



## **Design Review Committee Minutes**

**Monday, July 14, 2025 at 5:00 PM**

**33 Church Street, Sutter Creek, CA 95685**

**The Agenda can be found on the City's Website: [www.cityofsuttercreek.org](http://www.cityofsuttercreek.org)**

---

**The City of Sutter Creek Design Review Committee Meeting was available in person and LIVE on YouTube and Zoom.**

### **1. Call to Order and Establish a Quorum for Regular Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM by Susan Peters.

Present: Members Sandi Baracco, John Otto, Susan Peters

Absent: Sharyn Brown

Staff: Erin Ventura – Contract City Planner, Aaron Wolcott – City Clerk, Tom DuBois – City Manager

### **2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**

The pledge of allegiance was led by Susan Peters.

### **3. Public Forum**

No public comment was made regarding items not on the agenda.

### **4. Consent Agenda**

A. Design Review Committee Minutes of May 12, 2025

Recommendation: Approval of Minutes

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda with corrections to the minutes by Otto, seconded by Baracco.**

**AYES:** Baracco, Otto, Peters

**NOES:**

**ABSENT:** Brown

**MOTION CARRIED 3-0**

### **5. Design Clearance Applications**

A. Design Clearance

110 Gold Dust Trail

New 828sf SFR

Applicant: Alex Panzera, PreFab Innovations

Contract City Planner, Erin Ventura introduced the project, noting it was brought to the Design Review Committee for feedback on the exterior design before proceeding through the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and site plan permit process required for a residential unit in a commercial zone.

There was discussion regarding the property's precise location, parcel size, and access, with discrepancies noted between the application and other sources. These issues are expected to be resolved during the site plan review.

Committee member Otto expressed concern that the proposed design did not meet the City's design standards for the historic district, describing it as "mid-century modern" rather than the "Craftsman Bungalow" style indicated in the application materials.

The committee noted that while the neighborhood is eclectic, the proposed design was not compatible with the surrounding homes. Specific concerns included the lack of a porch or sufficient roof overhangs and the "shed" style roof.

Committee member Peters noted that while the home is tucked away and not visible in the neighborhood, the committee has to adhere to the standards set by the City for homes within the historic district.

The committee suggested the applicant work with the designer to revise the plans to be more compatible with the neighborhood, possibly by adding a porch or exploring other models offered by the manufacturer.

**Motion to approve the continue the item at a later meeting by Otto, seconded by Baracco.**

**AYES:** Baracco, Otto, Peters

**NOES:**

**ABSENT:** Brown

**MOTION CARRIED 3-0**

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:51 PM