

1



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

3

Minutes

4

Regular Meeting

August 26, 2004

5

City Council Chambers

3:00 p.m.

6

City Hall, 11 English Street

Petaluma, CA

7

Telephone: 707-778-4301

E-Mail: cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us

8

FAX: 707-778-4498

Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

9

10

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.

11

12

13

14

Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Terry Kosewic, John Mills, Larry Reed, Jack Rittenhouse*

15

16

17

*Chairperson

18

19

Staff:

Irene Borba, Senior Planner

20

Phil Boyle, Associate Planner

21

Jayni Allsep, Project Planner

22

Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

23

24

25

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of August 12, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Mills, 5-0.

26

27

Committee Members' Report: Commissioner Mills stated there is a site visit at Tolay Ranch, 8-10 Saturday, August 28, 2004.

28

29

Correspondence: Staff noted that an e-mail was sent to the Committee members from the Petaluma Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) regarding items on today's agenda.

30

31

Public Comment: None

32

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

33

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

34

35

36

37

38

39

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

40

41

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
47
48

I. DISCUSSION OF SCHEDULE FOR UPCOMING HOLIDAYS

Committee is willing to meet the 1st and 3rd Thursday for the month of November, 2004 if necessary. If only one meeting is necessary, will meet on November 18, 2004.

Discussion with staff and the committee regarding Agenda management. The Committee determined that there was no problem with the Agenda management at this time.

Hearing began at 3:30 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:
PUBLIC HEARING:

**II. NORTH BAY CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE BUILDING, 879 Lindberg Lane
AP No: 005-010-032
File: 04-SPC-0443-CR
Planner: Phil Boyle**

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee consideration of revised plans for the construction of a 16,250 square foot industrial building at 879 Lindberg Lane.

Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

Rick Brereton, ADR: Reiterated the changes to the building.

Public hearing opened/closed:

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Kosewic: Building looks naked without eaves; suggested either eaves or awnings to make it more useful and it would have a better appearance.

M/S Mills/Reed to approve the revised architectural plans as presented. 5-0

Public hearing ended at 3:20.

Public hearing began at 3:20

**III. LAKEVILLE AUTO BODY, 1104 and 1106 Petaluma Boulevard North
APN: 019-030-001
File: 04-SPC-0341-CR
Planner: Phil Boyle**

1 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
2 of a project to construct a 7,903 square foot auto body shop on two lots totaling
3 approximately .45 acres at 1104 and 1106 Petaluma Boulevard North.

4

5 Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

6

7 Greg Ledoux: Discussed the shared driveway with the northern property owner.

8

9 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested a 5 ft radius on the driveway on Petaluma
10 Boulevard for easier ingress and egress.

11

12 Committee Member Reed: Suggested moving the trash enclosure to the end of the
13 driveway and give up one parking space so it would not be next to the employee eating
14 area.

15

16 Committee Member Mills: The men's bathroom in the shop may not be accessible for
17 customers without posing liability issues.

18

19 Greg: Bathrooms are unisex and can be used by customers.

20

21 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if there could be a larger canopy tree on Petaluma
22 Boulevard frontage?

23

24 Mike Estournes, Owner: Would be fine if there is still visibility to see the shop and sign.

25

26 Public hearing opened/closed:

27

28 Committee Comments:

29

30 Committee Member Mills: Likes the western front design. Goes with what's there. No
31 problem with project, resolve the retaining wall at the rear property line.

32

33 Committee Member Reed: Agree with John, the architecture looks appropriate for the
34 Boulevard. Agree with Teresa about the street trees on Petaluma Boulevard. Suggest
35 mixing in Sycamore. If the trash enclosure can be moved that would be an improvement.

36

37 Committee Member Kosewic: Wouldn't object to the trash enclosure being next to the
38 building but not next to the eating area.

39

40 Committee Member Barrett: Don't want to lose the flared driveway entrance. Would
41 prefer trash enclosure be moved further away, just so it is not next to the eating area.
42 Picnic table is ADA accessible, however there is gravel underneath. Do not know what
43 the trellis looks like. Want to include some Sycamores on the Petaluma Boulevard
44 frontage. Appreciate the bike access for future trails. The architecture looks like it used
45 to be a Cattlemen's Restaurant. Wish it were more simplified. Like that it is metal.
46 Seems there are too many angles that are at odds with each other.

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

Chair Rittenhouse: Need to clarify how you are dealing with the adjacent property owners. If we don't have that we need to use the retaining wall on the plans. Am not fond of the way the site is laid out, bench in front of the doors, trash enclosure and lunch seating area. Trellis and eating area would be better in the opposite corner. Customers need to access bathrooms. Relocate the counter. Add condition if there is rooftop equipment it needs to be screened. Architecture – agree with Teresa. I like the back and metal and the roof. I don't understand dressing it up with the parapet. Other buildings on the boulevard are all stucco – would like to see that changed. Believe we can find conditions to move it forward.

Committee Member Barrett: Am not as concerned about the pedestrian circulation. Agree to move the lunch area as far away from the trash enclosure as possible. Larry's suggestion at the end of the driveway is a good one. Agree with Chair Rittenhouse that we need clarification about the retaining wall.

Mike Estournes: We tried to go with the feel of some of the other buildings on the Boulevard and then upgrade it.

Committee Member Mills: Agree with the applicant that it fits in with other buildings in the area.

Chair Rittenhouse: I believe we need a color board, a letter from the neighbor or clarification of the grading, trellis design and I would prefer façade changes on the front, and civil drawings showing a flared entrance.

Committee Member Mills: Believe if you came back to the next meeting with the above details it would be approved.

Chair Rittenhouse: Polled the committee on the architecture.

Committee Member Kosewic: Ok with the architecture, believe staff could deal with the other details.

Committee Member Reed: Will defer to Jack's comments on the architecture.

Committee Member Barrett: Would like all of the above issues dealt with before I can approve the project.

M/S Barrett/Mills to continue to September 23, 2004.

Public hearing ended at 4:15

Public hearing began at 4:25 p.m.

1 **IV. MMM BUSINESS CONDOS, 3820 Cypress Drive**

2 **APN: 005-090-039**

3 **File: 03-SPC-0589-CR**

4 **Planner: Irene Borba**

5
6 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
7 of plans to construct 12 business condominium units on a 2.07-acre site located at
8 3820 Cypress Drive.

9
10 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

11
12 Willie McDevitt: Discussed changes to the project. Want to widen the driveway to the
13 east. One of the tenants is requesting changes to the landscape plan and we would like to
14 address that with staff. Point Reyes Bird Observatory, one of the major tenants, needs to
15 park a boat. We will put in a picnic table in east corner however it was not on the plans.
16 A combination of units/square footage would provide one shower. Regarding: condition
17 #5, pg 8, lockers would only be applicable if there were showers. Condition 15, pg. 9
18 refers to hospital – may be applicable to a different project.

19
20 Ed Sohl, Architect, Fifth Resource: Introduced PRBO.

21
22 PRBO: Gave some background on the non-profit and it's relocation to Petaluma.

23
24 Ed Sohl: Discussed the changes to the project and the suggested changes by the
25 Committee at the last SPARC preliminary hearing.

26
27 Committee Member Reed: Asked about more pervious pavement for PRBO's parking
28 spaces.

29
30 Ed Sohl: If that is something the Committee would want us to look at, we would do that,
31 however we do not want it as a condition of approval.

32
33 Committee Member Reed: Asked if they would consider some vines on the buildings.

34
35 Committee Member Mills: Suggested having an agreement with the Petaluma Marina for
36 possible boat storage.

37
38 Public hearing opened/closed:

39
40 Committee Comments:

41
42 Committee member Kosewic: Fine with project.

43
44 Committee Member Mills: I like the idea of adding vines on the concrete. Believe
45 awnings on the east and west elevations could reduce the heat.

46
47 Committee Member Barrett: Believe the submittal is much improved. The range of

1 colors is ok with me. Like that you want to put in more native landscaping. Look for
2 other means of storage for the boat – it is an attractive nuisance. I believe expanding the
3 driveway is a good idea. OK with your conditions and findings changes.

4
5 Committee Member Reed: Believe the parking lot is a great place to explore pervious
6 surface, would like more native trees on the Shollenberger edge. The Bike committee's
7 comments are regarding the sidewalk on Cypress, suggested 3 more sycamores on
8 Cypress. Vines on the building will help cool it off and break up the massing. Replace
9 soil treated with lime.

10
11 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree the submittal is better. Wish windows were to the east instead
12 of the west. The only change I would ask is for sunshades on the south and west
13 elevations on the 2nd level. Agree with Larry the 5' path is on Cypress. Condition 15,
14 deal with this at the staff level, showers will be required per the final plan/tenant
15 improvements. Find a way to put the boat inside or possible store at the Marina. Color
16 palate is good within the range presented. If minor changes, can go through staff,
17 landscaping can go through staff and to include vines on the building on the sycamores
18 on Cypress. Clear up ambiguity on the finding.

19
20 Committee Member Mills: Sunshade or awnings on south or west will help with the
21 massing as well.

22
23 Willie McDevitt: Point is well taken, we like the architecture and would prefer to use
24 low e windows instead of sunshades.

25
26 M/S Mills/Barrett to approve the project per the amended conditions with the color
27 palette, landscaping (including vines on the building and sycamores on Cypress), the use
28 of low e windows, modification of the shower/locker condition and the expansion of east
29 driveway to be reviewed by staff.

30
31
32 Public hearing began at 5:30 p.m.

33
34 **V. SOUTHGATE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, Lakeville Highway and**
35 **Frates Road**

36 **APN: 0017-150-019 and 017-030-022**

37 **File: 04-SPC-0337**

38 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**

39
40 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
41 of plans for 216 single-family homes on a 40-acre site at Frates Road between
42 Lakeville Highway and Ely Road.

43
44 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report.

45
46 Vin Smith: Introduced the project team and gave some background on the project.

47

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked for clarification on what the applicant is asking for approval
2 today.

3
4 Vin Smith: Asking for approval of the architecture for the all of the homes, as well as
5 landscaping

6
7 Jill Williams, KTG Y Group: Presented the architecture.

8
9 Ernest from Gretchen McCann, Landscape Architecture: Presented the landscape plan.

10
11 Public hearing opened:

12
13 Art Kerbel: Representing the Adobe Del Oro Action Group. We, the neighborhood are
14 supportive of the project and have worked very long and hard with the developer to come
15 up with a good project.

16
17 Public hearing closed:

18
19 Committee Comments:

20
21 Committee Member Barrett: Asked the architect to respond to the reduced setbacks on
22 lots 25-29.

23
24 Jill: Can do some refiguring to make those rear yards 17 feet instead of 15.

25
26 Committee Member Barrett: The houses are too large for the lots, need to meet the 20'
27 setbacks for the rear yards. Rethink the vine on the Lakeville sound wall – use an
28 evergreen vine or combination that would provide a green screen. Frates Road needs
29 larger canopy trees, as studies have shown that larger trees can have a traffic-calming
30 effect. On Parcel C, I agree with PBAC that the path should extend to south end of the
31 urban separator even if it terminates there. Agree that bike racks should be changed, that
32 a bench should be provided along southern edge of path on Parcel C, the urban separator.

33
34 Committee Member Reed: Agree regarding bike rack comments. I like the organization
35 of the streetscape of the neighborhood. Like the mix of the trees on the interior of the
36 site. The bigger issues are with the exterior or perimeter of the site, especially the
37 soundwalls. The only vines that work here are Boston Ivy and Creeping Fig. Would like
38 those two vines used predominately. Once these are established you can introduce the
39 other vines. Agree with Teresa that we need large canopy trees on Frates Road, don't
40 need to take away the accents, just use more Redwoods and Sycamores. Regarding
41 Lakeville, there is an opportunity to reinforce the gateway to Petaluma, as it will be the
42 first residential project that you see coming into the City. Consider introducing a uniform
43 street tree along Lakeville like a sycamore or redwoods, particularly at the bend in the
44 road. Detention basin - I like the planting although I would like to see a lot more of it,
45 especially native materials. Introduce another row of trees, poplar or oaks that create
46 separation from outlying parcels.

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

Committee Member Kosewic: I like the variety of the architecture, the streetscape looks good. I trust the veneer brickwork will go all the way to the ground. Have a problem with the sound wall. Hope the sound wall does not look like the rest of Lakeville. Would like a living sound wall, as was done some years ago along Sonoma Mountain Parkway.

Committee Member Mills: Agree with everything that has been said. Agree that the bike path should go all the way to lot 75. Do not agree with a break in the sound wall. Don't know how to solve the setbacks on the lots for Phase III. Agree with landscape comments on the walls.

Chair Rittenhouse: For the record, have met with the applicant and reviewed the project. Believe that the project is well-plotted, there is attention to the corners, and there is a sculptured streetscape and a good variety of house plans. The overall plans have been worked out fairly well. My major issue has to do with the path near the detention basin. I do not want it to connect to a major highway like Lakeville. I believe it could go down and end in a loop within the urban separator. Do not want to punch a hole in the wall. The sound wall is the weakest link in the project. I would prefer the style of the wall near Turtle Creek and Cader Highlands.

Vin Smith: Agree to add a link with the current path and extend it along the south property line and add a bulb and a bench. We can change the vine on the wall to creeping fig.

Committee Member Reed: Boston Ivy is preferable because it clings better.

Vin Smith: Add more large canopy trees (Sycamores) and keep the accent trees along Frates.

Committee Member Reed: Suggested 30 ft on center for the canopy trees.

Vin Smith: Have a large continuous canopy of trees on Lakeville such as Sycamore, 30ft on center as well.

Committee Member Reed: Consider other canopy trees, does not have to be just sycamore.

Chair Rittenhouse: Can come back to the Committee with the final landscaping details.

Vin Smith: Would like to install the perimeter of the detention basin as phase I. Can we agree on a specific tree species and a frequency? Believe poplar is a good choice.

Committee Member Reed: Suggested planting along the entire detention basin. Poplars are non native.

1 Vin Smith: Discussed the sound wall and stated that the intent all along has been to make
2 the wall disappear, and asked the committee to approve the design as proposed today.
3 Our hope is that the wall will go away once vines have been planted on both sides – want
4 to make it look like a green living wall.

5
6 Chair Rittenhouse: This is the gateway to Petaluma and the wall is important. I would
7 like to see a substantial, capped wall. I want to poll the Committee on the sound wall.
8 Kosewic, I am ok with the wall proposed as long as it will disappear with vines; Barrett, I
9 would like a more substantial wall; Mills, I agree with Terry that if the wall is covered it
10 does not matter what is underneath; Kosewic recommended a cinderblock wall with
11 stucco; Reed, on Lakeville I am ok with the wall proposed with the vines planted right
12 away.

13
14 Committee Member Mills: Confirmed that the wall would go in during Phase I and the
15 vine would be planted immediately.

16
17 Vin Smith: The issue of setback on lots 22-29.

18
19 Jill: Can create a 20-foot rear yard on lots 22-28. Requesting to come back to staff with
20 the solution and agree to provide a 20' rear yard on lot 63 and all other lots with a 19'
21 setback..

22
23 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested bringing these lots in Phase III back to the
24 Committee. Asked staff why it is being recommended that action on the Lakeville
25 soundwall be deferred.

26
27 Jayni Allsep: Discussed condition 7 on page 9 and stated that the public art element to be
28 installed near corner of Frates and Lakeville, as well as the two gateway elements
29 required along Lakeville have not yet been submitted. Staff felt that the Lakeville
30 soundwall, the gateway element and public art element are all related to the soundwall
31 design, and staff did not want to ask the Committee to approve soundwall without
32 knowing more about the gateway and the public art components.

33
34 Vin Smith: Will defer the approval of the wall and landscaping until we can come back
35 with the public art component. We will come back with an integrated plan before we
36 build the wall.

37
38 Doyle Heaton: I would like to build what we have proposed because that is what I am
39 comfortable with.

- 40
41 1. M/S Mills/Kosewic approve the application with the following conditions: 1) site
42 and architectural plans for lots 22-29 (Phase III), as shown on the site plan, are
43 not approved. Plans for these lots shall be modified so that minimum 20-foot rear
44 yard setback is achieved, and shall be submitted for review and approval by
45 SPARC prior to the issuance of a building permit for Phase III; 2) The path in
46 Parcel C shall be extended south (toward Lakeville Highway) to run the full

1 length of the Urban Separator and shall terminate in a loop within the Urban
 2 Separator and a bench shall be provided in accordance with the PBAC
 3 recommendation; 3) the landscape plans for Frates Road shall be revised to
 4 provide for more large canopy trees at 30 feet on center; 4) Plans for lots where
 5 there is a 19-foot rear yard setback indicated shall be revised to provide for the
 6 full 20-foot setback; 5) The type of bike rack on Parcel B (public park) shall be
 7 changed from the proposed serpentine rack to a Ribcage or Gauntlet bike rack
 8 model recommended by PBAC in order to provide two contact points per bicycle
 9 for adequate support; 6) The landscape plan for the detention pond shall include
 10 more densely planted natives and poplars shall be planted along the perimeter of
 11 the detention pond; and 7) The design and material of the sound walls along
 12 Frates and Lakeville and associated landscaping shall come back to the committee
 13 for review and approval. 5-0.

14
15
16 **VI. REPORTS:**

17
18 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

19 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission has not met. Tree Committee is
 20 working on a tree ordinance

21
22
23 **VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

- 24
25 **Mary Issac Center Landscaping conditions**
 26 **McDowell Townhomes Preliminary**
 27 **Central Animal Hospital Preliminary**
 28 **Pinnacle Ridge Subdivision Preliminary**

29
30 Discussion regarding the First Street Town homes coming to the committee as a
 31 preliminary review.

32
33
34 **Adjournment: 7:50**

35
36
37
38
39