

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 August 12, 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, Terry Kosewic, John Mills, Larry Reed, Jack Rittenhouse*

Historic: Michael Iritz
Absent: Corrine Farez-Demil

*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Betsi Lewitter, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of July 8, 2004 were approved as presented. M/S Mills/Rittenhouse, Barrett abstained.

Minutes of July 22, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Mills, Kosewic & Rittenhouse abstained.

Committee Members' Report: None.

Correspondence: Letter from Bill Mattson and Joern Kroll regarding Magnolia Place.

Public Comment: Richard Ramstead, 955 Gossage: Concerned about the ratio of the tree replacement. Want a border between the City and the County. Want more trees planted between the two properties (north boundary). This is the last boundary between the City and the County. If trees are planted, they must be maintained for 5 years.

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

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

3
4
5 **I. ST. VINCENT'S ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
6 **Howard and Union Streets**
7 **AP No: 006-244-004**
8 **File: 03-SPC-0081CR**
9 **Planner: Irene Borba**

10
11 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review for
12 the renovation/remodel of the existing Academy (Old High School) structure
13 located on the corner of Howard and Union Streets. (Continued from July 22,
14 2004, due to lack of a quorum).

15
16 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

17
18 Larry Reed recused himself as he lives within 500 feet of the project.

19
20 Chris Lucia, Tierney-Figueiredo: Introduced the project team and presented the project.
21 Requested the removal of condition #3 from planning.

22
23 Committee discussion with the applicant regarding the walls matching the old walls or
24 new walls.

25
26 Chris Lucia: Will be matching more of the new walls than what is existing on Union
27 Street.

28
29 Committee Member Barrett: Dogwood trees need protection for the bark. Suggested
30 selecting a better tree for children to be around. Horn beam may be subject to insects.

31
32 Public hearing open/closed:

33
34 Committee Member Mills: Don't have a problem with deletion of condition 3. Regarding
35 the wall issue, I would like the walls to blend together, want texture and capping to match
36 what is existing in neighborhood. Want to matching existing walls that you are tearing
37 down.

38
39 Committee Member Kosewic: Like the stair design. The existing wall goes around
40 convent. Other wall is more of an 1800's look. I believe the same wall all the way
41 around ties it together; it could go with new wall in front of old high school. Don't know
42 that you can blend the walls to match – I do not have a problem with new wall around the
43 high school. Possibly retain a hip from an old photo. I was impressed with all the
44 research done.

45
46 Committee Member Barrett: I agree that the research conducted was very good. Also I
47 agree that condition 3 can be eliminated. I am not clear about lights being proposed,

1 want all downward casting lights. On the proposed metal doors on the east elevation – do
2 not know what standards apply to here. Do not know if there were originally metal doors
3 on the east elevation.

4
5 Committee Member Kosewic: Clarified metal doors were for fire safety, metal is ok.

6
7 Committee Member Iritz: Photos Terry referred to earlier in the meeting were from the
8 Historic museum. Carey & Co. noted stairs were only partially compliant with Secretary
9 of Interior standards. I think the proposal looks better, but the narrow feature is
10 consistent with guidelines. I do not think it is appropriate to remove condition #3. South
11 elevation, shows color of door in blue. Don't feel the color is consistent with the history
12 of the building. I am more concerned with condition 3. Agree with John, I like the
13 original site wall, new site wall has been approved in a separate application. I will say
14 that this is fine for this application and can continue to maintain consistency.

15
16 Committee Member Barrett: Wall was approved for the Walnut Street side only.

17
18 Committee Member Iritz: Believe it is important for consistency.

19
20 Committee Member Mills: I can go either way on the wall but there would be
21 inconsistency where it matches with the southwest elevation.

22
23 Committee Member Barrett: Am more concerned about the back stairway.

24
25 Committee Member Kosewic: Looking at east elevation, 2 walls match except the
26 existing wall does not have a cap, can add a cap to the old wall.

27
28 Chair Rittenhouse: The new wall design is to be a container for the whole project, in
29 favor of wall style approved for the playground. Rear staircase, believe the proportions
30 are fine – do not have a problem with design. Believe there is a better choice for trim
31 design. Metal doors on boiler room – want them to fade into background without panels.
32 Flush and painted the same as the wall.

33
34 Committee Member Kosewic: Disagree on a flat panel door. Believe a 6 panel speaks to
35 the building a little better.

36
37 M/S Iritz/Barrett wall design to match wall approved for playground, no blue trim,
38 eliminate Planning condition 3. 4-0, Reed recused himself.

39
40 Public hearing ended at 4:00

41
42
43
44 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
45 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

46
47 Public hearing began at 4:00 p.m.

1 **II. PLAZA SOUTH SHOPPING CENTER (PHASE II), Corner of McDowell**
2 **Boulevard North and East Washington Street**
3 **AP No: 007-340-007**
4 **File: 04-SPC-0157-CR**
5 **Planner: Irene Borba**
6

7 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
8 consideration and approval of facade modifications and addition to the Plaza
9 South Shopping Center (Phase II) located on the corner of McDowell Boulevard
10 North and East Washington Street.

11
12 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

13
14 Beau Hale: Addressed the committee's concerns.

15
16 Committee Member Reed: Asked about planting vines on some of the elevations.
17 Boston Ivy is a good choice.

18
19 Public comment opened/closed.

20
21 Committee Member Kosewic: Like the separation from the Bank of America building to
22 the other pad. Signage is more realistic. Believe they have done what we asked.

23
24 Committee Member Reed: Suggested Boston Ivy on buildings that are recessed,
25 particularly east and south elevations and the north elevation of building G as well. Mix
26 up pistashe and sycamore trees.

27
28 Committee Member Mills: Agree with Larry about the vines. Am assuming where there
29 are trellis' there will be vines. Don't have a problem with the detail on the bldg between
30 Bank of America and the next pad.

31
32 Committee Member Barrett: I believe it meets our requirements.

33
34 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe Big 5 is much improved. Don't know if we can add a
35 condition regarding additional planting. Mechanical room accomplished the height and
36 recess that as we were asking for. Possibly add window on east elevation to add more
37 visual interest.

38
39 M/S Barrett/ Mills to approve the conditions of the façade modification for Plaza South
40 Shopping Center. 4-0.

41
42
43
44 Public hearing began at 4:30

45
46 **OLD BUSINESS:**
47

1 **III. MAGNOLIA PLACE, 1120 Magnolia Avenue and 1111 Gossage Avenue**
2 **APN: 048-141-012; 048-132-027**
3 **File: 03-SPC-0580-CR**
4 **Planner: Betsi Lewitter**
5

6 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
7 of the Tree Mitigation and Landscape Plan for Magnolia Place, a 44-unit
8 residential subdivision located at 1120 Magnolia Avenue and 1111 Gossage
9 Avenue.

10
11 Betsi Lewitter gave background and presented the staff report.

12
13 Committee Member Barrett: Asked staff to respond to the e-mail from the Bike
14 Committee.

15
16 Betsi Lewitter: The lack of sidewalk referred to by the Bike Committee was an issue that
17 was decided by the City Council. The City has an easement and there will be a bike path.

18
19 Eric Keller, O'Brien Group: Discussed that the LLC will be around for 10 years after the
20 last house closes escrow. Discussed some discrepancies and inconsistencies on landscape
21 and architectural plans sent to the Committee. Have met with the neighbors and are
22 trying to address concerns. Introduced the project team.

23
24 Committee Member Mills: Asked if the developer has met with Mr. Ramstead to plant
25 additional trees as a barrier between his property and the proposed project.

26
27 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if the applicant addressed Mr. Matsen's concerns.

28
29 Eric Keller: Will be meeting with Mr. Matsen after the meeting.

30
31 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Mr. Keller if he was expecting approval today even with the
32 inconsistencies pointed out this afternoon.

33
34 Dave Hansen, Carlisle Macy: Reviewed the grading plans for the site and its
35 conformance with the Vesting Tentative Map.

36
37 Committee Member Kosewic: Want to see that what is on the plans is actually built.

38
39 Jill Williams, KTG Y Group: Addressed the Committee's concerns regarding the
40 architecture, walked the committee through the changes.

41
42 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if shutters work?

43
44 Jill: No.

45
46 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if blind windows were removed?

1

2 Jill: Yes on Plan 2 A and B on Magnolia Place. On plan 7, there is a dormer on entry.

3

4 Steve Arago, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan. Asked for clarification
5 on items 16 and 20. Asked for clarification of 15 also regarding water usage. Addressed
6 Teresa's concerns regarding the walkways on lots 36 and 37.

7

8 Committee Member Reed: Asked about a buffer north and south of Gossage.

9

10 Steve Arago: Have added more trees on that edge.

11

12 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about replanting trees on a slope.

13

14 Steve Arago: Arborist will be monitoring removal and replacement of all the trees.

15

16 Committee Member Barrett: Re: PUD guidelines, bridge changed from stone to stone
17 veneer, 1.3 on pg. 1. Asked for the timeline on phasing, want to see that specified in the
18 guidelines.

19

20 Betsi Lewitter: Condition 20 will be eliminated, clarified phasing of the park.

21

22 Committee Member Barrett: Review PUD guidelines, 2.2 Permitted Accessory Uses,
23 #4-no more than 2 domestic animals. In addition, under prohibited uses, #5 vehicle
24 storage needs to be defined and add that residents cannot park in the parking area for the
25 park.

26

27 Public hearing opened:

28

29 Journ Kroll, 906 Samuel Drive: Attended a meeting with the O'Brien group. I am
30 opposed to a 3-story house on the easterly edge of my property, lot 5 of Magnolia
31 Heights. Urged the committee not to approve the project until all the details are worked
32 out. Another issue is the sidewalk on Magnolia.

33

34 Cathy Kroll, 906 Samuel Drive: Do not feel they and the neighbors need to bear the
35 burden of the design of the O'Brien Group.

36

37 Public hearing closed:

38

39 Committee Comments:

40

41 Committee Member Kosewic: Need fences on top of retaining walls so there is not a gap
42 for weeds. Keep retaining walls that you have to have, keep walls on property line and
43 fences on top of retaining walls. Did not provide landscaping in front yards – using
44 landscaping to sell elevations, so build the way the houses are drawn. Shutters are a
45 decoration; disagree with the rest of the committee on blind windows. Do not know how
46 to address concerns the neighbor has at lot 5. Like the lower roof line on plan 1, front

1 porches are an improvement. Eliminate some of the cut and fill, leave the lay of the land
2 as it is.

3
4 Committee Member Reed: The step units made a difference, however, it is just a
5 beginning. Lots 1 through 5 jump out at everyone. Magnolia Heights, the edges define
6 the property – needs to be a substantial mitigation plan along the edges. Need a native
7 master landscape plan that pulls everything together. Suggested the detention pond area
8 for some of the replanted oaks. This will lessen the massive bridge. On Gossage, go
9 with a more native palate and eliminate paths, keep the rural country feeling.

10
11 Committee Member Mills: Agree with Terry regarding shutters as an architectural detail.
12 Do not agree with the quality of the windows – I believe true divided light is appropriate
13 for these homes since they are so expensive. Lot 5 is a concern, 2 one-story designs in
14 Magnolia Place that could possibly be used on lot 5 to eliminate the neighbor's issues. I
15 believe it is a small design flaw in the stairs in the garage. On pg. 7 of attachment B, read
16 drip line of relocated trees. Pg. 8, attachment B, 12, monthly reports seems to be too
17 much – suggested quarterly, semi-annual and annually.

18
19 Committee Member Barrett: Pg. 7 of attachment B, numbering problem. Have difficulty
20 approving the project when there are discrepancies between what is proposed and what is
21 on the plans presented. Agree with Terry regarding space between fence and retaining
22 wall. On Lots 36 and 37 of Magnolia Place, there is no way to access except the
23 easement – are coming into the garage, not a good design. Do not think it would matter
24 putting a shoulder to Gossage. Agree with Larry about the north property line to create
25 more of a buffer and define the edges. Glad to see the split designs – would like to see
26 more of them. Particularly backfires on lot 5. John's idea of a single story home is a
27 good solution if you cannot do a step down design. Stone should be used on the bridge
28 and not stone veneer – need to have a higher quality with stone and windows. Suggest
29 taking the shutters off, they do not add anything. Do not think you need workable
30 shutters, just take them off. Lot 28, need to address the back area.

31
32 Committee Member Mills: Sometimes a stone veneer can be a better product and will
33 last longer – just needs to be of a high quality.

34
35 Chair Rittenhouse: I have expressed my frustration with incomplete packets. Believe the
36 project has improved, however, it has the potential to be better. Do not agree with the
37 situation on lot 5, suggested reducing the grading on lots 1 through 5 on lower Elm.
38 Agree with comments on lots 36 and 37, do not like the orientation and agree with
39 Larry's comments regarding the edges of project. There needs to be mitigation to take
40 care of the edges of the project. Agree with moving some of the relocated oaks to the
41 detention basin. Would ask the committee to consider 1-story on lot 5, want all those
42 lower lots to be looked at. Believe there are a number of changes that could be made to
43 make it a better project.

44
45 Committee Member Barrett: I concur and would like to see the homes fit more to the
46 topography.

1

2 Committee Member Reed: Cannot figure out where the retaining walls are and the buffer
3 on the northern property line. Re: lots 1 through 5, I believe they deserve to be looked at
4 again.

5

6 Committee Member Barrett: There is a discrepancy regarding grading from property line
7 to property line on the Magnolia Place site – what else is not on the table today?

8

9 Committee Member Mills: Suggested asking the applicant to come back with more
10 details.

11

12 Committee Member Kosewic: Needs to come together for the applicant's sake as well as
13 ours.

14

15 Dan Aguilar: I am the original developer of the site. Stated the layout of the Kroll's
16 house and living situation. Finished grade on lot 5 has always been 2-story, designed to
17 minimize the intrusion on the neighbors. This is the first time that this issue has come up.
18 The applicant has minimized the amount of retaining walls. There are issues to be
19 resolved, asked the committee to list the issues and approve the site plan.

20

21 Eric Keller: We build to the market. I concur regarding lot 5 – it is a 2-story home next
22 to a home that is at a lower grade. Bringing trees to the detention basin does not work.
23 On Lots 36 and 37, I disagree with the comments. Until we have removed the soil on the
24 Gossage site we cannot define the edges. Believe we have exceeded the conditions of
25 approval. Reiterate Mr. Aguilar's comments to approve the site plan.

26

27 Committee Member Kosewic: Lot 5 is not a problem for me now that I know the Kroll's
28 have a 2-story home.

29

30 Committee Member Reed: Do not believe the applicant has addressed the issue of
31 buffering for the neighbors on the northern border.

32

33 Committee Member Mills: Plan 4B reverse has only 1 window looking at the Kroll
34 property - it does not seem to be a privacy issue. Agree with Larry that we asked for a
35 more detailed plan regarding the relocation of the trees and how mitigation was to be
36 handled. Agree that we do not have enough landscape details.

37

38 Committee Member Barrett: There are too many lose ends to approve the project tonight.

39

40 Chair Rittenhouse: Polled the committee - with the plans on the table today, can we
41 approve the project?

42

43 Committee Member Mills: The applicant addressed the cut and fill problems, those
44 concerns have been addressed.

45

46 Committee Member Reed: The issues of grading on lots 1 through 5 are still an issue.

1
2 Committee Member Barrett: Do not think this is insurmountable. Grading on lots 1
3 through 5 and the other lose ends need to be worked out.

4
5 Committee Member Mills: Asked what the grading problems are on lots 1 through 4.

6
7 Committee Member Reed: We can see the benefit of step units, it makes more sense to
8 step the houses into the terrain.

9
10 Eric Keller: We can address lot 5, believe lots 1 through 4 are ok as they are designed.
11 What if we address lot 5 and leave lots 1 through 4 as they are.

12
13 Committee Member Reed: I do not think it makes sense not to not deal with lots 1
14 through 4 – do not agree with dealing with lot 5 only.

15
16 Eric Keller: We can come back to the committee to address grading on lots 1 through 4,
17 architecture and final landscaping plans.

18
19 M/S Mills/Kosewic to approve grading for storm drain, streets and utilities and all pad
20 grades with the exception of lots 1 through 5. Applicant to come back to the committee
21 addressing the inconsistencies identified here today, tree edges, lots 36 and 37
22 orientation, tree edges, trees near the detention basin. 4-1, Reed no.

23
24 Public hearing ended at 8:25
25

26
27
28 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

29
30 **IV. EAST WASHINGTON PLACE, 980 East Washington Street**
31 **APN: 0007-241-002, 007-473-001, 007-251-001 and 007-031-001**
32 **File: 04-PRE-0434**
33

34 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
35 preliminary review of a mixed-use project on approximately 40.4 acres which
36 includes retail, multi-family and single family units.
37

38 Bruce Qualls, Regency Centers: Gave background on the Regency Group, stated the
39 project goals and introduced the project team.
40

41 Bill Smith, Landscape Architect: Presented the open space and the landscape
42 architecture.
43

44 David Janes, Architect: Presented the retail aspect of the project.
45

46 Bonne Harper, Pulte Homes: Presented the architecture for the town homes.
47

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 Comments:

Chair Rittenhouse: The overall concept is interesting. Like the entry and scale of the buildings and how they relate to the buildings around them. Asked the applicant to reconsider diagonal parking. Appreciate the contemporary architecture. Like the colors and materials and the progression from retail to mixed use and the way forms repeat and transition. I see East coast architecture with the paseo on the town homes. Is there any way to push the architecture of the residential component toward a more modern downtown look? Play area seems to be in the wrong place – seems disjointed from the residential and is next to the freeway. Structure of residential, don't see a center or a core with a park like setting. Is there a way to have more open space or a stronger central pedestrian link back to the shopping area? Create a center so people do not have to get in their cars to have some open space. You will get more traffic from Lindberg than you might expect due to traffic issues already existing in the community.

Committee Member Reed: Like the proposed Washington Street planting. There is an opportunity to make Kenilworth a real street, an anchor. Agree with a lot of what Jack said. Like the plazas on Washington Street. Diagonal parking may have a cuing problem, continuing down Kenilworth, it seems to peter out to the south. Possibly create another connection to Lindberg? Have a terminus at the residential component. Like the modern architecture and the single-loading of the units. Like the fountains and integrating them into the plaza. Want to see the parking lots filled with trees, perhaps a grove of trees. Everything feels great until you get to the residential. Residential needs more open space and a more central open space. Playground is in the wrong place. Like the stepped up paseos.

Committee Member Mills: Like the modern architecture. Diagonal parking needs to be reconsidered. The Bicycle Committee will have concerns about diagonal parking because it is dangerous for cyclists. Agree with others regarding traffic from Lindberg. Need to look at the transition from Kenilworth to Lindberg. Look at the industrial uses nearby. Is there a possibility to come into the center from the south bound exit on 101? Need at least three tot lots on the residential portion, need to take out a section of housing in the center and add a core park with a green open space. You are eliminating prime recreational facilities – these problems need to be addressed up front. All the recreation facilities need to be replaced, especially the gymnasium, swim center and the ball fields.

Committee Member Kosewic: I agree with John especially on the recreational facilities. Agree with John also on the southbound exit. The retail is interesting. With 2-3 story buildings proposed, why a 10 and 12 roof pitch? A four and twelve roof pitch would eliminate some of the massing. Consider creating more living space over the retail. It could free up some land for parks. Believe you are headed in the right direction.

Committee Member Barrett: There are four problems and the first three are traffic. Agree with previous comments about traffic on Lindberg. Recreational losses need to be replaced and need to be replaced on the west side of town due to the cross town traffic

1 issues. Suggested parking structures instead of parking lots. I am not opposed to dense
2 housing. Believe you have done a good job on the housing. Agree with comments about
3 the need for a central green space which needs to be larger. Need to address having a
4 place for the kids to go, especially teenagers. I am very pleased about the trees on the
5 101 corridor; want to see some LEED standards. Need to look at the circulation of the
6 site.

7
8 Committee Member Mills: Can put tennis courts on top of the parking structure.

9
10 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not forget about the back of the buildings.

11
12 Committee Member Mills: Do something fun with the residential.
13

14
15 **V. MC DOWELL TOWNHOMES, 325 North McDowell Boulevard**
16 **APN: 007-350-013**
17 **File: 04-PRE-0391**

18
19 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
20 preliminary review of a 35-unit condominium project on 2.22 acres located at 325
21 North McDowell Boulevard.

22
23 The applicant requested a continuance to September 9, 2004.
24

25 **VI. REPORTS:**

26
27 **Planning Staff Reports:**
28 **Liaison Reports:**
29

30
31 **VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

32
33 **North Bay Construction Maintenance Building**
34 **Lakeville Autobody**
35 **MMM Business Condos**
36 **Southgate**
37

38
39 **Adjournment: 9:40**
40
41
42
43