

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



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

Minutes

Regular Meeting April 8, 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, Mary Schearer, Jack Rittenhouse*
Absent: Terry Kosewic
*Chairperson
Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Lynn Goldberg, Project Planner
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of March 25, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett, 4-0, Kosewic absent.
Committee Members' Report: Asked re: status of warehouses on 1st Street. Barrett suggested sending conditions for Theater District to new historic members, Mary Shearer and Terry Kosewic since they were not on the committee at the time. Janet Gracyk updated Committee on the progress of reviewing the historic guidelines and flyer to distribute to homeowners re: replacement windows in a historic district.
Correspondence: Bike Committee comments for Boulevard Apartments and Adobe Crreek project were provided for Mary Shearer at her place, all other committee members received the comments via e-mail.
Public Comment: None.
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

1 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
2 **OLD BUSINESS:**
3 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

4
5 **I. MARINA OFFICE BUILDING, 785 Baywood Drive**
6 **AP No: 005-060-074**
7 **File: 03-SPC-0516-CR**
8 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**
9

10 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
11 consideration of site, architectural and landscaping plans to construct a two-story
12 29,966 square foot office/commercial building on a 1.46-acre site at the Petaluma
13 Marina.
14

15 Continued from February 26, 2004. Applicant is requesting further continuance
16 to May 13, 2004.
17

18 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to continue to May 13, 2004. 4-0, Kosewic absent.
19

20
21 Public hearing began @ 3:00 p.m.
22

23 **NEW BUSINESS:**
24

25 **II. BOULEVARD APARTMENTS, 945 Petaluma Blvd. North**
26 **AP No.: 006-450-018**
27 **File: 03-ZOA-0405-CR**
28 **Planner: Lynn Goldberg**
29

30 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
31 consideration of final site, architectural, landscaping and lighting plans for the
32 Boulevard Apartments project at 945 Petaluma Blvd. North.
33

34 Lynn Goldberg presented the staff report.
35

36 Christine Vargas, Kodama-Diseno Architects: Presented the architecture for the project.
37

38 Katie Crecilus: Addressed the issue of the adequacy of the parking for the project. Is the
39 same parking ratio for all PEP projects throughout Petaluma. Since very few residents
40 own cars, parking has never been an issue.
41

42 Jeffrey Katz, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.
43

44 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested a water spigot for the community boxes.
45

46 Committee Member Shearer: Suggested some landscaping for shielding the cars from the

1 outdoor seating area near the community garden

2

3 Public comment opened:

4

5 Public comment closed:

6

7 Lynn Goldberg: Addressed the issue of width of the sidewalk on Petaluma Boulevard for
8 putting in the London Plane trees. Sidewalk is 71/2 ft.

9

10 **Committee comments:**

11

12 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to make sure the trees work in the front – need more
13 space for London plane trees. Agree with the change in the trellis material and painting
14 them white. The covered bike parking proposed is insufficient particularly in the winter.
15 Suggested a possible closet with hooks as a solution for interior bike parking. The
16 building will be a dynamic addition to the Boulevard.

17 Landscaping: Believe it's suitable and will be dynamic. Providing shrubs near parking is
18 good idea if it is not needed for the fire turnaround. If planters are used for flowers the
19 tree is appropriate – if using for vegetables, would not be appropriate there because of
20 shading. Glad to see most of the choices for landscaping. Match water requirements of
21 birch to shrubs and groundcover. For example, mixing birch and stipa – both high water
22 use. Concern about betulas (white birch). Resolve the location of the wisteria. Spiral
23 juncus – do not work well here, difficult to keep healthy – requires constantly wet soil.
24 Courtyard near multipurpose room – do not need center tree, will be shade from the
25 building – tree would interfere with the gathering space.

26

27 Committee Member Barrett: Architecture: would prefer not to have vinyl windows.
28 Want to be sure all lighting is downward. Need a community garden spigot. Would like
29 to see enclosed bike parking for the upper units. Plane trees are an excellent choice for
30 the Boulevard elevation – would like to see this go the tree committee – want it to be
31 successful.

32

33 Committee Member Shearer: Believe community gardens can be very successful –
34 residents will possibly need tools and an area for storage. Water is essential, must have
35 the spigot. Suggested moving the community garden out of the center gathering area.

36

37 Katie Crecelius: Addressed the bike rack issue. Our experience has been that very few
38 residents own bicycles. We will keep working on this.

39

40 Chair Rittenhouse: Architecture is quite nice, like the simplicity. There is a lot of
41 attention to the landscape plan except where the outdoor area is next parking spaces.
42 Have staff resolve the trees on the boulevard and clearance. Believe every unit needs
43 some storage. Detailing on trellis and railing still concern me – will require special
44 attention.

45 Concur with Teresa that there be no up lighting. White on trellis is much better than the
46 red.

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

M/S Barrett/Gracyk approve the project per the attaching findings and the following amended conditions: the street tree selection shall be subject to approval by the tree Advisory Committee; no up-lighting shall be used; a hose bib shall be provided at each of the community garden areas; all-weather storage shall be provided for at least five bicycles for use by upper-floor units; plans submitted for building permit shall provide additional storage areas for tenants and plans submitted for building permit shall have detail on the railing for the stairs to the upper units. 4-0, Kosewic absent.

Public hearing began @ 4:20 p.m.

III. ADOBE CREEK CENTER, South McDowell Blvd. and Lakeville Highway
APN: 005-280-048
File: 03-SPC-0528-CR
Planner: Kim Gordon

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee approval of a project to construct 3 commercial buildings with a net square footage totaling 15,000 square feet; minor PCD amendment; and an amendment to the master sign program. The site is on 3.1 acres at the southeast corner of Lakeville Highway and South McDowell Boulevard.

- Kim Gordon presented the staff report.
- Paul Elmore, RNM Properties: Introduced the project team and provided some background and description of the project.
- Scott Brasfield, Architect: Presented the architecture for the project and addressed some of the site issues and signage issues.
- Paul Reed, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.
- Committee Member Gracyk: Keep Lantana to a minimum, does not winter well here. Suggested the vine on screen be compatible with water requirements.
- Allan Tilton, Traffic Engineer: Addressed the traffic issues.
- John Schafer, BT Commercial: Gave an overview of commercial uses.
- Public comment opened:
- Public comment closed:
- Committee Comments:**

1 Committee Member Barrett: Like the architecture, arched element is interesting, would
2 like to see more clearly how it will look. Restaurant oriented development would be
3 good here. Agree with Mr. Titlton that the traffic coming to site would not be during
4 peak times. Not happy with Building B and no windows to Adobe Creek. If there is a
5 good tenant in Building B and you have an amenity to the creek, it would be beneficial to
6 the entire project. Paths along South McDowell and Lakeville should link up to each
7 other and be at least 8 ft to be a Class I Bike path. Do not believe a meandering path is
8 necessary on Lakeville and South McDowell, however, meandering path on the creek is
9 ok, need at least 8 ft. Traffic is becoming an issue in Petaluma and any paths for people
10 to access the site by bike or foot would be beneficial. Look toward the Kaiser site to see
11 how paths were incorporated. Access in from Lakeville is ok, exiting onto Lakeville is
12 problematic – would like applicant to rethink that. Agree with staff that there should be
13 one measurement standard for signs. Want some wording about temporary signs. Need
14 to specify and limit use to avoid banners, pennants, window signs advertising specials up
15 indefinitely instead of temporarily. In general I like the colors and the materials. Want
16 non-reflective materials used – will help cut down night-light and sun and heat, especially
17 important due to tree removal. Want to see material for metal roof and the arched
18 entryway. Think the metal works here. Pleased about the treatment of heating and air
19 conditioning units. Propose no flagpoles be allowed unless flying country, state or city
20 flags. Not clear on the size of monument signs – want to condition that external light is
21 contained to the sign itself, like the sign at Park Central. Want to see materials for
22 trashcans proposed for the site. Suggested including more benches – parking area is
23 stark. Need a better visual of the trellis between Bldg A and B- provide an
24 elevation/detail. Maybe more use of vines. Suggest trees be recommended by Ed or go to
25 tree committee. Not in favor of internally lit signs – not sure sign brightness can be
26 regulated so want to err on the side of caution. Have no problems with reflective signs
27 or signs on buildings with lighting on them within current sign size and number
28 limitations. If internally lit would want it on interior of site and not exterior. Willing to
29 agree to landscaping on Lakeville and encroaching into setback in return for amenity and
30 upgrading of Adobe Creek.

31
32 Committee Member Shearer: Like the architecture, not clear on all of the finishes and
33 materials, tower height and how it would look. Would like more trees on the Lakeville
34 side, believe you can have visual clearance and have more trees. Am not opposed to
35 internally lit signs if they are small and on the interior of site. Like the idea of a
36 monument sign that names the 6 or 8 tenants. Want visibility inside the site from Bldg. B
37 across to Building A and C. Believe it will be beneficial to the business park.

38
39 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with most of the comments. The approach is sound
40 and I appreciate what you have done on Adobe Creek. Appreciate what you are doing
41 toward compliance with LEED. Materials should not be shiny, possibly powder coat.
42 Clarify next time. Like the metal awning and roof. Consider working with the colors a
43 little more – possibly variations on yellow, something subtle. Internally lighting
44 individual letters would be ok. Do not want can internal lighting. Want the lights
45 downplayed. Need more information on the lighting in the arcade. Want to hear other
46 committee members weigh in on monument sign. Encourage you to put windows on

1 creek side of Bldg B and orient to the creek. Having this use at this location will be very
2 important here and I support the use. Will want good screening for the trash enclosure.
3 Agree with Teresa that the paths increase to 8 feet and meet up with one another.
4 Encourage you to decrease the lawn area. Suggest trees with a high canopy on Lakeville
5 – you can still see into the site- like the trees at Kinkos on East Washington Street. Want
6 large trees at the entryway. Recommend plane trees. Could use box trees to get visual
7 clearance. Use of hornbeam seems contrary to desire for visibility of tenants. Question
8 use of hornbeam against Building A. Okay with tree removal- ulmus at end of life and
9 redwoods don't serve well. On the site in the parking area, believe Crepe Myrtles are
10 appropriate. At the southern end of project there is an opportunity for large canopy trees
11 where the two oaks are proposed. In middle sidewalk strip, flip bulb out to the other side.
12 Add a tree back in at Lakeville, should be a crepe myrtle. Use sticky monkey flower
13 instead of cardinal monkey flower. Like seeing baccharis, heteromeles, garrya. In some
14 cases, these are shown with incompatible plants. Keep lantana minimal. Lagerstroemia
15 'natchez' not 'hopi.' Find an alternative for the acer negundo trees along the creek – want
16 the biologist to weigh in on this. Some acer negundo okay for wildlife value per
17 biologist's recommendations.
18 Like the concrete pattern proposed. Adding a few benches up against the building is a
19 good idea as well as trash cans on the site and paths and recycling containers as well.
20 Want to see how the arbor in the center will work- provide a detail. Possible intake vents
21 low to draw in the cool air. Glad to see bioswale.

22
23 Chair Rittenhouse: The difficulty with a triangular site is inherent here. I support what
24 you want to do here. You are cutting down trees on Lakeville to put in parking, cutting
25 down trees on S. McDowell to view the backs of buildings. Regarding the issue of
26 parking ratios – we have looked at 3-4/1000. This is over parked and under parked.
27 Buildings are moved to have access to Adobe Creek – vehicles drive right by the creek –
28 no buffer. Plaza closest to shop space 7 is next to major egress and ingress, similar on
29 Bldg B, plaza is on the back of the building with no relationship to the creek– building is
30 not relating to the plaza. Agree paths need to be widened. Project is over parked and
31 under parked at the same time. Consider parking reserve for spaces in the setback, still at
32 5/1000.

33 Architecture: See many different styles, barn element and a high tech influence in the
34 materials and a tilt up look all at the same time. Front of buildings are all windows and
35 blank walls on the back with signage. Would benefit from different parapet heights –
36 proportion need to be reconsidered. Suggest gooseneck lighting on signs as opposed to
37 lighting from inside. Do not know what Building B is – wait until you have a tenant and
38 then design the buildings. Concur trellis and site issues need to be brought back.
39 Building can use a lot more color – too monochromatic.

40
41 Committee Member Barrett: South McDowell elevation needs to be addressed.

42
43 Chair Rittenhouse: Monument sign may be a better way to address signage instead of
44 cutting down trees and putting signs on blank walls.

45
46 Committee Member Shearer: Building B is a very beneficial site for a restaurant – orient

1 seating to face the creek. Seems like signage on tower will be visible for a long distance.
2
3 Committee Member Barrett: Bridge over Adobe Creek – not necessarily a condition for
4 this project?
5
6 Kim Gordon: Can create a condition when other properties develop so there is a shared
7 responsibility.
8
9 Barrett: Could be based on percentage of size.
10
11 Gracyk: Take Jack’s comments seriously – ask the applicant to take comments to heart.
12 Discuss with the committee what direction to give the applicant.
13
14 Chair Rittenhouse: Barn type tower is connecting two very mundane retail buildings.
15 The tower is too much of an element – needs to be lowered. Want to see what is really
16 going to happen in the archway. Need interior elevations and sections. Parking count was
17 established by peak parking demand. Forty foot tower height is equivalent to a four story
18 building. Need to unify project.
19
20 Committee Member Gracyk: Polled the committee for agreement on a mix of rural and
21 high tech – all agreed. Asked the applicant to take that as a direction throughout the
22 project. Intrigued by the arcade – want Jack’s concerns addressed. Is this enough for you
23 to go on?
24
25 Scott Brasfield: It gives us something to go on, however, we could go a lot of places with
26 this.
27
28 Chair Rittenhouse: Tech and rural need to be blended throughout.
29
30 Scott: Trying to tie project architecture into architecture of the business park. Intended to
31 be eclectic. Want the retailers to bring their own identity. We are trying to allow this to
32 happen.
33
34 Committee Member Barrett: Agree that Bldg B should just be a pad until you have a
35 tenant. Seems as though you want to down play the building and focus on the signs – do
36 not want the signs to dominant the architecture.
37
38 Scott: Want to create an identity with the tower element.
39
40 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested taking a look at the Park Central apartments in the
41 neighborhood as a good example to make it new and old too.
42
43 Paul Elmore: Addressed committee’s comments. Misconception about building B –
44 there are windows that face the creek and it is our intention to use the creek as an
45 amenity. Re: the paths – we are very concerned about kids taking the path along the
46 creek and going across Lakeville, which is dangerous. Want to keep it a 5 ft path and

1 encourage use of path at signalized intersection. Concern about exiting on Lakeville –
2 might kill the project if you channel everyone to South McDowell. Benches in parking
3 area – have sighted benches on the creek instead of parking area. Important to some
4 retailers to have some internally lit signs. My preference would be to have the signs on
5 the buildings along South McDowell. Will have exit doors on the South McDowell side.
6 Biologist has already provided comments on landscaping along the creek. On the other
7 side of the creek there are a series of 1-acre parcels – would be burdensome to a 1-acre
8 parcel with the expensive requirement of building a bridge. We are not enthusiastic
9 about this requirement. Also, the 50-ft setback is unique.

10
11 Kim Gordon: Several parcels on Lakeville Highway have the 50' setback.

12
13 Committee Member Gracyk: No one is suggesting that you do away with the exit onto
14 Lakeville. Suggested benches associated with the businesses and not in the parking lot.
15 Adobe creek bridge – do agree with fare share toward building a bridge.

16
17 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not think we can condition this project at this time.

18
19 Kim Gordon: Addressed the sign issue regarding signage on the front and rear of the
20 buildings according to square footage. There is a requirement of amount of signage per
21 square footage.

22
23 Committee Member Shearer: Do think tenants need a sign on the back as well as the front
24 of the building. Can the allowed square footage for signage be split to use on front and
25 back of buildings?

26
27 Kim Gordon: We can do an analysis for the signs proposed.

28
29 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to continue to May 27, 2004 to address architectural concerns,
30 parking reserve, staff to weigh in on sign size and lighting, further design of bldg B or a
31 pad, landscaping and changing the paths, street trees on McDowell and Lakeville.

32
33 Paul Elmore: Asked about clarification on landscape reserve.

34
35 Chair Rittenhouse: Explained landscape reserve and suggested parking spaces that
36 encroach on the setback be used as parking reserve.

37
38 Public hearing ended at 7:45.

39
40
41 Committee Member Gracyk left the meeting at 7:55.

42
43 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

44
45 **IV. EL ROSE SUBDIVISION, 3 El Rose Drive**
46 **APN: 008-480-040 and 008-480-015**

1 **File: 04-PRE-0085**

2

3 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
4 preliminary review of a proposal for a six-lot subdivision at the corner of El Rose
5 Drive and B Street.

6

7 Larry Jonas presented the project.

8

9 Committee Member Barrett: For clarification, garages that are not underneath, where are
10 they located? Is not clear on the drawings.

11

12 Larry Jonas: On the side of the house, don't know why they were not drawn.

13

14 Committee Member Barrett: Don't think it's a bad idea for this site – is compatible with
15 the neighborhood where some of the medical offices are phasing out. However, it is on
16 the entrance to Victoria so I want you to give attention to curb appeal of these houses, lot
17 2 in particular fronts onto El Rose, however, it will be seen from B Street – needs to be
18 done well. Have concerns about 5 ft. between houses and the property line – seems
19 sparse. Lot 3 is 5 ft from either property line, giving it only 10 ft. difference with lot 4.
20 Lot 5 has 5 1/3 feet – is the extra tandem parking? That will change how the building
21 will look. Lot 6 – coming down a big driveway and right into the garage - cannot see
22 where the entrance to the house is – want a nice entrance to house. Like the idea of
23 parking underneath the house – do not know if I've seen it with a Craftsman style house
24 though.

25

26 Chair Rittenhouse: Need to look more at the topography of the site. Two driveway
27 accesses for lots 1 and 2 which are 6-8 feet below existing grade by the time you get to
28 the house. You will have retaining walls and lots of steps or the house needs to get
29 picked up somehow. Look closely at lots 1, 2 and 3 and understanding the concept of
30 what you are trying to do with small foot print homes. Look at flat pad of lot 3 – bring in
31 a common drive right down what you have as the rear of lot 1 and 2 you could get all the
32 parking away from the street and eliminate the retaining walls. Put each building with
33 more of a porch architecture. Believe you have 1 house too many. If you want to spread
34 out a little more and create some yard space, eliminate lot 6 which clearly does not work
35 because you have a retaining wall all the way up the property line, 20 feet of concrete or
36 asphalt adjacent to the property line with no landscaping and bringing you up in grade
37 about 12 ft above the street elevation. I see no design of how you get this flat lot
38 architecture on that lot. The whole thing needs to shift in a different direction, look at the
39 grades. You have to truly study the product type – I commend the small house.
40 Bungalow style may or may not be appropriate here, however, when you start attaching
41 two car garages it loses the bungalow. It is no longer a clean historical reference. Putting
42 the garage in the ground is not representative of Bungalow either.

43

44 Committee Member Shearer: Would like to see you replicate modest homes on B Street.
45 Do not like all the concrete – is not attractive at all. Seems as though you could do more
46 with the site.

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

Chair Rittenhouse: Small one-car garage in the back is more in keeping with the bungalow style.

Larry Jones: What about tandem garages, it is not as obvious.

Chair Rittenhouse: Is more obvious with this type of architecture – you have a long tunnel.

Committee Member Shearer: Will lose the charm with all the cement.

Committee Member Barrett: B Street needs more street trees – consider that at the corner lot.

Chair Rittenhouse: You have a good vision – go with it.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

V. REPORTS:

Planning Staff Reports: None.

Liaison Reports: No PC or tree since last meeting.

VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Corporate Hanger

Chevron

In-N-Out Burger

G & B Kawasaki Preliminary

Adjournment: 8:20