

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



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

Minutes

Regular Meeting April 22, 2004
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, Terry Kosewic, Mary Schearer, Jack Rittenhouse*

*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Tiffany Robbe, Associate Planner
Phil Boyle, Associate Planner
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of April 8, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Gracyk, 4-0, Kosewic abstained.
Committee Members' Report:
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

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
OLD BUSINESS:

1
2 **I. GATTI/STRATFORD PLACE SUBDIVISION, 710 Sonoma Mountain**
3 **Parkway**
4 **AP No: 137-070-079**
5 **File: 04-SPC-0191-CR**
6 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**
7

8 The City Council is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
9 consideration of the revised townhouse portion of the site plan and the applicant is
10 requesting SPARC consideration of the landscape plan for the single-family
11 portion of Stratford Place (Gatti Nursery) at 710 Sonoma Mountain Parkway east
12 of the future Gatti Park.
13

14 Mary Shearer recused herself from this item since she had no background information
15 and was not on the Committee for the prior hearings.
16

17 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report.
18

19 R.J. Wilson, Delco Builders: Thanked the committee for all of their input. Delco agrees
20 with the staff report and looks forward to finalizing the plan.
21

22 **Public comment opened/closed:**
23

24 Committee Member Kosewic: Not concerned about 7½ ft. on the front yard, would be
25 easy to have property line follow FEMA line. The 10-feet is important, however, you
26 could then combine or rearrange your duplexes a little. You would end up with triplexes
27 being lots 30, 31 and 32, but 39 could move to 40 and 41 could move to 42, etc. Then 45
28 and 46 could move over that 10 ft. and you would end up with 1 triplex and more
29 duplexes. I think that would solve more issues than just trying to rearrange the 1 triplex
30 and add the 7½ feet and end up with a SFD on lot 46.
31

32 Architecture is fine for what you are doing. Do not want to see a color palette that is
33 limited to 2 or 3 colors. Can do so much with color - use imagination on colors.
34

35 Committee Member Gracyk: Commended the applicant for sticking with this and
36 making changes. Commend our Chair as well for working with you. It will be a much
37 more appealing place for residents. Agree to move 46 over and push front yard into the
38 FEMA line and getting another passageway through the town homes. Suggest pathways
39 line up with private park to give you line of sight to creek. Need to see the final lighting
40 plan. Incorporate signage between units 34 and 35 and 43 and 44 and the end units as
41 well. Sidewalk side entrances are good choices – add them to 13 and 15. No comments
42 in particular on architecture. Glad to see lights above side doors. Where there are 4 ft
43 planters for Pistashe trees is not sufficient – need 6 ft. planters. Choices red maple,
44 Zelkova, European Hackberry, Red Horsechestnut (from street tree list). Olive trees are
45 ok. Where crepe myrtles are proposed they should only be on sunny side, Japanese
46 Maple will work on shady side (very narrow form).
47

1 Committee Member Barrett: Echo what Committee Member Gracyk said regarding trees
2 on the Single Family Homes – needs to be conditioned.

3
4 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked for clarification, staff report says all the trees are on the street
5 tree list and consistent – is that incorrect.

6
7 Tiffany Robbe: No, it is not incorrect. Do not see a Crepe Myrtle on SFD side and we
8 are only looking at that today. Pistache in City's guidelines does say 6 ft., however, I
9 have spoken with Ed Anchordoguy and he is fine with it at 4 ft. Olive tree is in town
10 home portion. Believe in the single-family portion they are either consistent with the
11 guidelines or the City arborist.

12
13 Committee Member Barrett: Corona-Ely Specific Plan has color guidelines. Is that
14 correct?

15
16 Tiffany Robbe: Only for the first 300 ft. from the urban separator it talks about
17 neutral/natural colors.

18
19 Committee Member Barrett: Neutral/natural sounds fine – there is a lot you can do with
20 that. I like the site plan much better, however, # 13, 14 and 15 if they were flipped so
21 front is on Belgrave and garage is underneath, it would be more useful - it seems
22 awkward. Side entrances are a good idea – can work for 13 and 15, however, not 14.
23 Town homes facing Corona Creek makes the livability much better. Fencing will be very
24 important – want to see what that will look like. Agree with staff to give 10 more feet
25 and the chair can address how that will work. When landscaping comes back, need to see
26 mailboxes and lighting as well. Site plan works better for getting people to take garbage
27 cans to either Belgrave or Private Alley C for people who live on Private Alley B or A.
28 People on Bachelor and Cody Court here on the west side have to do that – would like it
29 to be a condition of approval.

30
31 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicant. Believe the project has benefited from the
32 new layout. Believe suggestion by staff of moving buildings over 10 feet and distributing
33 through the interior along the creek is a good idea, extending front yard of lot 46 in the
34 FEMA line and unifying the fence line along the creek would be useful. There are many
35 different ways to group the duplexes and triplexes. I think reorganizing units 30-46 to
36 line up two 12-16 ft pedestrian paths with the walkways next to townhouse park and
37 creating a stronger access there by putting two duplexes on either end and three triplexes
38 in the center would be better. I will give you my diagram to look at and consider. Would
39 like other committee members to weigh in on this. Want to verify side entry conditions.
40 End units that have shaded pathways – are they the units with side doors? Could 12, 13
41 and 15 have that condition? Wider path between 36 and 37 and 39 and 40, may have an
42 opportunity to have side entry, wouldn't have to pop out 4½ feet. Center the decorative
43 alley pavement with pathways. Want to see proposed lighting with landscape and
44 directional signs.

45
46 Architecture: Believe some fun colors would be good here. Request the applicant use

1 hip roof instead of gable roof on the units at the end of a row to reduce massing.

2
3 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to have a path centered on the sidewalks around the
4 private park. Hip roof at corner is good. Don't hesitate to come back with revised
5 colors– could be very rich even in natural colors.

6
7 R.J. Wilson: Condition re: garbage – may be difficult for homeowners.

8
9 Chair Rittenhouse: Homeowners will figure it out. Not necessary to condition project.

10
11 Committee agreed with the Chair regarding garbage.

12
13 Chair Rittenhouse: Confirmed that the applicant will bring back the lighting and
14 landscape plan.

15
16 Conditions/Issues:

- 17 ▪ Hip roof (instead of gable) at end of building rows.
- 18 ▪ Side entry on units 12, 13 and 15.
- 19 ▪ Align some large paths with the private park.
- 20 ▪ Possibly 4 more side entries.

21
22 Committee Member Barrett: Possibly not have pathways from creek side to alley C align
23 with park, as would increase visibility of a private park.

24
25 M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to 1) Accept the townhouse site plan as amended: Move lot 46
26 over to FEMA line, redistribute extra 10 feet between other units; extend front yard of lot
27 46 6½ feet into FEMA area; attempt to get 2 primary pedestrian paths aligned with
28 sidewalks on either side of private park; triplexes no more than 1 unit away from
29 pedestrian pathway; include as many side entries as possible – require on lots 12, 13, 15
30 and attempt on 36, 37, 39 and 40; use hip roof at end units instead of gable; decorative
31 paving in alleys lined up with paths. Lighting & way-finding signage will return with
32 townhouse landscaping. 2) Approve single-family (phase 1) landscaping plan 4-0,
33 Shearer recused.

34
35
36 Public hearing ended at 4:00

37
38 Public hearing began @ 4:00 p.m.

39
40 **NEW BUSINESS:**

41 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

42
43 **II. CORPORATE HANGAR, Executive Drive off of East Washington Street**

44 **APN: 136-080-004**

45 **File: 03-SPC-0043-CR**

46 **Planner: Phil Boyle**

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

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee consideration of a project to construct a 9,975 square foot hangar on the grounds of the Petaluma Municipal Airport. The building would be 150 feet wide and 66.5 feet deep and would be located adjacent to an existing hangar.

Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

Applicant: The simplistic design met the needs of the owner and the hangar is not very visible.

Mike Gloss: Addressed the landscaping that was conditioned with a prior application – is currently being designed by a landscape architect.

Public hearing opened/closed:

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Kosewic: It's a typical hangar, is only visible from Sky Ranch Drive. Do not have a problem with the architecture – is ok the way that it is.

Committee Member Gracyk: Consistency is important out there. Would be better to match existing buildings – lose the gable. Need more plants, landscaping is insufficient. Emitters for landscaping – 24 in box, 6 emitters, 15 gallon, 4 emitters, 5 gallon, 3 emitters and 1 gallon, 2 emitters. Colors should be consistent with what is going on already.

Committee Member Barrett: Don't have a problem with simplicity; however, consistency with what already exists would be preferable. Agree with Janet on landscaping.

Committee Member Shearer: Agree about consistency of colors and architecture and needs additional landscaping.

Chair Rittenhouse: Concur with the committee – would like it to match closer to the parapet style that already exists, colors should match what is out there.

Committee Member Barrett: Not sure what the consensus of the committee is on parapet style vs. gable.

Applicant: Do not have a problem either way. Can give it a square look to match what is already out there.

M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to approve project as amended to have a consistency in the parapet design and color of existing hangars, include Janet's condition regarding plants and watering. 5-0.

1
2 Public hearing ended at 4:10 p.m.
3

4
5 Public hearing began at 4:15 p.m.
6

7 **III. GAS STATION AND MARKET, 1000 Lakeville Street**
8 **APN: 005-060-031**
9 **File: 03-SPC-0572-CR**
10 **Planner: Kim Gordon**
11

12 The applicant is requesting approval of site, architectural, civil, and landscaping
13 plans to construct a Chevron gas station with a 4,199 square foot market at 1000
14 Lakeville Street, in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan area.
15

16 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.
17

18 Rick Norman, Applicant: Addressed concerns from the Preliminary Review. Asked that
19 Condition 25 be removed. Do not believe this coordination of signals needs to take place
20 until all projects are complete.
21

22 Craig Spaulding: Addressed questions regarding the Caulfield Extension and the
23 proposed access easement.
24

25 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested 8 ft. radius on the driveway into the gas station.
26

27 George Nicholson, Traffic Engineer: Addressed condition #25 by Cal Trans regarding
28 the signals being coordinated now or at build out of projects south of the railroad tracks.
29 Addressed cumulative traffic impacts.
30

31 Mehrdad Haji-Sharifi, Architect: Presented the architecture.
32

33 Maisha Ruth, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape architecture.
34

35 **Public comment opened/closed:**
36

37 Break @ 5:35 p.m.
38

39 Resumed @ 5:45 p.m.
40

41 **Committee Comments:**
42

43 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggest changing Cal Tran's condition to putting in
44 conduit only. Like location of the planter boxes. Prefer parapet on the first design. Want
45 radius increased on driveway. No landscape between south wall and sidewalk. Leave
46 signage up to staff.

1

2 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Terry on the signal timing and putting in
3 conduit alone, also agree on the radius increase on the driveway. Leave staff
4 (engineering) to work out the back-up requirement. Want required landscaping on the
5 east side of the building (car wash side). Am concerned about lack of light at the back of
6 building where employees park – needs to be conditioned to be down lighting – will
7 leave up to staff. Landscape architect indicated changes will be made to standard brought
8 up by staff.

9

10 Architecture: It is what it is – I am ok with the architecture. All lighting needs to be
11 down lighting. Agree with staff's recommendation on back up into the easement.

12

13 Committee Member Shearer: Agree with safety lighting on the back of the building.
14 Want applicant to work with staff on back up into the easement – do not want to use as a
15 back up area. I am not adamant about the landscaping on the east side of the building –
16 would like to see it in the landscaped area between the two uses (gas station and car
17 wash). Would not want to lose landscaping between building and Caulfield Lane.
18 Architecture looks functional as to what it is. Want engineering to work out turning
19 radius for trucks.

20

21 Committee Member Kosewic: Indicated the lighting shown on the plans.

22

23 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with comments re: radius and the back-up space in
24 the easement – is quite different from a shopping center – people will perceive this
25 easement as a road and will not be expecting people to back-up into it. Do not care for
26 the architecture. Planting palette is fine – 24 in box minimum and using clearance
27 standards suggested by the landscape architect in strip between gas station and future car
28 wash is important. Trees indicated on Caulfield Extension – hold off on placement until
29 street tree location on Caulfield is determined. Have mixed feeling about planting on the
30 east side – is narrow, only have about 2 ft. Would hope building could be smaller – do
31 not want to lose landscaping on the Caulfield side. Take care of handicap parking, was
32 just an oversight. Proposed pass through at Lakeville is fine, want additional pass
33 through from station to car wash. Doing conduit now instead of coordinating signals at
34 this time – should be conditioned when Caulfield goes over the railroad tracks. If lights
35 are added to building, will want to run by staff. Also, I'm fine with staff handling all of
36 the sign requirements.

37

38 Chair Rittenhouse: Site circulation – tanker truck movement is troubling if it is during
39 normal business hours for In & Out and other business in the area; and potential build out
40 across the railroad tracks. We would have a confluence of vehicles trying to leave In &
41 Out Burger and the future development on the McPhail site with a tanker truck that needs
42 the in and out lanes. Adding to that the impacts of delivery to In & Out Burger, Hammer
43 Marine plus employees of both sites all using this easement. It does not seem sufficient.
44 If easement was perpendicular to the road at its terminus, you would find more depth for
45 the parking up against the back of the building. You could turn the parking at a 60
46 degree angle which would make it more perpendicular to the exiting aisle and extend

1 landscaping into the area where the proposed easement is and get more buffer there. In
2 addition it would allow the tanker truck to turn in a little better angle in the drive aisle
3 heading back toward the tanks. Shifting the building over would create landscaping
4 adjacent to the building where the freezer area is and the drive aisle. I would rather see
5 the building get a little smaller. How will employees who park in rear maneuver around
6 the building? Flair driveway in and out and add pork chop – tanker routed to the back.
7 Handicap parking is oversight – can be simply corrected. Do not think you can get to
8 50% coverage for tree canopy, use 15 ft. pole for lighting as per the Specific Plan, concur
9 with conduit going in now.

10 Architecture: Building has too much going on; too many competing elements; do not like
11 the tower element at primary entry, do not like the open trellis design, competing
12 elements on the corners. It is not being lit up in a way that is appealing. Electrical room
13 needs to be incorporated into the structure with a set of doors instead of a lean to shed.
14 Believe the site plan needs work and the building needs to be toned down.

15
16 **Issues:**

- 17 • Radius should be as wide as possible.
- 18 • Pork chop is a good idea.
- 19 • Angling the easement to be at right angle to Caulfield Lane
- 20 • Delay placement of trees until we see where street trees will be placed on
21 Caulfield side
- 22 • Want landscaping on east side of building – need as much green as possible
- 23 • Incorporate electrical box in the building

24
25 Committee Member Shearer: Architecture does seem busy – do not oppose it enough to
26 say no at this point.

27
28 Applicant: Agree with conditions as I understand them. In terms of the electrical – when
29 the final alignment of Caulfield was decided upon, it narrowed this site. To do this
30 further constrains the retail space.

31
32 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not believe the electrical has to go inside the building but be
33 integrated into the building and not block entire sidewalk.

34
35 Applicant: We can work around that and adjust the plan. We can add a foot or two on
36 the east side and add vines. The architecture is utilitarian and serves the purpose. Hope
37 that we do not have to come back and redesign.

38
39 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not want this project to set the standard for what is to come in the
40 future.

41
42 M/S Kosewic/Shearer approve the project as amended with pork chop, increasing the
43 radius on driveway, applicant to put in conduit only, signage to be addressed by staff,
44 rearrange the easement to resolve back-up issues. Motion failed.

45
46 M/S Barrett/Kosewic approve the project as amended with pork chop, increasing the

1 radius on driveway, applicant to put in conduit only at this time, signage to be addressed
2 by staff, include changes in lighting down to 15 feet, withhold placement of trees until
3 Caulfield street tree placement is determined, including vines on east side of building, 24-
4 in box minimum between this parcel and next door. Bring color and landscaping back to
5 the Committee. 3-2; Gracyk and Rittenhouse – No.

6
7 Public hearing closed at 5:40

8
9
10 Public hearing began @ 6:45

11
12 **IV. IN-N-OUT BURGER, 1006 and 1010 Lakeville Highway**
13 **APN: 005-060-015 and 005-060-038**
14 **File: 03-SPC-0580-CR**
15 **Planner: Phil Boyle**

16
17 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
18 approval of site, architectural and landscaping plans to construct a 3,220 square
19 foot drive through restaurant at 1006 and 1010 Lakeville Hwy, in the Central
20 Petaluma Specific Plan area.

21
22 Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

23
24 Ron Volle, Applicant: Gave some background and history of In and Out Burger.

25
26 George Nicholson: Addressed traffic issues and questions.

27
28 Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested signs to direct traffic to use easement and
29 Caulfield Lane as access to 101.

30
31 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested putting sign in drive-through lane between
32 ordering and picking up food, which will direct people to use the easement to exit the
33 site.

34
35 **Public comment opened:**

36
37 Jim Hammer, Hammer-Marine: In & Out has worked hard to make this work for both
38 parties.

39
40 **Public comment closed:**

41
42 **Committee Comments:**

43
44 **Site/Circulation:**
45

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Shifting back to 8 ft for plaza which could be additional queuing
2 space.

3
4 Committee Member Gracyk: Makes sense unless we do not lose the planters.

5
6 Committee Member Barrett: Good idea for site circulation. Agree with Terry about
7 signage. Am not confident that people will not go out through Mr. Hammer's property.
8 Want Hammer to get a second look at the final site plan. Make sure patrons know about
9 the additional cuing space.

10
11 Committee Member Kosewic: Site has improved since preliminary review. Believe it's
12 to your advantage to make the right turn work out of the drive through lane. Work with
13 Hammer Marine. Believe landscaping should come back. Do not know why the need for
14 a rod iron fence and a chain link fence.

15
16 Chair Rittenhouse: Still have concerns for amount of traffic going through the Hammer
17 Marine property. Believe people will turn right out of the drive-through line. Believe the
18 intersection of Lakeville Hwy/ Southbound Ramps and Hammer Marine property needs
19 further study.

20
21 Committee Member Kosewic: Possible change in pavement and texture rather than just a
22 keep clear sign.

23
24 **Architecture:**

25
26 Committee Member Kosewic: It's ok – like the covered drive through. Don't like plastic
27 awnings. Would be nice to continue the same covering from drive through instead of the
28 awning. Brick work is ok.

29
30 Committee Member Gracyk: It is what it is and is ok.

31
32 Committee member Shearer: Is ok – would prefer a fabric awning as opposed to plastic.

33
34 Committee Member Barrett: Do not like plastic awning. Would prefer metal painted
35 red; however, I do like overhang for drive through. The plastic and fluorescent is too
36 much.

37
38 Chair Rittenhouse: Is a corporate design, canopy is a little chunky; make columns look a
39 little more streamlined. Canopy done in metal with a good paint job would be preferable
40 over the plastic.

41
42 **Landscaping:**

43
44 Committee Member Gracyk: Melaleuca – reduce the number, does marginally here. On
45 Lakeville, don't use Pyrus – has health problem. Want large canopy trees on Lakeville.
46 Glad you are willing to take out the lawn. Asked that the landscaping come back. Want

1 a large canopy tree near trash area. Switch Magnolia for Melaleuca Bottle brush can be
2 marginal here. Recommend looking at the rod iron fence again. Put many signs
3 regarding access to Hwy 101 – will be very important.

4
5 Committee Member Barrett: Possibly put in shrubs next to the chain link fence at
6 Hammer Marine. Bike committee suggested striping the walkway at the traffic signal.

7
8 Craig Spaulding: The intersection is controlled by Cal Trans. Can condition that it be
9 submitted to Cal Trans to be hatched.

10
11 Applicant: Believe we can accomplish a metal awning. Four foot rod iron fencing was
12 for aesthetics. Am ok for putting signage in the drive through area to direct traffic to 101.

13
14 Committee Member Barrett: May only need to have signage on a temporary basis. Once
15 people are aware they will use Caulfield.

16
17 Nicholson: Best signs should be simple – northbound 101 this way, southbound 101 this
18 way. Want to give options so people will use all three driveways.

19
20 M/S Gracyk/Barrett to approve the project as amended with metal awnings, 4 ft. high
21 fencing removed, directional signage included, plaza shortened to accommodate extra
22 stacking, 15 ft. high lighting pole, cross walk be striped at 101, landscape to come back to
23 committee. 5-0.

24
25 Public hearing ended @ 8:15

26
27
28 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

29
30 **V. G & B KAWASAKI, 326 Petaluma Blvd. North**
31 **APN: 006-163-033 and 006-163-043**
32 **File: 04-PRE-0068**

33
34 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
35 preliminary review of a proposal for 2000 square foot showroom addition at 326
36 Petaluma Boulevard North.

37
38 Brad Kotsaris: Gave background and history of the project.

39
40 Shawn Montoya, Architect: Goal is to have a nice showroom inside, want to discuss
41 parking and a possible reduction because so many people drive motor cycles.

42
43 **Comments:**

44
45 Chair Rittenhouse: You are proposing modifying a curb access to something smaller.
46 Take 34' 5" space you have now and make more of a uniform 26' back-up space to allow

1 motorcycle parking in front of the building. Would give you the potential to take the
2 compact and handicap accessible striping and maintain a loop through the site which is
3 lacking now.

4
5 Addition seems to make sense as well as addition to metal storage area, however, the
6 remodel on the Boulevard elevation is of concern. I am not particularly fond of mansard
7 roof and the trellis design, is not adding to the building. Believe there are other ways to
8 tie into the old part of town.

9
10 Committee Member Kosewic: Trellis blocks the view – would be nice to see what is on
11 display. Don't think the mansard roof fits downtown. Something more like the Fraley's
12 building. Awning which is rod held. Front needs more thought. Consider art deco or
13 stainless to keep in line with the 1950's architecture. Need more glass.

14
15 Committee Member Gracyk: Good comments about access and the roofline. Like the
16 idea of awning – if you go 50s go with a cool sleek look. Can make it look more
17 modern. Need more glass and spotlighting the motorcycles. Put trellis over the door and
18 add outside area for people who are waiting for service. Want to see a landscape plan –
19 will be important. Try to get some trees in the parking lot.

20
21 Committee Member Barrett: No on mansard roof and trellis – increase the glass to
22 increase the show room. No problem with the storage addition. Circulation suggestion
23 by Jack is really good. Suggest something tall on the north side of parking lot. Keep
24 simple and stay with the 50s look.

25
26 Committee Member Shearer: Agree with the comments that have been made.
27

28
29 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

30
31 **VI. REPORTS:**

32
33 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

34 **Liaison Reports:** Missed Tree Committee; Planning Commission - Rivas
35 subdivision was approved with a condition that it goes to SPARC for compatibility with
36 neighboring architectural styles.

37
38 Janet Gracyk asked for an illustration for 50% canopy coverage in CPSP. Will not be at
39 the meeting on May 13, 2004.

40 Mary Shearer asked for chart re: traffic projected in CPSP.
41

42
43 **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

44
45 **Marina Office Building**

46 **Hanson House**

47 **Redwood Gateway Phase II**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

**Kohl's Redwood Gateway
St. Vincent's Old High School Renovation Marina Office Building**

Adjournment: 8:50