



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 May 22, 2003
City Council Chambers 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 11 English Street Petaluma, CA
Telephone: 707-778-4301 E-Mail: cdd@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: Teresa Barrett, Janet Gracyk, Chris Lynch, vacant,
Jack Rittenhouse*
Historic: Marianne Hurley, Hoppy Hopkins

*Chairperson

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

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of May 8, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett-6/0.

Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Hurley invited the committee to upcoming Historic preservation workshops. Distributed flyers regarding the workshops.

Correspondence: None

Public Comment: None

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:00 p.m.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
OLD BUSINESS:

1
2 **I. DOWNTOWN STREETScape MASTER PLAN**

3 **File: SPC02035**

4 **Planner: Irene Borba**

5
6 Request for Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee approval of details for
7 the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan including benches, planter posts, trash
8 receptacles, bike bollards, bike racks, tree grates and palm plinths.
9

10 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

11
12 Paul Marangella, Director of Economic Development and Redevelopment. Gave a
13 history of the project.

14
15 Sandy Reed: Gave a recap of previous approvals for the streetscape and presented the
16 details of the street furniture, planter pots, bike racks, lighting and trees as well as the
17 placement of each in the downtown area.

18
19 Don Curry, Engineer: Explained the bulb outs on corners with regard to the storm drains
20 and utilities.

21
22 Paul Marangella: Bulb outs on Kentucky would be done in a later phase.

23
24 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about the phasing of the project – when would the entire
25 project be complete.

26
27 Paul Marangella: 5-7 years.

28
29 Sandy Reed: Trees, lights, and concrete will be done before the end of the year. Palm
30 trees are part of the bulb out phase.

31
32 Committee Member Hurley: Is there additional monies for maintenance of the trees and
33 plantings, etc.

34
35 Paul Marangella: Working with Downtown Association or establishing an assessment
36 district. Redevelopment cannot finance maintenance. Possibly paid parking from the
37 Keller Street garage could contribute.

38
39 Sandy Reed: There is maintenance built into the project startup – for approximately 3
40 years. If funding is not set up for maintenance of the pots, they will not go in.

41
42 Committee Member Gracyk: Did we lose palm trees at the museum?

43
44 Sandy Reed: Yes.

45
46 Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested taking a look at concrete on Kentucky at the
47 Golden Concourse (near KCO) – collects water.

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

Committee Member Hopkins: Asked why palm trees?

Sandy Reed: To create a district or gateway and because maintenance is easy.

Public hearing opened:

Stuart Hide, 800 Middlefield: Moved here because Petaluma is unique. Do not want to see any changes made.

Mary Shearer: Improvement to downtown would be great – the ambiance would be wonderful. Need sufficient clearance for trucks on Petaluma Boulevard in front of McNears. Would like to see cross walk on B Street in front of 24-Hr. fitness beautified.

Brian Rossen: Like the improvements. Have the road diets been addressed in these improvements?

Paul Marangella: CPSP is going to Council June 2, 2003. Nothing here will implement or impede the CPSP.

Public hearing closed:

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Hurley: Propose no trees on Western between Petaluma Boulevard and Kentucky Street. Do not want to see a barrier between the street and the buildings. Trees break up the relationship of the buildings. Like the light standards and the lights. Concerned about the sidewalk color. Concern about bulb outs because you lose the historic aspects of the downtown.

Committee Member Hopkins: All questions have been addressed.

Committee Member Gracyk: Concerned about the greenness of concrete – look at it outdoors. Sometimes the green turns black depending on the stain. Would be appropriate to leave Western as it is. Do not want to make Petaluma cute. Bulb outs are at odds with historic downtown – maybe use only on Petaluma Boulevard. Like the pots and the 3 or 4 sided tree grates – check with Ed Anchordoguy about 24” root barrier. Do not like decorative metal on canopies. Like the TEKA lights. Like the wider sidewalk in front of 24-Hr. Fitness on Petaluma Boulevard.

Committee Member Barrett: Against the palm trees – look too staged. Prefer a minimum number of bulb outs. Agree with Marianne about no trees on Western between Petaluma Boulevard and Kentucky Street. Not encouraged about the sidewalk overlay holding up over time.

Jeanne Miche: Company who is doing the overlay has been in business for 19 years.

1 The product that cracked is not what we are suggesting.

2

3 Paul Marangella: The contractor would have to guarantee the product. If we follow the
4 scoring patterns on the sidewalk, the product will adhere better.

5

6 Committee Member Lynch: Ambivalent about bulb outs – are they required to put in the
7 palm trees.

8

9 Sandy Reed: Yes.

10

11 Committee Member Lynch: If the sidewalk product is not guaranteed – would be worse
12 than what we have now. Also, do not want to make too cute. Only about 40 lineal feet of
13 sidewalk being taken out – is overlay being done on all other sidewalks? Prefer the
14 overlay with the smoother texture. Don't agree with removing all trees on Western – a
15 few would keep continuity. Canopy – suggest leaving alone until the buildings are dealt
16 with – detailing is ok except for scallops. Like the palm trees – is a very eclectic town –
17 think the palm trees add to this diversity. Do have a reservation about bulb outs – support
18 at this point. No problems with furniture. Like the custom pots.

19

20 Chair Rittenhouse: Like bike racks, pots, etc. Thought there was consensus to scale back
21 the number of trees on Western – not in favor of no trees at all. In favor of bulb outs if
22 detailing is done well – too late to get rid of them all. Canopy design should be part of
23 store front improvements. Like four-side tree grates, pots with metal legs. Like cast iron
24 trash receptacles.

25

26 Consensus of committee:

27

- Bulb outs at Petaluma Boulevard and B Streets

28

- Widen sidewalk on Petaluma Boulevard at 24-Hour Fitness and in front of
29 McNears

30

- No canopy changes until building fronts are improved (conduits to go in now)

31

- Replace concrete whenever possible – use overlay with a written guarantee from
32 contractor

32

- Square trash receptacles

33

34

35 M/S Gracyk/Hurley to approve streetscape with bulb outs on Petaluma Boulevard South
36 and B Street, widen sidewalk on Petaluma Boulevard in front of 24-Hr. Fitness and
37 McNear's Restaurant, leave out trees on Western between Petaluma Boulevard and
38 Kentucky Street, no canopy changes until building fronts are improved (put in conduits
39 now), replace concrete whenever possible and use overlay with a written guarantee from
40 contractor, put in square trash receptacles. 6-0

41

42 Public hearing ended at 5:00 p.m.

43

44 Hearing resumed @ 5:05

45

46

PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**II. PETALUMA TOWN CENTER, Petaluma Blvd. South, First Street and Second Street at C and D Streets.****AP No(s): 008-065-002 & 003; 008-068-001, 002 & 003; 008-066-002, 003, 006, 007 & 009 and 008-121-001, 008-121-007, 008, 009, 010, 011 and 012.****File: 03PRE0129**

- A. Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee preliminary review of plans for a 10-screen theater building (on the corner of Petaluma Blvd South and C Street), a parking garage with ground floor retail (bounded by C, 1st and 2nd Streets), a mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and 2nd and 3rd floor residential (bounded by Petaluma Blvd South, C, 2nd and D Streets), a 3-story commercial/office building (on the corner of D and 1st Streets), and a 96-unit residential complex and associated parking (on 1st Street).

Matt White: Presented the changes to the cinema, added entrance on C Street, brought new renderings for the 1st Street apartments. Did not come back with the parking garage today. Asking for comments on the above. Introduced the team.

Guy Farris, KTG Y Group: Presented the changes to the 1st Street apartments since the last meeting.

Public hearing opened:

Stuart Hide: A lot of problems - buildings are over 50 years old and historic – explore lofts or other residential uses. Traffic will be problematic. Does not seem to be in the best interest of Petaluma.

Wayne Miller: Two distinct patterns of the buildings – like the simplification. The rendering is more consistent with the character of the buildings that are there. Does not humanize the street though – very little amenity for the residents. May be a hybrid solution. Allow buildings on the street to be perpendicular to street, buildings in the back turned toward the river. Possibly keep one building as it is. Design is closer to something that will work.

Mary Shearer, 40 Mission: Have buildings face the river. Possible carriage front (as seen in Europe) to drive through. Concerned about the parking – want phases to have adequate parking.

Linda Mandolini: Plan captures the look of the warehouses, however, keeping that look gives up on the amenities for the residents, less open space.

Brian Rossen: Like the orientation of the buildings – is it possible to delete balconies to keep more of a warehouse look.

1 Public hearing closed:

2

3 Committee Member Hurley: Buildings are considered historic. This design is a good
4 solution for an empty lot near a historic warehouse. There has been no attempt to
5 adaptively reuse these buildings. Perfect use is one that complements the heavy
6 industrial use that exists. Imitating the warehouses without addressing the historic value
7 of the buildings does not work. Need to go through the environmental process. If you
8 are demolishing warehouses, start from scratch.

9

10 Committee Member Hopkins: How will traffic be handled? City is going into this with
11 their eyes shut.

12

13 George White: There has been no environmental review for this project. Traffic was
14 looked at in the EIR for the specific plan.

15

16 Committee Member Gracyk: Does CEQA apply here?

17

18 George White: Yes.

19

20 Committee Member Gracyk: Can make comments knowing the process has to go
21 through environmental review. Is a worthwhile exercise to use the forms of the
22 warehouses that exist. Explore an alternative that might be a combination of both
23 designs. Streetscape is still an issue. Interior of units still consists of garages and
24 asphalt. Want more amenities for residents – suggest fewer units. Possibly keep one of
25 the warehouses – explore using for parking on the bottom. Buildings have so much
26 potential. Details will follow later – currently the site plan is the issue.

27

28 Committee Member Barrett: Also find it difficult to talk about since an EIR has not been
29 done. Discussing the site plan adds to the frustration for the design team. The real issue
30 is to look at the buildings that are there. If you are tearing down the warehouses – you
31 want to use the amenity of the river. Increase the green space. Looking from 1st Street -
32 except for two areas - all you see is parking and garage doors.

33

34 Committee Member Lynch: Do not know what will happen after the CEQA process.
35 Density is too high, therefore no amenities. Need to strike a balance with the parking –
36 too much asphalt, not enough amenities. Now the view corridors have nothing to look at
37 – looks like a motor court. Do some custom architecture – interesting idea to keep one of
38 the buildings. Need to bridge gap on 1st Street. Only one vehicular entrance would be
39 better, bridge with some mixed-use. Punctuate with driveway when you have to.
40 Possibly close off the back. Need to explore more than 1 or 2 unit types. Going in the
41 wrong direction.

42

43 Chair Rittenhouse: Reiterate CEQA issues. Like the attempt to mimic the warehouse
44 buildings. Need to resolve the definition of mixed use. Like materials and colors.
45 Number of units drives the motor court design without amenities. Problems with
46 amenities, density, and access to the buildings – appreciate the simplification. Need a

- 1 compromise between this streetscape and the previous plan. Architecturally more on
2 track, not sold on site plan.
3
- 4 Committee Member Hurley: Asked if the committee is in support of adaptively reusing
5 the buildings.
6
- 7 Committee Member Barrett: Need to have guidance from an environmental document –
8 if reuse is a possibility, would like to see that happen.
9
- 10 Chair Rittenhouse: Have a responsibility to respond to the applicant coming
11 preliminarily.
12
- 13 Committee Member Lynch: Would like to have the buildings adaptively reused if
14 possible.
15
- 16 Committee Member Gracyk: Prefer to retain the buildings, however, do feel we need to
17 comment on what is before us.
18
- 19 Committee Member Lynch: Buildings are making a reference to the warehouses – I
20 don't have a problem with that. Do not have a continuous street frontage. Leave gabled
21 frontages and fill in with some retail uses on the green space. Need to establish the
22 parking – want only one or two entrances. Have an opening carved out architecturally as
23 was suggested by Ms. Sherer.
24
- 25 Matt White: Designing something that can convert to retail in the future is ideal.
26
- 27 Wayne Miller: Density is a problem. Can you get the profitability with fewer units and
28 larger unit spaces.
29
- 30 Committee Member Lynch: You have a more suburban parking ratio.
31
- 32 Committee Member Barrett: Referred to Eden Housing project where parking was put
33 inside. This is the first project and will set the standard.
34
- 35 Committee Member Gracyk: Introducing other units types might be helpful.
36
- 37 Committee Member Lynch: Makes more sense to have an adaptive project.
38
- 39 Chair Rittenhouse: If you have parking garage underneath, you can go with more
40 density.
41
- 42 Guy Farris: Compromise with an above grading parking in the middle and hide with
43 units facing the street and the river. It loses the warehouse look.
44
- 45 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggest the above grade parking and use the architecture and
46 massing of the buildings to wrap around the parking. Take the concept of the massing

1 from the grain buildings.

2

3 Matt White: Will come back for one more preliminary review for just this portion.

4

5 Scot Braun: Like height variation; 30 ft. maximum opening on 1st Street.

6

7 Brian Rossen: Would like to see the nautical aspect added as well as green space.

8

9 Chair Rittenhouse: Need to look at density to build downtown, need some green space,
10 however, not a suburban model.

11

12 Rick Strauss: Presented changes to the theater. Architect initiated discussion about
13 shallow storefronts – especially on the Boulevard, supported by committee members.

14

15 Chair Rittenhouse: Think the site plan works much better. Architecturally the entrance
16 is weak.

17

18 Committee Member Hurley: Disappointed on the Petaluma Boulevard elevation. Need
19 to build up the corner of C Street and the Boulevard.

20

21 Committee Member Lynch: If you can do away with a 50’ wall along the Boulevard,
22 would be helpful.

23

24 Committee Member Gracyk: If the CPSP is adopted the way it is right now – cannot
25 have a blank wall.

26

27 Committee Member Lynch: The entry needs more work.

28

29 Chair Rittenhouse: Scale the corner down and build the lobby entrance up.

30

31 Consensus of committee:

32

- 33 • Make the entry and lobby more appealing.
- 34 • Try to get some retail on Petaluma Boulevard elevation

35

36

37

38 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
39 **OLD BUSINESS:**

40

41 **III. DOWNTOWN RIVER APARTMENTS, 3-39 East Washington Street.**
42 **AP Nos: 007-121-006; 007; 008; 009; 010; 011; 012; 013 and 017**
43 **File: SPC0009**
44 **Planner: Irene Borba**

45

46 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review approval for details as
47 conditioned, for Downtown River Apartments (Eden Housing), an 81-unit

1 affordable housing project with 5,000 square feet of commercial space and a
2 3,000 square foot Community Center.

3

4 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

5

6 Linda Mandolini, Eden Housing: Introduced the architect and outlined the details being
7 brought before the committee.

8

9 Paul Barnhart, Architect: Presented the details that were conditioned to return to
10 SPARC: signage, main stairway, shade study of courtyard, railing, ventilation grates,
11 corner details, treatment of materials, color palette, awnings/sun shades, pedestrian path.

12

13 Ned Smith, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.

14

15 Public hearing opened:

16

17 Brian Rossen: Any possibility of railings or window boxes on the windows to mix up the
18 façade? Like the vertical elevation. Tie in the trash containers to the downtown
19 streetscape.

20

21 Linda Mandolini: Did not want to put railings or window boxes – maintenance becomes
22 an issue.

23

24 Public hearing closed:

25

26 Committee Member Lynch: Have an issue with cornices with a styrofoam or stow
27 product and windows. Glad you are using quality windows. Needs to be done right with
28 the details because it is a prominent building – would like more modern details explored
29 for the cornices. Simple colors and a flat window will make the façade look cheap.
30 Would like some of the landscaping budget put into the design of the building. Two front
31 buildings are too symmetrical.

32

33 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested cleaning up cornices and windows so do not have such a
34 flat front to the building.

35

36 Committee Member Gracyk: Clarified some of the plant materials with the landscape
37 architect. Landscape architect pointed out that plants are not expensive.

38

39 Committee Member Barrett: Like the buildings – recessed windows would be better if
40 possible.

41

42 Paul Barnhart: Recessing the windows is very costly.

43

44 Chair Rittenhouse: Would like to find a way to make changes to offset the cost of recess
45 windows.

46

1 Priorities of the committee:

- 2
- 3 • Quality of windows – no phony grids
- 4 • Recessed windows on the turrets and other pop out areas where possible
- 5 • Brick fronts not necessary if a cost issue (spec as an alternate)
- 6 • Change cornices – make simpler
- 7 • Color scheme is good
- 8 • Blade Signage ok – do not need to come back to SPARC (signs shall conform to
- 9 sign ordinance)
- 10 • Simplify fence details in back of building to match front railings

11
12 M/S Barrett/ Lynch to approve the details of the project with cornices and painting to be
13 reviewed in the field. 4-0

14
15
16
17 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

18
19 **IV. ROCKRIDGE POINT, 2323 Western Avenue.**
20 **AP Nos: 020-030-037 and 039**
21 **File: O3PRE0167**
22 **Planner: Laura Lafler**

23
24 Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural preliminary review of 62 homes
25 on a 123-acre
26 site, of which approximately 91 acres will be designated as open space.

27
28 Due to the full agenda, the applicant requested a continuance.
29

30
31 **V. REPORTS:**

32
33 **Committee Business:** Election of Vice Chair. M/S Lynch/Rittenhouse to
34 nominate Janet Gracyk as Vice-Chair. 4-0
35 **Planning Staff Reports:** None
36 **Liaison Reports:** EIR for Factory Outlet may be reconsidered. Gatti subdivision
37 was approved.
38

39
40
41 **Adjournment:** 8 :45

42
43 S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes03\052203.doc
44
45
46