



**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: [jatkinson@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:jatkinson@cityofsebastopol.org)

**UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES**

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF JUNE 01, 2016

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

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on May 26, 2016.

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Luthin called the meeting to order at 4:02 P.M.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Ted Luthin, Chair  
Lynn Deedler, Vice Chair  
Cary Bush, Board Member

**Absent:** Bill Shortridge, Board Member (excused)  
Christine Level, Board Member (excused)  
Alexis Persinger, Board Member (excused)

**Staff:** Jonathan Atkinson, Assistant Planner  
Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

**3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

The Board agreed to continue this item until more members were present.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** There were none.

**5. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATES:**

Assistant Planner Atkinson provided the following updates:

- The draft General Plan and Environmental Impact Report are available for public review and comment. Copies of both documents are available at the Planning Department, Sebastopol Regional Library, and on the City's website. Written comments on the draft General Plan and EIR may be submitted in writing to Kenyon Webster, Planning Director at 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA 95472 or by email to: [kwebster@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:kwebster@cityofsebastopol.org). The deadline to submit comments is July 08, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.

The Board had no questions for staff.

**6. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:** There were none.

**7. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** There were none.

**8. CONSENT CALENDER:** There were none.

**9. REGULAR AGENDA:**

**A. DESIGN REVIEW AMENDMENT – Handline (Project 2016-34)** – This is an application submitted by Steve Sheldon, requesting approval to construct a gabion wall and revise an approved landscape plan for Handline, a proposed restaurant, at 935 Gravenstein Highway South. The Design Review Board initially approved the project in 2015.

Assistant Planner Atkinson presented the staff report and referred to an email received by a member of the public who expressed that the walled off atmosphere created by the gabion wall, particularly fronting Gravenstein Highway South, was not pedestrian friendly and thought that a shorter, 3 ½ to 4' wall may be more appropriate.

The Board asked questions of staff.

The applicant, Steve Sheldon, gave a presentation and was available for questions.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Sheldon.

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

Hearing none, Chair Luthin brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Vice Chair Deedler commented:

- Expressed having a few problems with the gabion wall.
- Concurred with the email submitted by a member of the public on the effect that the wall will have.
- Our Design Standards require that a front door face the street, however, the gabion wall and tall hedge effectively negates that requirement.
- With the gabion wall and tall hedge, the life, people and activity of the site will not be viewable from the street.
- The internal landscape was one of the main reasons that this project received wholehearted support.
- The internal landscape adds so much to the community, to the view and to the business itself.
- The gabion wall takes away from both the intent and the actuality of the front door entering out onto the main street.
- Residential neighborhoods have a 3 ½' height limit for fencing so that there can be visual contact between the house and the street.
- Relocation of the seating area will help to reduce sound as well.
- The overall net effect of the gabion wall is undesirable.

Board Member Bush commented:

- Vice Chair Deedler's comments were well said.
- Echoed some of what had been said.

- Commended the applicant on the construction of the gabion as a sort of mockup onsite.
- The gabion wall does not lend itself to a desirable pedestrian experience and quality.
- Questioned the lack of being able to see the people and activity from the street.
- Commended the idea of reclaiming the asphalt and using it for the gabion wall.
- Questioned application and full execution of the gabion wall long term.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Chair Luthin commented:

- There is a dramatic difference between a 6' hedge and a 6' cage full of asphalt.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Chair Luthin commented:

- There is an enormous difference between a 6' tall hedge and a 3' thick, 6' tall wall of any kind.
- There is no tradeoff in placing one in front of the other.
- A wall is a dramatically different expression and has a dramatically different feel than a hedge.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Chair Luthin commented:

- The wall will read massive, and stay out.
- The wall will be dramatic, imposing, unfriendly and unwelcoming.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Board Member Bush commented:

- The tall dense hedge that was chosen by the applicant is a good choice for their intent.
- A big block cage full of asphalt is not inviting and will not be an asset to the property.

Chair Luthin interjected.

Chair Luthin commented:

- There are two grades of gabion walls; architectural grade, and retaining wall grade.
- The proposed gabion wall is retaining wall grade.
- Anything that goes out in front of a business, especially when it is fronting a major highway, should be architectural grade and should be designed as a feature, especially if it is going to be 6' tall.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Loves the idea of using reclaimed materials.
- Commended the idea of reclaiming the asphalt and using it for the gabion wall.
- There is a lot to like about the site plan.
- The location of the seating area will be more pleasant than what was originally proposed.
- Likes shrinking of the parking area.

- Expressed being okay with the change in location of the trash enclosure.
- Handed a printout of some examples of architectural grade retaining walls to Mr. Sheldon.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Chair Luthin commented:

- Cannot support something like what is being proposed, as it will be highly visible.
- The building is looking fantastic.
- Hates to lose view of the building.

Vice Chair Deedler commented that he was not okay with a wall of any kind.

Chair Luthin commented that that was a good point and asked to hear from the Board on whether or not a 6' tall wall would be appropriate.

Board Member Bush commented that a 4' wall, from finished grade, would be reasonable.

Vice Chair Deedler reiterated that he was not okay with a wall of any kind.

The consensus of the Board was that a 6' tall wall would not be appropriate.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

The consensus of the Board was that a wall no taller than 4' would be appropriate along Highway 116.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Vice Chair Deedler and Chair Luthin expressed a preference to preserve the view of the building as much as possible.

Board Member Bush commented that he'd be in favor of enclosing the area with a wall no taller than 4'.

Chair Luthin commented that he could be okay with that as well.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Board Member Bush made the following motion:

- The parking as proposed is approved.
- The outdoor dining area is approved.
- Expansion of the walk-in refrigerator is approved.
- Relocation of the trash enclosure is continued to give the applicant the opportunity to return with more details.
- As proposed, the gabion wall is denied.

Mr. Sheldon interjected.

Vice Chair Deedler commented that he did not feel that asking the applicant to return with details of the trash enclosure was necessary.

The Board agreed.

Board Member Bush amended his motion as follows:

- The parking as proposed is approved.
- The outdoor dining area is approved.
- Expansion of the walk-in refrigerator is approved.
- As proposed, the gabion wall is denied.
- Relocation of the trash enclosure is approved.

The Board agreed.

Vice Chair Deedler seconded the amended motion.

AYES: Chair Luthin, Vice Chair Deedler and Board Member Bush

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

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

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

**12. ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Luthin adjourned the meeting of the Design Review Board at 4:55 p.m. to the next Design Review Board meeting to be held June 15, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., at the Sebastopol City Hall, 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Jonathan Atkinson  
Assistant Planner