member Kordenbrock returned to the meeting at this time (9:49pm)

City Planner Amy Nicholson gave the staff presentation and answered Board Members' questions.

Vice Chair Hedgpeth opened public comments at 10:02 pm.

Vice Chair Hedgpeth closed public comments at 10:02 pm.

Design Review Board (DRB):

The Board asked about landscaping and storm water standards. The DRB asked how the changes would be incorporated with the Downtown Station Area Plan, without discouraging projects, as SB35 is restrictive; it encourages bad design because does not have a discretionary element. Consider changing proposed Building Design No. 5- "Window frames must be recessed a minimum of 2-inches from the surrounding wall plane" - it limits flange windows, normally be seen on multifamily structures, where windows would be flush. Page 10 of the presentation, the Proposed Design Standards - "Common facilities located to the interior or rear of project site" - does not work; it takes away the idea of humanizing the street when common facilities are pulled to the to the interior.

Cultural Heritage Board (CHB):

Use the Cultural Heritage Board as a resource. Santa Rosa has amazing examples where multifamily housing was inserted into single family dwelling neighborhoods, in and outside of Historic districts: four-squares, garden apartment complexes, 1920's motor courts. Multifamily can fit into the fabric of the City as a whole, in particular moving outside the Downtown where there is infill opportunity; possibly acquire County land. How does this impact CHB for purview of infill in Historic Districts? Parking is already an issue in Historic neighborhoods; Page 7 of the HCD-Draft SB35 Guidelines, section (d) Parking requirements - may cause more parking issues and chaos. Projects on infill lots in Historic districts need to check in with CHB.

## 7. BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

There were no Board Member reports.

## **8. DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

There were no Department Reports.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Hedgpeth adjourned the meeting at 10:26 pm.

PREPARED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Patti Pacheco Gregg, Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jessica Jones, Executive Secretary

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Warren Hedgpeth, Vice Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristinae Toomians, Executive Secretary

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Casey Edmondson