

**AGENDA
CITY OF FERNDALE – HUMBOLDT COUNTY CALIFORNIA – U.S.A.
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Location:	City Hall	Date:	August 03, 2016
	834 Main Street	Time:	7:00 pm
	Ferndale CA 95536	Posted:	July 28, 2016

The City endeavors to be ADA compliant. Should you require assistance with written information or access to the facility please call 786-4224 24 hours prior to the meeting.

- 1.0 Call meeting to order / Flag salute / Roll call
- 2.0 Ceremonial - None
- 3.0 Modifications to the Agenda
- 4.0 Approval of previous minutes
 - 4.1 Minutes of July 06, 2016 Regular Meeting Page3
- 5.0 Public Comment
- 6.0 Business (Note: This is the time for commissioners to report any Ex Parte communications on this agenda item.)
 - 6.1 Solar Panel Guidelines for Historic District Page 6
 - 6.2 Design Review Penalties Page 12
 - 6.3 Building and Land Use Permits June 30, 2016-July 27, 2016 Page 17
 - 6.4 Design Review Committee Report & Minutes Page 18
- 7.0 Correspondence None
- 8.0 Commissioner Comments
- 9.0 City Planners and Deputy City Clerk’s Staff Reports
- 10.0 Adjournment

**The next regular meeting of the Ferndale Planning Commission will be on
September 7, 2016 at 7:00 pm.**

Section 1: CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Section 2: CEREMONIAL

Section 3: MODIFICATION TO THE AGENDA

Section 4: APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

City of Ferndale, Humboldt County, California USA
Minutes for Planning Commission Meeting of July 6, 2016

Call to Order — Chair Jorgen von Frausing-Borch called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:01 pm. Commissioners Ellin Beltz and Dean Nielsen were present along with City Planner Stephen Avis and Deputy City Clerk Kristene Tavares. (Commissioner Gregson had an excused absence.) Those in attendance pledged allegiance to the flag.

2.0 Ceremonial—None

3.0 Modifications to the Agenda – None

4.0 Approval of previous minutes – **Motion:** To approve the minutes of the May 5, 2016 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. **(Beltz/Nielsen) Unanimous**

5.0 Public Comment-None

6.0 Business

6.1 Solar Panel Guidelines for Historic District- City Planner Stephen Avis presented to commissioners the need to implement guidelines for solar installs within the Historic and Design Review areas of the city. Avis explained the importance of both solar installations and the preservation of historical character and appearance of the community. Avis also explained that under the California Solar Act we may not ban solar installations in these particular zones. The Planning Commission and staff were asked to devise these guidelines to assist the Design Review Committee in determining the approval of applications of Solar Installs. Avis presented a brochure from the National Alliance of Preservations Commissions for Sample Guidelines for Solar Systems in Historic Districts. Chair von Frausing-Borch stated he was glad to see the brochure and the national involvement of preserving historic districts. He also stated with all the technology available and new technology coming out, it should be easier for installations to not take away from the historic character of a building. Commissioner Beltz inquired if a building permit is required for a solar install. Staff informed committee that a building permit is required for an install. Commissioner Nielsen commented that explaining the efficiency of each system was missing from the presented brochure. Nielsen would like to know the effectiveness of the different solar systems and stated the Design Review Committee should know this. Planner Avis explained the effectiveness and product would be a decision the homeowner would need to make. Avis also explained he didn't think Design review could regulate what type of Solar System the homeowner should get. Staff also explained that when a Design Review application was presented to the city the type of system is already been chosen by the homeowner and professional solar installer who should know the best system. Avis informed Nielsen he would get him the requested information on the efficiency of the different systems. Commissioner Beltz requested that in the guidelines we mention auxiliary buildings that do not require a building permit (buildings under 120 sqft). Avis explained that even if the building

itself doesn't require a permit; the installation of a solar system would still require an electrical permit. Staff also presented an email sent from Commissioner Gregson regarding the solar panels. Gregson stated the California Solar Rights Act prevented any aesthetical changes that would decrease effectiveness up to 20%. Gregson stated that if this were the case, we should require a letter from an engineer stating the effectiveness had indeed been decreased by that much. Chair von Frausing-Borch thanked staff for getting this together. Avis asked commissioners what they were after; standards, guidelines, or an ordinance. Von Frausing-Borch stated at this time they were looking for guidelines.

6.2 Building and Land Use Permits April 25, 2016-June 25, 2016: Chair von Frausing-Borch stated there were two solar installs on the building permit list. Avis explained the type of system that was located on 5th Street. There were no other comments

6.3 Design Review Committee Report & Minutes: Commissioner Beltz reported on the Design Review Minutes and the different projects brought to the committee. Commissioners had no other comments.

7.0 Correspondence- Staff explained the few letters that were included in the correspondence section. There were no other comments.

8.0 Commissioner Comments- Staff read Commissioner Gregson's comments. Gregson would like to review the banners/pennants section of the Sign Ordinance. Commissioners discussed the pennant flags located at 1400 Main Street. Gregson also wrote the need for "teeth" in the Design Review Ordinance. Staff explained the lack of consequences for not obtaining a Design Review Permit before building, painting, etc. Chair von Frausing-Borch asked for both these items to be put on the agenda next month for discussion.

9.0 Staff Comments- Staff will advertise again for Planning Commission Vacancy.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:59 pm

Respectfully Submitted

Kristene Hall
Deputy City Clerk

Section 5: PUBLIC COMMENT

This time is for persons who wish to address the Commission on any matter not on this agenda and over which the Commission has jurisdiction. Items requiring Commission action not listed on this agenda will be placed on the next regular agenda for consideration, unless a finding is made by at least 2/3rd of the Commission (three of the five members) that the item came up after the agenda was posted and is of an urgent nature requiring immediate action. This portion of the meeting will be approximately 30 minutes total for all speakers, with each speaker given no more than five minutes. Please state your name and address for the record. (This is optional.)

Section 6: BUSINESS

Meeting Date:	August 3, 2016	Agenda Item Number	6.1
Agenda Item Title	Discuss and Implement Guidelines for the Installation of Solar Panels in the Historic & Design Review Zones		
Presented By:	Staff		
Type of Item:	X	Action	Discussion
Action Required:		No Action	X
			Information
			Voice Vote
			Roll Call Vote

RECOMMENDATION: Review and Discuss

BACKGROUND: At the May 26, 2016 City Council Meeting, the council directed the Planning Commission to create guidelines regarding solar panel installations within the Historic and Design Review Zones. With the cities adoption of both the HERO & PACE programs, the city could see an increase in solar installations. The guidelines created will assist the Design Review Committee in the preservation of historic integrity while approving permits for these solar installations.

Discussions took place at the 7/06/16 Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioners decided that putting guidelines in place to assist citizens was best for the city. Over the next few Planning Commission Meetings, we will discuss what these guidelines should consist of.

Staff is working on the following approach to the matter of solar panels in historic districts and on older homes in general.

APPROACH:

Take a positive and proactive stance on the introduction of solar panels in Ferndale and encourage considered approaches to design.

1. Since state law restricts the regulatory power of local jurisdictions (Section 714 attached) any amendments to the zoning ordinance will have to be carefully drafted.
2. If authorized, staff can develop and distribute to local solar equipment installers and make available to residential and commercial property owners, literature on the City's historic heritage, its enthusiasm for solar power generation, and suggestions on how to plan an installation that minimizes impacts (Low Impact Development or LID). Photographs will be used to illustrate concepts including solar shingles.
3. Provide written guidance for the Design Review Committee on how to review and evaluate solar collector projects that come before them.
4. Work with solar designers and installers to view Ferndale as a unique opportunity for creative ways to implement LID.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Solar Shingles
2. Solar Panels

Attachment 1

Solar Shingles: What are they?



For those who want solar power without looking like they have solar power, solar shingles are an option. Designed to look like ordinary asphalt shingles, they also protect your roof, and are meant to be as durable and flexible as regular shingles. They're also lightweight and easy to install. A few different types of solar shingles are available. You may also see them called building-integrated photovoltaics (BIPV).

Thin-film solar shingles

These are the latest solar shingles. Dow has a new line of thin-film shingles that will be available next year; they use CIGS technology (copper indium gallium diselenide), which is laminated in thin films—hence the name—over the shingles. They match the flexibility of ordinary shingles. Thin-film cells are currently less efficient than traditional silicon technology, but they are also less expensive to make. Dow estimates that a set of their solar shingles can be installed in about ten hours, which is about half the time that the first solar shingles required for installation.

Silicon-based solar shingles

Other solar shingles are made with silicon, the material used in most solar panels. These are more efficient than the thin-film shingles. The [solar shingles made by SunPower](#) convert up to 22% of available sunlight into electricity.* Note that the first silicon solar shingles were released in 2005, so the whole industry is new.

How much power do solar shingles produce?

Each shingle will produce between 13 and 63 watts, depending on the brand of shingle. If you use the shingles that produce 13 watts, you'd need 77 tiles to cover 100 square feet of roof, for a kilowatt of potential energy.**

Can they withstand the weather?

Just like ordinary shingles, solar shingles are designed to withstand rain, wind, and hail. However, because they're new to the market, there isn't a lot of real-life data on how long solar shingles can last (**more:** [How long do solar panels last](#)).

Solar shingles vs. solar panels

Photovoltaic roof tiles aren't a good match for all roofs. You need to have a roof that's correctly angled to receive sunlight. You also need to have a roofing substrate that can handle getting hot, and the correct air circulation. If you're interested in solar shingles, you'll need to have an installer check out your roof to see if it's a possibility.

Solar panels, on the other hand, can be angled to receive maximum sunlight even if the roof itself isn't quite at the right slope or if it's facing the wrong direction. They can be moved and relocated if necessary, without replacing the roof. They're also less expensive. Solar panels are more efficient, so you don't need to use as much roof space to bring down your electric bill. Solar shingles also may not last as long. Right now, very few solar installers use solar shingles.

Efficiency of shingles vs. panels

<http://roofpedia.com/solar-roof-shingles-vs-solar-panels/>

Solar shingles used to be much less efficient when compared to solar panels. In fact, before 2008 solar shingles (thin-film solar cells) barely peaked above 10% conversion efficiency. But in 2008 there was a breakthrough with (CIGS) copper indium gallium diselenide that allowed the thin-film solar cells to reach a conversion efficiency of 19.9% which was a new world record for this type of solar cell.

Before 2008 the silicone cells used for solar panels far outperformed the thin-film solar cells. Silicone solar cells have been known to reach 20.3% conversion efficiency making them the obvious choice for solar power for many years. Now, however, the thin-film solar cells conversion rates are almost identical making solar panels not as desirable as before

* This is based on information from us.sunpower.com.

** This is based on information from care2.com.

Before

After



Photos are of [Dow Powerhouse Solar Shingles](#) from their before and after pictures.

Attachment 2

Solar Panels

California Civil Code Article 2 Section 714.

(a) Any covenant, restriction, or condition contained in any deed, contract, security instrument, or other instrument affecting the transfer or sale of, or any interest in, real property, and any provision of a governing document, as defined in Section 4150 or 6552, that effectively prohibits or restricts the installation or use of a solar energy system is void and unenforceable.

(b) This section does not apply to provisions that impose reasonable restrictions on solar energy systems. However, it is the policy of the state to promote and encourage the use of solar energy systems and to remove obstacles thereto. Accordingly, reasonable restrictions on a solar energy system are those restrictions that do not significantly increase the cost of the system or significantly decrease its efficiency or specified performance, or that allow for an alternative system of comparable cost, efficiency, and energy conservation benefits.

(c) (1) A solar energy system shall meet applicable health and safety standards and requirements imposed by state and local permitting authorities, consistent with Section 65850.5 of the Government Code.

(2) Solar energy systems used for heating water in single family residences and solar collectors used for heating water in commercial or swimming pool applications shall be certified by an accredited listing agency as defined in the Plumbing and Mechanical Codes.

(3) A solar energy system for producing electricity shall also meet all applicable safety and performance standards established by the California Electrical Code, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and accredited testing laboratories such as Underwriters Laboratories and, where applicable, rules of the Public Utilities Commission regarding safety and reliability.

(d) For the purposes of this section:

(1) (A) For solar domestic water heating systems or solar swimming pool heating systems that comply with state and federal law, “significantly” means an amount exceeding 10 percent of the cost of the system, but in no case more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or decreasing the efficiency of the solar energy system by an amount exceeding 10 percent, as originally specified and proposed.

(B) For photovoltaic systems that comply with state and federal law, “significantly” means an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000) over the system cost as originally specified and proposed, or a decrease in system efficiency of an amount exceeding 10 percent as originally specified and proposed.

(2) “Solar energy system” has the same meaning as defined in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 801.5.

(e) (1) Whenever approval is required for the installation or use of a solar energy system, the application for approval shall be processed and approved by the appropriate approving entity in

the same manner as an application for approval of an architectural modification to the property, and shall not be willfully avoided or delayed.

(2) For an approving entity that is an association, as defined in Section 4080 or 6528, and that is not a public entity, both of the following shall apply:

(A) The approval or denial of an application shall be in writing.

(B) If an application is not denied in writing within 45 days from the date of receipt of the application, the application shall be deemed approved, unless that delay is the result of a reasonable request for additional information.

(f) Any entity, other than a public entity, that willfully violates this section shall be liable to the applicant or other party for actual damages occasioned thereby, and shall pay a civil penalty to the applicant or other party in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000).

(g) In any action to enforce compliance with this section, the prevailing party shall be awarded reasonable attorney's fees.

(h) (1) A public entity that fails to comply with this section may not receive funds from a state-sponsored grant or loan program for solar energy. A public entity shall certify its compliance with the requirements of this section when applying for funds from a state-sponsored grant or loan program.

(2) A local public entity may not exempt residents in its jurisdiction from the requirements of this section.

(Amended by Stats. 2014, Ch. 521, Sec. 2. Effective January 1, 2015.)

Meeting Date:	August 3, 2016	Agenda Item Number	6.2
Agenda Item Title	Design Review Penalties		
Presented By:	Staff		
Type of Item:	X	Action	Discussion
Action Required:		No Action	X
			Information
			Voice Vote
			Roll Call Vote

RECOMMENDATION: To ask City Council for funding to modify the current Design Review Ordinance and draft penalties for failing to obtain and comply with the Design Review Use Permit application process.

BACKGROUND: The Design Review Committee has discussed the lack of penalties or “teeth” in the current Design Review Ordinance. On many occasions applicants for a Design Review Use Permit have already begun, or finished a project before even applying or going through the approval process. The Committee would like the Planning Commission and City Council’s help in amending the current Design Review Ordinance and assessing penalties on citizens that do not follow the approval process.

For budgetary reasons, the City Council needs to direct the City Manager to use staff time in order to accomplish important tasks. If the City’s Design Review Committee wishes to have the Zoning Ordinance include a penalty section for violations, the language and the amount will have to be approved by the City Council preceded by a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

A minimum of three public hearing are required plus staff time from Planwest Partners and the City Attorney.

The Zoning Ordinance will be amended once a new general plan has been adopted. An alternative approach is to hold the concept until that time or, at a minimum, bundle two or more zoning ordinance changes for a cost effective approach.

ATTACHMENT:

1. Ferndale Ordinance 09-01 Amending Design Review Zone

ORDINANCE NO. 09-01

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FERNDALE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AMENDING ARTICLE 2 PERTAINING TO ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY,
§6.05 PERTAINING TO DESIGN REVIEW AND
§7.04 PERTAINING TO ANIMALS OF ZONING ORDINANCE 02-02

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FERNDALE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

ARTICLE 1: ADOPTION and PURPOSE

- §1.01 Adoption: There is hereby adopted an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Ferndale, State of California, as provided by Title Seven of the Government Code of the State of California. This Ordinance constitutes a precise plan for the use of land in conformity with the General Plan and General Plan Standards. The provisions of this Ordinance shall apply to all lands and all owners of lands within all the incorporated areas of the City of Ferndale.
- §1.02 Purpose: This Ordinance is adopted to promote and protect the public health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare, to provide a plan for sound and orderly development and to ensure social and economic stability within the various established zones.

ARTICLE 2: STATUTORY AUTHORITY / ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

- §2.01 The statutory authority for Zoning is Article 11, Section 7 of the California Constitution.
- §2.02 The enforcement authority shall be as listed in Zoning Ordinance 02-02 Sections 2.02 through 2.06.

ARTICLE 3: GENERAL PROVISIONS

- §3.01 The following changes shall be made to various sections of the Zoning Ordinance 02-02. The sections noted shall read as follows:

Article 2: STATUTORY AUTHORITY / ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

- §2.07 In the event that any fee or charge is not paid within the time period specified by the City, the City shall retain the right to seek enforcement and/or collection in court, at the expense of the responsible party. Expenses shall be recoverable by the City whether by assessment by the City Council following a hearing at a regularly scheduled City Council meeting or by a court of competent jurisdiction and shall further include the actual costs of collection such as staff time, administrative costs, court costs, attorneys' fees and penalties.
-

- §6.05 Design Control Combining or -D Zone. The Design Control Combining or -D Zone is intended to be combined with any principal zone in which the appearance and design of buildings and structures form a substantial contribution to the desirability of the zone for the uses permitted therein, and in which it is desired to protect the over-all Victorian appearance of the zone by regulating the design of proposed

buildings and structures in the zone. The following regulations shall apply in any zone with which a Design Control Combining or –D Zone is combined: (This entire section amended by Ordinance 09-01 on 08/06/09)

- 6.05.1 The procedures and authority for Design Review are established by this section to achieve the following purposes and objectives:
- a. To ensure that new buildings and structures and/or the modification, alteration and/or enlargement of existing buildings or structures occurs in a manner which is consistent with the policies of the general plan;
 - b. To preserve the natural beauty of the town's site and setting;
 - c. To ensure that the architectural design of buildings and structures and their materials and colors are visually harmonious with and are conceptually consistent in character and scale with surrounding area;
 - d. To ensure that the design and location of signs and their material and colors are consistent with the character and scale of the buildings to which they are attached or which are located on the same site, and to ensure that signs are visually harmonious with surrounding development.
- 6.05.2 Before any structure or building may be erected, structurally altered, or in any way remodeled or improved so as to change the outward appearance of the structure or building, a Design Review Use Permit shall be obtained.
- 6.05.3 Each application for such Design Review Use Permit shall be accompanied by drawings, plans and such written matter as may be necessary to show the front, side and rear elevations and the colors and materials to be used, and to show any other information that may be required by the Design Review Committee or the Planning Commission in order that it may adequately evaluate the proposed structure or building.
- 6.05.4 Design Review Use Permits for structural or building alterations, remodeling or improvements so as to change the outward appearance of the structure or building, including changes in exterior paint color, shall be subject to the following procedures:
- a. The Planning Commission shall appoint two of its members as Design Review Committee Members.
 - b. The Planning Commission shall interview and recommend to the City Council appointment of three members from the 95536 zip code, preferably with design background in planning, architecture, landscape architecture, historical restoration, or other similar experience related to the design of physical improvements and buildings in the following manner:
 - i. The City Clerk shall advertise the vacancy(ies) (via notice in newspaper, public posting) and

- notify Ferndale residents to contact the City Clerk for an application, which can be picked up at City Hall or mailed to the applicant.
- ii. Applications must be received by the City Clerk by ten (10) calendar days from the date of posting of the vacancy. Applications must be forwarded to the members of the Planning Commission by the next regular or special meeting. The Planning Commission will interview applicants and make appointments at their next regular or special meeting.
 - iii. A priority ranking of the Commission's recommendations as well as reasons supporting the ranking will be forwarded to the City Council for their next regular or special meeting.
 - iv. The first person(s) that receives a majority will be selected to fill the vacancy. If a majority is not obtained, or if there are no applicants, the vacancy will be re-advertised and the clock resets.
- c. The Design Review Committee is a sub-committee of, and reports to the Planning Commission.
 - d. Design Review Use Permit applications shall be forwarded to and reviewed by the Design Review Committee Members. No discussion between committee members shall take place, unless in a duly noticed meeting of the Committee.
 - i. If 3 members approve, the City Clerk shall issue a Design Review Permit.
 - ii. If 3 members deny, the applicant can change the design, or can ask that the application go to the Planning Commission at a fee as set by the Fees and Fines Schedule.
- 6.05.5 The Planning Commission shall consider the proposed structure or building in conjunction with the appearance and design of other structures and/or buildings in the zone in an endeavor to provide that the proposed structure or building will not be unsightly, obnoxious or undesirable in appearance to the extent that it will hinder the harmonious development of the zone, impair the desirability of the zone for the uses permitted therein, limit the opportunity to attain optimum use and value of the land and improvements or otherwise adversely affect the general property and welfare. The Planning Commission shall suggest any changes or alterations in the proposed structure or building as it may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Section.
- 6.05.6 Upon denial of any proposal, the applicant has the option of appealing the decision to the City Council, at the same fee as quoted in the current Fees and Fines Resolution for Design Review.

- 6.05.7 Upon the approval of any proposal, the Planning Commission shall issue a Design Review Use Permit. Any construction or structural alteration shall be in accordance with such approved proposal.
- 6.05.8 Emergency / minor / routine repairs in Design Control Combining Zone.
 - a. Any of said repairs as defined in Sections 3.29 and 3.48 having value of less than \$1000 requires no Design Review Use Permit; if greater than \$1000, compliance shall be made under the Building Permit Ordinance.
- 6.05.9 Time Limits:
 - a. Applicants for projects that do not require a building permit shall have six months after the date of the last Design Review Committee member’s signature to complete their project. The Planning Commission may grant a one-time extension of 6 months upon applicant’s request.
 - b. Applicants for projects that do require a building permit shall be subject to the conditions and time limits of the building permit.
- §6.06 Penalties: A fine, of double the original fee as determined by the Fee & Fine Schedule Resolution, and at the discretion of the Planning Department, shall be levied against any contractor or individual or business that routinely does business in Ferndale as evidenced by a business license or has previously gone through Design Review, if that business, contractor or individual begins a change to the outside of a building, if in a design review zone, without a Design Review Use Permit. (End of section amended by Ordinance 09-01 on 08/06/09)

-
- §7.04 Animals and Animal Shelters:
 - 7.04.1 One (1) large domestic bovine and equine animal may be kept on any parcel of not less than one acre, or any same-owner contiguous parcels used only for livestock, of not less than one acre. One Additional animal may be kept for each ½ acre of area by which such parcel exceeds one acre.
-

ARTICLE 7: ENACTMENT

- §7.05 SEVERABILITY CLAUSE: The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that one or more of such sections, subsections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases might be declared invalid, unconstitutional or void. Should any section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance be declared invalid, such declaration shall not affect the validity of any other section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase; and if this Ordinance or any portion thereof should be held to be invalid on one ground, but valid on another, it shall

be construed that the valid ground is the one upon which said Ordinance or such portion thereof was enacted.

§7.06 Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after the date of its enactment.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 6th Day of August, 2009 on the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Nancy Kaytis-Slocum, City Clerk

Jeffrey Farley, Mayor

First Reading:	04/02/09
Review	06/04/09
Second Reading:	08/06/09
Enacted:	09/06/09

Business Item 6.3 - Building and Land Use Permits

<i>BUSINESS ITEM</i>		<i>June 30, 2016-July 27, 2016</i>
<i>Building Permits</i>		
B1637	841 Tennyson	Re-Roof
B1638	1105 Cream Ct	New Construction

NOTE: Staff will bring the Building Permit Book to the Planning Commission meetings so that any of the commissioners, or public, can view any permits that have been issued.

Meeting Date:	August 3, 2016	Agenda Item Number	6.4
Agenda Item Title	Design Review Committee Report & Minutes		
Presented By:	Kristene Tavares, Deputy City Clerk		
Type of Item:	<input type="checkbox"/> Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Information
Action Required:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action	<input type="checkbox"/> Voice Vote	<input type="checkbox"/> Roll Call Vote

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive and file report from Design Review Committee members.

BACKGROUND:

Chairman Von Frausing-Borch and staff have discussed having the two Design Review Committee members report on items of interest. This will be an on-going item on the agenda.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Minutes of the 06/09/2016 Design Review Committee
2. Minutes of the 06/30/2016 Design Review Committee

City of Ferndale, Humboldt County, California USA

Design Review Minutes for the 06/09/16 - 8:30am meeting

Chair Jeff Farley opened the meeting at 8:33 a.m. Committee Members Paul Gregson, Ellin Beltz, and Marc Daniels were present along with Deputy City Clerk Kristene Tavares.

Approval of Previous Minutes: **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the May 26, 2016 and June 2, 2016 meeting minutes **(Gregson/Daniels) Unanimous**

There was no Modifications to the Agenda

There was no Public Comments.

207 Francis Street: The Design Review Committee was presented with an additional drawing for the side and upper views of the proposed deck for the remodel of the shed into a secondary dwelling unit. Chair Farley commented that the Committee had received all the drawings they had asked for over the last couple meetings. **MOTION** to make the required findings of fact listed in Attachment A to **APPROVE** the Design Review Use Permit, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Attachment B, to reconstruct a shed into a secondary dwelling unit, using all the approved drawings submitted during the approval process over the last several meetings. **(Beltz/Daniels) Unanimous**

There was no Correspondence:

Committee Member Comments: Committee Member Daniels commented on the possibility of putting a bicycle rack in the vicinity of the town clock. Committee Members stated it would be a good idea to look into. Committee Member Beltz mentioned the St. Mark's Lutheran Church having a new sign that is now illuminated all night. Staff will check into new illuminated sign.

Meeting adjourned at 8:49 am

Respectfully submitted,

Kristene Hall, Deputy City Clerk
City of Ferndale

City of Ferndale, Humboldt County, California USA

Design Review Minutes for the 06/30/16 - 8:30am meeting

Chair Jeff Farley opened the meeting at 8:32 a.m. Committee Members Paul Gregson, Ellin Beltz, Marc Daniels, and Diane Ostler were present along with Deputy City Clerk Kristene Tavares.

Approval of Previous Minutes: **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the June 9, 2016 meeting minutes
(Beltz/Ostler) Unanimous

There were no Modifications to the Agenda

There was no Public Comments.

476 Main Street: The Design Review Committee was presented with an application to paint the exterior door and window casings of the business using the approved colors. Committee Member Ostler stated she had spoken with the applicants and the applicants had stated they want to shape up the business a little at a time. Chair Farley stated he is glad to see the upgrades. **MOTION** to make the required findings of fact listed in Attachment A to **APPROVE** the Design Review Use Permit, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Attachment B, to paint an exterior door and window casings using the approved color schemes. **(Beltz/Ostler) Unanimous**

Design Review Sign-Offs: The following Design Review Permits were signed-off: DR1520, DR1605, DR1606, and DR1609.

There was no Correspondence:

Committee Member Comments:

Meeting adjourned at 8:53 am

Respectfully submitted,

Kristene Hall, Deputy City Clerk
City of Ferndale

Section 7: CORRESPONDENCE

Section 8: COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Section 9: STAFF REPORTS

Section 10: ADJOURNMENT