## DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE RECORD OF ACTION March 7, 2018

Item No:

	Time: File No.: Applicant: Staff:								
	Con't from: Env. Doc:		Not App Not App						
	Proposal:		Conceptual Design Review for a Mixed Use Project for 29 market rate residential units, 8 affordable units, and 7,000 square feet of commercial uses. This project will include the following; (1) General Plan Amendment to add the LC designation to an additional 0.08 acres and to change the residential portion of the site to Medium Density Residential allowing 12 dwelling units per acre; (2) Zone Change from LC/R1 to Planned Community; (3) Major Subdivision to create 11 parcels; (4) Preliminary and Precise Development Plan for Planned Community Zoning; (5) Use Permit; (6) Design Review with Hearing; and (7) Sign Program.						
	Location: APN: Supervisorial		18285 Sonoma Highway, Sonoma 056-415-020, -018,-017, 016						
	District: Zoning:		1 LC (Limited Commercial) TS (Traffic Sensitive), R1 (Low Density Residential), B6 5 DU (5 Dwelling Units Per Acre), LG/SPR (Local Guidelines/The Springs Highway 12 Corridor), SR (Scenic Resource) and X (Vacation Rental Exclusion Combining District).						
	Public Hearing	g:	No						
	Design Review Committee:		Don MacNair, Jim Henderson & Karin Theriault						
	Staff:		Scott Orr-Project Planner  Tim Sloat for KS Mattson Partners LP, Karen Massey-Project Planning Consultant, Quadriga Landscape Architects/Rachael McQueen, Adobe Associates/Casey McDonald- Project Civil Engineer						
	Applicant:								
	Others:		Associates/Casey MicDonald- Floject Civil Engineer						
	PROJECT DESIGN:		[X] Preliminary Review		[ ] Final Review	[ ] Referral Only			
	ACTION: Proj Des Nee Revis (see att comm		gn ds ion ached	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								
Archit	ecture _	Х							

ing &								
lation	X							
scaping &	X							
S	X					_		<u> </u>
ing			Χ					
rior Lighting	X							
VOTE:	Don McNair:	X	Jim Hend	derson:	X	Karin <sup>-</sup>	Theriault:	X
Ayes	: 3 No	oes: 0		Abse	<b>nt:</b> 0		Abstai	<b>n:</b> 0
Applicant:	Tim Sloat for k	(S Matts		s LP	IONS		le: PLP18	
Address:	10205 Canom	18285 Sonoma Highway, Sonoma				<b>Date:</b> March 7, 2018		
revised. If a r	applicant is urged recommended ch th plans for Final	to respo ange is r	ond under e not made, p	ach com		to how p	lans have	e been
revised. If a r responses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensu	applicant is urged	to respo ange is r Design F	ond under e not made, p Review.	each com blease in	dicate wh	to how p	olans havo	e been t your
revised. If a responses with	applicant is urged recommended ch th plans for Final	to respo ange is r Design F	ond under enot made, p Review.	each com please in	dicate wh	to how p	olans havo	e been t your
revised. If a r responses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensur  Response:  2. Ensur	applicant is urged recommended chath th plans for Final re the outdoor se	to respo ange is r Design F ating are	end under en	each com please in ated outs	dicate wh	to how p ny. Pleas e public r	olans have se submit ight-of-wa	e been t your
revised. If a rresponses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensu  Response:  2. Ensu	applicant is urged recommended charth plans for Final re the outdoor search that the propose	to respo ange is r Design F ating are	end under end made, p Review. eas are local rete design	each complease industrial	ide of the	to how p ny. Pleas e public r	olans have se submit ight-of-wa	e been t your
revised. If a rresponses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensur  Response:  2. Ensure eventors	applicant is urged recommended chather the plans for Final re the outdoor search that the propose by throughout the	to respo ange is r Design F ating are	end under end made, p Review. eas are local rete design	each complease industrial	ide of the	to how p ny. Pleas e public r	olans have se submit ight-of-wa	e been t your
revised. If a rresponses with responses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensurement Response:  2. Ensurevent event Response:	applicant is urged recommended charth plans for Final re the outdoor search that the propose by throughout the	to respo ange is r Design F ating are sed conc new com	end under endt made, p Review. eas are locates	each complease in	ide of the	to how p ny. Pleas e public r gh time a	olans have se submit ight-of-wa	e been t your
revised. If a rresponses with responses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensurement Response:  2. Ensurevent Response:  ARCHITECT	recommended character the outdoor search the first the proposity throughout the	to respo ange is r Design F ating are sed conc new com	end under end made, protoned with made, protoned with made, protoned with material are made with material are the design mercial are the	ach complease in a steed outs a is retaineas.	ide of the	to how p ny. Pleas e public r gh time a	ilans have se submit ight-of-wa	e been t your
revised. If a rresponses with responses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensu  Response:  2. Ensu  even!  Response:  ARCHITECT	applicant is urged recommended charth plans for Final re the outdoor search that the propose by throughout the	to responding angerism for the second concine where the second for	end under end made, protonate made, protonate made, protonate made, protonate made, protonate made made made made made made made mad	ach complease in a steed outs a is retaineas.	ide of the	to how p ny. Pleas e public r gh time a	ilans have se submit ight-of-wa	e been t your
revised. If a rresponses with responses with SITE PLAN  1. Ensurement Ensurement In En	recommended characteristics applicant is urged recommended characteristics and recommended characteristics are the outdoor search that the propose by throughout the recommendation and recommended and recomm	to responding is reconstructed to responding is reconstructed to reconstructed to responding to reconstructed to responding to r	rete designamercial armercial armeeting.	ach complease industrial attention of the second of the se	ide of the ed throu	to how pay. Please public republic republic references	ilans have se submit ight-of-wa and is car	e been tyour ay.

3. Consider tying the plaza area to the rear portion of the new commercial building.

Resp	or	nse:
4	₽.	The trash enclosure facing Calle Del Monte should be redesigned to fit in better with the architectural theme of the proposed project.
Resp	or	nse:
5	5.	Consider reducing the overall height of the new commercial portion of the project.
Resp	oor	nse:
6	S.	Focus on the northwest entry area of the new commercial portion of project so it is more in keeping with the proposed southwest entry.
Resp	oor	nse:
7	7.	Ensure all design elements are in keeping with each other and reflect the same design era.
Resp	oor	nse:
8	3.	Ensure the windows at the retail food center are symmetrical and are in keeping with the design era.
Resp	oor	nse:
9	).	Consider orienting the west-facing apartment windows to be more horizontal.
Resp	or	nse:
1	10.	The proposed mural should be more balanced with the rest of the building.
Resp	or	nse:
1	11.	Improve the lobby entry to the apartment building.
Resp	or	nse:
PAR	2 <b>K</b> I	NG & CIRCULATION
1	١.	Provide a parking space count (including the number of required Accessible spaces) that
·	•	includes the square footage of each existing use to be retained, the square footage of all new uses, and the required number of spaces for each use. Ensure the required number of bicycle parking spaces is included in the parking space count.
Resp	or	nse:

2.	Ensure the bicycle racks do not block any walkways or accessibility.
Respo	onse:
•	
LAND	SCAPING: Design, Plant Types and Sizes, Irrigation, etc.
1.	Provide an arborist's report for retention of the existing trees on the subject site.
Respo	onse:
2.	Consider providing landscape screening on the roof deck to provide shade to persons utilizing that area.
Respo	onse:
3.	If the applicant desires to install street trees in the ground at the Highway 12 frontage, the proposed buildings will have to be moved further back onto the site (to the east) to avoid the Caltrans right-of-way area.
Respo	onse:
4.	Retaining the existing trees on the site might be difficult during new site development; the driplines of those trees will have to be avoided and heavily mulched to retain moisture at the roots.
Respo	onse:
-	Consider avoiding the driplines of the existing trees at the new bio-retention areas.
Respo	onse:
6.	If the existing trees on the site cannot be retained, replace those trees with large, new trees.
Respo	onse:
7.	Consider installing landscaping at the proposed low masonry wall in the parking area.
Respo	nse:
8.	Provide a landscape and irrigation plan for review and approval. Ensure all proposed landscaping meets the most current WELO (Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance) requirements.
Respo	nse:

## **SIGNS**

1. Provide the square footage of the existing grocery store sign on the site to be retained. The Design Review Committee agrees with the applicant that the existing grocery store sign should be retained and not included in the overall new sign calculation for the site because the existing sign is considered an iconic neighborhood element and should be retained as is- with no changes. Please note, the sign is **not** considered historic nor does the subject site include a zoning historic designation ("HD"); the request for the existing square footage of the sign is for documentation purposes only.

Response:	
2. Provide a signage plan and details for all new sign areas.	
Response:	
EXTERIOR LIGHTING	
<ol> <li>Provide an exterior lighting plan and cut sheets. Ensure all exterior lighting is Dark- compliant.</li> </ol>	-Sky
Resnonse:	