



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

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

Minutes

Regular Meeting August 8, 2002
City Council Chambers 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 11 English Street Petaluma, CA
Telephone: 707-778-4301 E-Mail: planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us
FAX: 707-778-4498 Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee encourages applicants or their representatives to be available at the meeting to answer questions so that no agenda item need be deferred to a later date due to a lack of pertinent information.

Roll Call: Present: Chris Lynch, Janet Gracyk, Linda Mathies, Jack Rittenhouse *
Absent: Teresa Barrett
Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Laura Lafler, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

*Chairperson

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of July 25, 2002 were approved as amended except for the excerpt minutes for the G&C Autobody item which will be brought back to the next meeting for approval. The Committee requested that additional language be added to the minutes for this item that reflected the behavior of the project applicant, Gene Crozat and his unwillingness to work with the Committee to provide details/revisions on proposed plan.

Mr. Casad, the applicant for the Casad demolition, submitted comments on the minutes of July 25, 2002 for the record.

Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: Letter from George Riley re: G&C Auto body asking for reconsideration. Committee discussed reconsideration and was agreeable if the applicant's representative will work with the committee. M/S Mathies/Gracyk 3-0, Barrett absent, Lynch abstained, to reconsider the G&C auto body on September 12, 2002.

Public Comment: None
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

1 **OLD BUSINESS;**
2 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

3
4 **I. WATERFORD ASSOCIATES – BAKER LLC, 945 Front Street, Novato,**
5 **CA 94945**
6 **AP No: 137-070-09**
7 **File: ANX01001, TSM01001, PRZ01002, SPC01023**
8 **Planner: Laura Lafler**
9

10 Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural approval for a proposal to
11 construct ten new homes in an approved subdivision.

12
13 Laura Lafler presented the staff report.

14
15 Ben Smith, Waterford Associates, introduced the design team.

16
17 Shawn Faber, Architect: Presented the architecture for the project.

18
19 Phil Abey, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.

20
21 Janet Grayck: Suggested additional planting island between the two trees in the cul de
22 sac parking area. Suggested that the landscape plan show the location of the 3:1 oak
23 replacement.

24
25 Bonnie Diefendorf, Carlonzoni & Associates: Addressed the sight distance letter sent
26 with the packet.

27
28 Public hearing opened:

29
30 Doug Weisenpfluh, Kensington: Asked about density for R1-6500 and Corona Ely
31 specific plan.

32
33 Kristi Plum, Stonehenge Way: Find it difficult to believe that all the trees are diseased.
34 Would like the committee to try harder to preserve the oak trees. Would like oaks
35 replaced with oaks and not red buds. Think more effort should be made to preserve the
36 trees.

37
38 Jim Roeders: Waterford has been good about trying to incorporate project into the
39 surroundings. Concern that new trees along his property line might block the open space
40 and views to the west.

41
42 Pat, 1802 Hartford Lane: Have concerns about the materials blending with existing
43 neighborhood.

44
45 Don Phillips, 1831 Hartford Lane: Asked about walkway in the back of the property.

46 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Think the path along Corona Road will be an amenity. Will need

1 an outlet from the path back onto Corona Road. Future easement to the school, would
2 like landscaping and a bench and a curb cut at the end of cul de sac off Ely Road.

3
4 Hank Plum, 1721 Stonehenge Way: All of the houses in the neighborhood have tile
5 roofs. Perhaps reconsider roof material. Are lots 1 and 2 going to stay as large lots – are
6 there restricts that these remain rural properties? In approximate area near Riesling built
7 “granny units” – will this be permissible in this development? On the east side natural
8 trees are a gem – this area was a floodplain. Neighbors are very interested in retaining
9 the oaks, if not would like them replaced with comparable trees. Would like to recreate
10 the seed banks. Property is below grade – is the builder doing something to retain the
11 water? Detention type system needs to be considered here.

12
13 George White: Addressed Mr. Plum’s questions.

14
15 Public hearing closed:

16
17 Committee comments:

18
19 Committee Member Lynch: From a site plan point of view, understand that it is
20 production housing, however, the plans don’t make sense in the way they are oriented to
21 the sun. Houses are opposite of what you would rationalize. Quality of life is impacted
22 by how these houses are laid out. Driving in the neighborhood, you see a lot of garage
23 doors, which is duplicating existing houses. Houses should be two stories with detached
24 garages. Given the size of the lots, this can be provided. By going to two stories you can
25 have more outdoor amenities. The driveway ends up being the walkway to the house and
26 that is not good. Would like the houses closer to the street. Do not see anything rural
27 about these styles – can understand the dilemma of trying to fit into the surrounding area
28 – think you should defer to the rural, farm like vernacular. Design the houses to fit into
29 the open space. Think having a place where you can have a granny unit is a benefit.
30 Don’t put shutters on, stone needs to be reevaluated, simplify roofline. Don’t have a
31 problem with the comp roof. Path on Corona Road – use road oyle (decomposed
32 granite). House on the corner of Hartman Lane does not relate to the corner at all.
33 Should pull back fence and have wrap around porch design as corner lots. Agree with the
34 curb cut at the cul de sac. Like sycamores as street trees. Where will the oaks be that are
35 replacing the ones to be removed? If there was some way to save at least two trees on lot
36 4 think it would be beneficial and pass on the liability to the new owners.

37
38 Committee Member Mathies: With the size of lots, garages do not need to be prominent.
39 When I think of rural, I think of simple lines and the garage in the back. Would like to
40 see the architecture more along the rural lines. Does not need to be a similar style of the
41 existing neighborhood. Would prefer aluminum over vinyl windows. Would like a
42 minimum of 12 new oak trees or even more. Like adding the landscaping in the center of
43 the cul de sac. Like the idea of the pocket park, and the cul de sac – do not need to go to
44 the extent of lighting maybe 1 or 2 benches.

45
46 Committee Member Gracyk: Think the number of trees in the rear could be reduced for

1 view purposes. The two trees near Ely are decaying and are going to deteriorate faster
2 since there is development. Agree that we need to be responsible and remove all four
3 trees. Need four trees that are a 60 inch box, and 8 could be 24 inch box – need to be
4 carefully selected with good structure. Recommend that acorns be planted from the trees
5 on the site – could work with the school children. There is an opportunity for a new oak
6 at the end of the cul de sac. There are opportunities in lots 1 and 2 and along the road
7 edge. Need to allow space for roots if in the parking strip area. Sycamore is a good
8 choice or pistache. Would like a more detailed planting plan, would like more variety
9 and perennials. Make efforts to reduce water usage. Be careful about public utility
10 easements and the tree plantings. Be consistent with the street tree list – allow rooting
11 room for street trees. Like the suggestion that there be an exit to Corona Road from the
12 bike path. Pull path back from the existing tree on the corner of Ely and Corona. Rural
13 architecture is the way to go – will solve a lot of the other problems. Do not need tile
14 roof with a rural architectural theme.

15
16 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Concur with what the other committee members. See
17 this as an opportunity to do a different type of architecture. Still have opportunities to
18 modify the architecture. Design the houses for solar access. Houses are essentially
19 boxes – can be broken up. Architecture does very little to address the feathering stated in
20 the General Plan – needs to be rethought. Front porch can encroach into front setback.
21 Do not like cultured stone – do not think it fits. Agree that bike/ped path needs to go
22 back to Corona Road. Pocket park since it's on private property may be problematic.
23 Defer to Janet on the oak trees. Bring large trees in to replace what was there. Do not
24 think the developer should just do the minimum.

25
26 Gloria Eckton, 938 Kensington Place: Will there be only one way out of the
27 development onto to Ely? Think there will be a traffic and safety hazard. Agree to save
28 the oaks if possible.

29
30 M/S Lynch/Grayck to continue to September 12, 2002.

31
32 All in favor:

33 Committee Member Gracyk: Yes
34 Committee Member Barrett: Absent
35 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes
36 Committee Member Lynch: Yes
37 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

38
39
40 **II. REPORTS:**

41
42 **Planning Staff Reports:** None
43 **Liaison Reports:** None

44
45 **Adjournment:** 5:01

46
47 S:\Sparc\Minutes\080802.doc