



CITY OF  
**FOLSOM**  
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE

**SPECIAL MEETING  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES  
October 21, 2020  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
4:00 p.m.  
50 Natoma Street  
Folsom, California 95630**

**CALL TO ORDER HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION:** Kathleen Cole, Mickey Ankhelyi, Daniel West, Kevin Duewel, Mary Asay, Vice Chair Rosario Rodriguez, Chair Daron Bracht

**ABSENT:** None

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**CITIZEN COMMUNICATION:** None

**MINUTES:** The minutes of October 7, 2020 were approved as submitted.

**WORKSHOP**

**1. Informational Public Workshop Regarding Project/Design Alternatives for Mixed-Use Project at 603 Sutter Street**

The project applicant (Mr. Ziad Alaywan) and his team gave a presentation to the Historic District Commission regarding two new design/project alternatives for development of a mixed-use building at 603 Sutter Street within the Historic District. The first design/project alternative (Alternative 1) presented included development of a three-story, 13,900-square-foot building (11,300 square feet of occupiable space) with seven on-site parking spaces (above-grade garage) which are accessible through a garage entrance located on Scott Street. The three-story building, which is 42 feet in height at its tallest point along Sutter Street, would require a Variance to exceed the maximum allowable building height (35 feet maximum allowable building height) by seven feet. A Variance for parking would be required as well as the project includes seven on-site parking spaces whereas 33 on-site parking spaces are required. In terms of building design, the mass of the three-story building has been broken down into smaller components and the corner of the building has been rounded, both of which are intended to create a more pedestrian-friendly scale and appearance. The design elements, building materials, and building color have also been updated to better reflect the historic nature of past and present buildings on Sutter Street. The second design/project alternative (Alternative 2) presented included development of a three-story, 14,300-square-foot building (14,300 square feet of occupiable space) with no on-site parking spaces. The three-story building, which is 42 feet in height at its tallest point along Sutter Street, would require a Variance to exceed the maximum allowable building height (35 feet maximum allowable building height) by seven feet. A Variance for parking would be required as well as the project includes no on-site parking spaces whereas 41 on-site parking spaces are required. With respect to on-site parking, the applicant described a technical memorandum which states that construction on an underground parking structure on the project site is prohibitive due to the existing bedrock and substantial blasting that would

be required. In terms of building design, the mass of the three-story building has been broken down into smaller components, the third story has been recessed back away from Sutter Street, and the corner of the building has been rounded, all of which are intended to create a more pedestrian-friendly scale and appearance. The design elements, building materials, and building color have also been updated to better reflect the historic nature of past and present buildings Sutter Street.

Following the applicant's presentation, seven members of the public spoke regarding the two proposed design/project alternatives. In addition, two letters from members of the public were read out loud to the Commission by City staff. The general feedback provided by the residents was that the two design/project alternatives were still too large in terms of size, scale, height, and mass and that the proposed buildings were not compatible with existing buildings located along Sutter Street. There were also concerns raised that the two design/project alternatives were not consistent with the Historic District Design and Development Guidelines in relation to the historic architectural theme and the proposed building materials and colors. The residents commented that the lack of parking provided by the two design/project alternatives was also a significant concern given the growing parking challenges that have been present in the Historic District, especially in the residential areas closest to Sutter Street. Lastly, residents indicated that they did not believe that there were sufficient grounds for the Commission to grant approval of a Building Height Variance or a Parking Variance for the two design/project alternatives. Additional feedback made by residents included comments about the location of the trash/recycling enclosure, the proposed uses within the building, and the lack of a strategy to address overall parking issues in the Historic District. A number of residents did commend the applicant on his continued efforts to make changes to the proposed project in an effort to address concerns and comments raised by the public.

1. Ben Fuentes addressed the Historic District Commission citing concerns regarding the trash enclosures, building design, building height and parking issues.
2. Loretta Hettinger addressed the Historic District Commission on behalf of Cindy Baker and the Heritage Preservation League, citing concerns about the size of the building, the building materials being used, and the gold rush architecture issues.
3. Mike Brenkwitz addressed the Historic District Commission, citing concerns about the parking variance and how it will affect the residents who live in the district.
4. Laura Fisher addressed the Historic District Commission, citing concerns on the workshop format, variances on height and parking, and issues complying with zoning code and design guidelines.
5. Adena Blair addressed the Historic District Commission citing concerns regarding building size, parking and commercial buildings being built in this area of Sutter Street.
6. Gary Richards addressed the Historic District Commission citing concerns on the variances.
7. Cindy Pharis addressed the Historic District Commission citing concerns on building size, height, and parking issues.
8. Laurette Laurent submitted a public comment letter to the Historic District Commission citing concerns on rezoning and parking.
9. Bob Delp submitted a public comment letter to the Historic District Commission citing concerns on the location of the building, building size, and parking.

Subsequent to feedback from the residents, the Commission provided their input to the applicant regarding the two design/project alternatives. The Commission expressed their appreciation to the applicant and his team and indicated that the two design/project alternatives represented a significant improvement relative to the overall design of the mixed-use building. However, the Commission indicated that they still had concerns regarding size, scale, height, and mass of the proposed building given its location on Sutter Street. In particular, there was concern raised by the Commission that the proposed building may not be compatible with the existing single-story building located on the adjacent property at 605 Sutter Street. The Commission also expressed concern regarding the mass of the building as viewed from Sutter Street. The Commission questioned whether there were unique conditions associated with the project site that would be sufficient enough grounds for granting of a Building Height Variance. The Commission was extremely concerned regarding the lack of parking provided by the two design/project alternatives, especially given the recent findings and recommendations made by the Historic District Ad Hoc Parking Committee. The Commission recognized that the proposed project cannot be held responsible for the existing parking issues within the Historic District, however, the Commission was concerned about adding to an existing parking problem by allowing another project that does not provide sufficient parking to meet its own parking demand. The Commission engaged in a discussion about the potential to form a parking assessment district or some sort of other mechanism that would lead to the

creation of more parking spaces within the Historic District. In terms of parking, the Commission was very concerned about issuing a Parking Variance for the project given the existing parking conditions in the Historic District. Overall, the Commission reiterated that they were very hesitant about the request for a Building Height Variance and a Parking Variance and want to see more specific details and justifications regarding the request for the two Variances.

**PRINCIPAL PLANNER REPORT**

None

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



---

Kelly Mullett, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

**APPROVED:**



---

Daron Bracht, CHAIR