



**City of Petaluma, California**

City Council Chambers  
City Hall, 11 English Street  
Petaluma, CA 94952

Telephone 707/778-4301 / Fax 707/778-4498

E-Mail [planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us](mailto:planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us)

Web Page <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

---

Planning Commission Minutes  
April 13, 2004 – 7:00 PM

Commissioners: *Present:* Asselmeier, Barrett, Harris, McAllister, Rose, von Raesfeld  
*Absent:* Dargie\*

\* Chair

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development  
Irene Borba, Senior Planner  
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

---

**ROLL CALL:**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of February 24 were approved as amended. M/S Asselmeier/von Raesfeld, 5-0, Dargie absent, Harris recused himself. Minutes of March 23, 2004 were approved as submitted. M/S Barrett/vonRaesfeld, 6-0, Dargie absent; Harris abstained.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** None

**COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** None

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.

**LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.

---

Public hearing began: @ 7:00

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**I. RIVAS SUBDIVISION, 1081 Bantam Way**  
**AP No.: 019-070-043**  
**File: PRZ01001, TPM01001**  
**Planner: Irene T. Borba**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Applicant is requesting a recommendation to the City Council of a proposal for a 3-lot subdivision outside City limits but within the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) on a 2-acre parcel. The proposal requires Adoption of a Negative Declaration, Pre-zoning, Tentative Parcel Map, and Annexation of subject parcel.

Irene Borba presented the staff report.

Edie Robbins, CSW Stuber-Stroeh: Answered commission questions regarding the air gap tank referred to on Page 4 of the staff report.

Joe Swicegood, applicant: Addressed the air gap system, the questions regarding removal of the trees and the reason for annexing into the City of Petaluma.

John Fitzgerald: Answered commission questions regarding improving the sidewalk, curb and gutter on Bantam Way.

Commissioner McAllister: Wanted to make sure the storm drain and water lines are outside the canopy of the existing trees. So not want to see the loss of the trees as they provide screening.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Do not want the public to perceive this as a private road and would want the sidewalk to be continuous on at least one side of Bantam Way. Recommend public thorough way. Want future connectivity to other neighboring subdivisions.

Commissioner Barrett: Asked for clarification that the public road stops at the southern edge of lot 3.

Craig Spaulding: That is correct.

Public comment opened.

Susan Kirks, Paula Lane: Related neighborhood concerns. Suggested less development. Will impact visual aesthetics, biological resources, hydrology, noise and lighting impacts, water pressure and fire safety on the Paula Lane neighbors. Will be a significant cumulative, negative impact.

Katie O'Connor, 594 Paula Lane: Asked to consider noise, feathering density, lighting, and loss of land and wildlife habitat, significant visual and aesthetic impact. Did not want to have the property annexed into the City.

Patrick Sheafer, 594 Paula Lane: What is this project good for the community – can this be blended more into the hillside and the environment considering the neighbors and the community.

Public comment closed:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**Commission Discussion:**

Commissioner Asselmeier: Can granny units be built on these lots?

Irene Borba: Yes, if it meets the requirements.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked if the Planning Commission can give direction toward the size of the homes?

George White: Yes, however, it would have to be very specific.

Commissioner Rose: Have a concern about the use of Bantam Way as a private road. There is a proposal to abandon the right of way at the end of lot 1 – question if this is something the City really wants to do.

Commissioner Barrett: Can the water easement be a future pedestrian or bike path?

Craig Spaulding: Yes, it is not an exclusive easement.

Commissioner Rose: Reiterated the responsibility of the City regarding public streets and private roads. Do not want the property to be over graded – there are compatible ways to develop houses. Would be useful for SPARC to review the design details.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Believe there is an adequate basis to condition the two parcels to go to SPARC. Some merits to public right of way going to southern boundary of lot 1.

Council Member Harris: Believe clear direction to SPARC on line of sight, etc. is appropriate.

Commissioner McAllister: Design of the homes is critical. Difference in grade is huge and needs a good architectural solution. Confused regarding county residential designation B6 versus what is in the staff report.

**Consensus of the Commission:**

SPARC review of development on lots 2 and 3 regarding view screening, siting of homes, particularly on the western slope, architectural size and fitting into the neighborhood, especially to the west, lighting on the site, minimize grading. In addition the commission requested to maintain as many trees as possible.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Concerned about connectivity and safety of school routes. Where is public benefit from this subdivision? Want a condition that allows public access – needs to be considered in relationship to where the homes will be. Can possibly have a path on the 10 ft water easement.

1 Commissioner Barrett: Would like the easement conditioned with this subdivision.  
2 Agree to move drainage lines out of the canopy of trees.

3  
4 George White: Suggested an evaluation of the trees and how close the drainage is to the  
5 tree canopy.

6  
7 Commissioner McAllister: Would like to condition the project to keep the trees – need  
8 the footprint of the homes to work around the trees. I am in support of an arborist report  
9 and measuring the tree canopy.

10  
11 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Want to make a pitch for the public street or private with  
12 an irrevocable offer of dedication for a public street in the future.

13  
14 Craig Spaulding: If there were an irrevocable offer of dedication, I would want the  
15 private street developed to city standards.

16  
17 Commissioner McAllister: Went over SPARC requirements, materials, and want trees to  
18 be a separate condition. Need the siting of the homes to work with the topography -  
19 stepped architecture. Size of the homes to fit with the neighborhood – do not know how  
20 to condition this.

21  
22 Commissioner Asselmeier: Want SPARC to look at the built environment. Want to  
23 proceed carefully so that the ambience of old neighborhoods is not ruined by new homes.

24  
25 Commissioner Barrett: This is infill and will be a dominant part of new development and  
26 we will want it compatible with existing development.

27  
28 Council Member Harris: Is it appropriate to go to the applicant again for a response to  
29 comments?

30  
31 Commissioner McAllister: Believe our conditions preclude a 3,000 sq. ft. home with a 3-  
32 car garage.

33  
34 The commission reviewed the consensus for approval:

- 35
- 36     ▪ Irrevocable dedication for private road to later become public street
  - 37     ▪ Private road developed to city standards
  - 38     ▪ Arborist evaluation of trees
  - 39     ▪ Measure tree canopies to ensure drainage pipes are not under or inside tree  
40     canopy line
  - 41     ▪ SPARC to review development on lots 2 and 3 regarding view screening; siting of  
42     homes, particularly on the western slope; architectural size and fitting into the  
43     neighborhood with compatible materials and colors of surrounding area,  
44     especially to the west; lighting on the site; and minimizing grading. In addition  
45     the commission requested to maintain as many trees as possible.
  - 46     ▪ 10-ft. water easement to become future pedestrian/bike path
- 47

1 Commissioner Barrett: Do not think there is a benefit to leaving this in the county.

2  
3 Commissioner Rose: Agree with what has been said, density is appropriate. Believe the  
4 lots are appropriate sizes.

5  
6 Commissioner Asselmeier: Agree with additional conditions and focusing on what the  
7 homes look like would benefit the city.

8  
9 Applicant: Pleased with the conditions, want to be good neighbors.

10  
11 M/S McAllister/Rose to forward a recommendation to adopt a Negative Declaration, Pre-  
12 zoning to R-1,20,000, Tentative Parcel Map, and Annexation of subject parcel per the  
13 attached findings and amended conditions of approval, 6-0, Dargie absent.

---

14  
15  
16  
17 **COMMISSION BUSINESS:**

18  
19 **II. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE ELIMINATION OF FULL SIZE**  
20 **PLANS.**

21  
22 Commissioner McAllister: Would support elimination of full size plans, except for the  
23 civil drawings. Need full size plans when looking at grading.

24  
25 George White: Clarified that just civil drawings should be full size, architectural can be  
26 reduced.

27  
28 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Want 21 x 15 if possible – want them to be scaleable.

---

29  
30  
31 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

32  
33 **a. City Council:** Next City Council meeting is on April 19, 2004.

34 **b. SPARC:** Mary Isaac center approved, North Bay construction on  
35 Lindberg, preliminary review for North Bay sunspace, preliminary review  
36 for Sonoma Marin narrows project; preliminary review for Petaluma  
37 Valley Plaza (Deer Creek), preliminary review for new SFD at 611 Baker  
38 Street; Boulevard Apartments approved with minor changes; Adobe Creek  
39 Center, continued to May 27, 2004, preliminary review of El Rose  
40 subdivision.

41 **c. Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Many committee  
42 members attended General Plan meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> of March; discussed  
43 Petaluma Valley Project; letter to representative Kerns on open space  
44 district; discussion about cross-walks in town at undersigned intersections.  
45 Sergeant Lyons will come and speak to the committee about safety for  
46 pedestrians; reviewed Lakeville Wastewater Treatment Plant.

1 d. Tree Advisory Committee: Chair Joseph Noriel was appointed to  
2 Park and Recreation Commission. Committee will be recommending a  
3 tree ordinance for tree protection.  
4

5 Commissioner Rose: Attended a meeting last month co-sponsored by the Greenbelt  
6 Alliance and the Farm Bureau. These groups were bitter foes in terms of the rural  
7 heritage initiative. They have now come together, received a major grant and did a  
8 publication, which I have a copy of and will share. I have also provided George White a  
9 copy as well. They are now applying pressure on Cloverdale to adopt a growth  
10 ordinance. Cloverdale is the only city in Sonoma County that does not have a growth  
11 ordinance. The other issue is density – their mission is to get the cities within Sonoma  
12 County to acknowledge that the only way agriculture will survive in its current state is if  
13 cities become more dense. The report provides good statistical data backup that could be  
14 useful for us in the General Plan process.  
15

16 The General Plan is moving forward at a fast pace – want to explore more ideas and have  
17 other options outside of the alternatives. Before we get to far along, I want to talk with  
18 staff and have more back and forth discussion as to what our options are. I would like to  
19 consider scheduling a special meeting or two.  
20

21 Commissioner Barrett: The City Council will be reviewing the alternatives on Tuesday,  
22 April 20, 2004.  
23

24 Commissioner Rose: Suggested scheduling a special meeting to give the General Plan  
25 the time it needs now.  
26

27 Commissioner Asselmeier: Would like us to do an informal workshop with Pamela Tuft  
28 and Scott Duiven. Chair Dargie also voiced an interest in an informal workshop.  
29

30 Commissioner McAllister: Want to know what the Council will be doing on April 20th.  
31

32 George White: The Council meeting will be a public meeting and people can weigh in on  
33 the alternatives at that time.  
34

35 Commissioner McAllister: What is the role of the Commission to weigh in on the  
36 General Plan.  
37

38 George White: You will be required to review the General Plan and the EIR and make a  
39 recommendation to the Council.  
40

41 Commissioner McAllister: Has the council already directed something and we will work  
42 within that framework?  
43

44 George White: Pamela Tuft expects to come back to the Planning Commission at least  
45 one more time.  
46

Planning Commission Minutes - April 13, 2004

1 Commissioner Barrett: Would like to see the Planning Commission working with the  
2 Council to move this General Plan forward. Need to get some dates and present to staff  
3 and Pamela Tuft.

4

5 Council Member Harris: Agree that we need some informal workshops.

6

7 George White: Will need lead-time so that we can do a public notice.

8

9 Commissioner Rose: Want a venue that would be informal we would all sit together.

10

11

12 Adjournment: 9:40

13

14

15 S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\PC Minutes 04\041304.doc