

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 December 9, 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: Corrine Farez-Demil, Michael Iritz

*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Phil Boyle, Associate Planner
Laura Lafler, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of November 18, 2004 were approved as presented. M/S Barrett/Mills, 5-0.

Committee Members' Report: Jack Rittenhouse recused himself from the Rockridge item; Larry Reed recused himself from Rivertown Apts. John Mills stated for the record that he was on a Committee with the developer.

Correspondence: None

Public Comment: None.

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:15 p.m.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS
NEW BUSINESS:

1
2 **I. RIVERTOWN APARTMENTS, 209-317 1st Street**
3 **APN: 008-121-007, 008, 009 and 010**
4 **File: 03-ZOA-0260-CR**
5 **Planner: Irene Borba**
6

7 The applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review
8 and approval for modifications to approved plans for the Rivertown Apartments
9 portion of the Theater District located at 209-317 1st Street.

10
11 **Continued from October 14, 2004**
12

13 Larry Reed, Landscape Architect: Presented an overview of the project, the ghosting and
14 the landscape plan.
15

16 Guy Ferris, KTG Y Group: Presented the changes to the architecture and a list of items
17 addressed: roof overhangs, siding and colors, roof vents, windows.
18

19 **Public hearing opened.**
20

21 Tammara Norman, 501 Keller Street: Encourage the committee to have the metal siding
22 go all the way to the ground, stucco will make it look suburban. Have concerns about the
23 phasing of the project. Why build carports and plant trees that need to be taken down.
24 Is it worth it to phase the project just for 15 units? It will be an imposition on the
25 residents to have a parking structure built in phase II. The interior elevations of building
26 B and C are very bland because of the parking structure. The transformers take up a lot
27 of space – they will impact the space more significantly than shown. The buildings really
28 have two fronts, the river front and the street front. Possibly put the transformers where
29 the parking is rather than in the landscape area.
30

31 **Public hearing closed:**
32

33 **Committee Comments:**
34

35 Committee Member Mills: Asked Chair Rittenhouse for an overview of meetings with
36 the applicant.
37

38 Chair Rittenhouse: The project has been before the Committee at least 8 times. Terry
39 and I have met with the developer, the landscaping consultant and the architect. It is
40 necessary to look at the constraints of the building. We have worked with the applicant
41 to bring back some of the character of the original design approved. I believe the
42 applicant has done that. I would like to see this move forward tonight.
43

44 Committee Member Kosewic: Reviewed the meetings with the developer regarding the
45 windows and the vents. The ghosting with the truss looks more like a structure. I like the
46 different textures and the colors. Don't care about color on the ghosting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Committee Member Mills: Appreciate Jack and Terry putting in extra time with the developer. I am very happy with the project. I like the mix of sliders and single hung windows. I prefer metal all the way down instead of stucco on the existing warehouse. I don't have any problems with the landscaping. I like the idea of having access to the water itself, like at the Foundry Wharf. I prefer the structure with the truss for the ghosting and prefer steel on the truss.

Committee Member Barrett: I agree with Larry on the ghosting, keep it simple. Want the ghosting to look separate and apart from the building - agree with John that it should be steel, silver in color like the original warehouses. The parking structure was already approved by this committee. Need to let residents know in their rental agreements that a parking structure will be built. I think the transformers are an issue. If you cannot hide the transformers, try and make them hidden from the river side. I think the landscaping is excessive where the parking structure will go. Seems like such a waste to plant trees and then remove. Maybe metal trellis' and vines could work instead - is much more temporary. There are several places where the metal siding comes down to the street. I think the colors are great and the textures are wonderful. Overhang correction is good, roof vents are better. I am not happy with slider windows. I believe the approved plan is much better.

Committee Member Demil: I have no problem with the windows. I like the colors. I do want to see the transformers hidden from the river elevation. The ghosting is not what I envisioned. I like the truss and prefer steel or oxidized iron. I like the gooseneck exterior lights. Want a tubular punched steel light on street front. Want the overhangs streamlined. Want to see some planters on the street level, possibly steel such as at the outlet mall. I would like to see the metal go all the way to the ground on the existing warehouse.

Committee Member Iritz: The gables on the river elevation go more toward the ghosting. I think it is necessary to bring the metal down to the bottom - do not believe stucco will work. For historical remembrance metal needs to go to the ground. For the ghosting I like steel or oxidized iron.

M/S Rittenhouse/Mills approve the project as presented today with the ghosting to be steel with the truss element. 4-2, Barrett and Iritz no.

Public hearing ended at 4:40

Public hearing began at 4:50 p.m.

II. MUHLENKAMP/NAPOLITANO ADDITION, 40 Sixth Street
APN: 008-101-013
File: 04-SPC-0556-CR

1 **Planner: Phil Boyle**

2

3 The applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review
4 of site and architectural plans for an addition to the single family dwelling at 40
5 Sixth Street within the “A” Street Historic District.

6

7 Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

8

9 Steve Napolitano: We attempted to address the concerns of the committee since the
10 preliminary review.

11

12 Ken Berman: Reviewed the site plan of the existing residence and the addition.

13

14 **Public hearing opened:**

15

16 **Public hearing closed:**

17

18 **Committee Comments:**

19

20 Committee Member Iritz: I like what you have done and I believe it will fit seamlessly.

21

22 Committee Member Demil: I agree, the new roofline works well. I’m not crazy about
23 the window boxes on the street front.

24

25 Committee Member Mills: I felt you listened to the committee. I believe it is a much
26 better project. The grouping of the windows in the back looks too modern.

27

28 Committee Member Barrett: I like what you have done. What you are doing is within
29 the history and context. I agree with Mr. Mills about the top window in the back.

30

31 Committee Member Reed: I think it’s beautiful. Stamped concrete in the driveway does
32 not fit, however.

33

34 Committee Member Kosewic: It’s a great improvement from the preliminary review.
35 Flower boxes are a little over done. I agree with John on the windows in the rear.
36 Suggested one tall window instead of one window over another. Glad you are doing
37 cedar siding.

38

39 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicant and the architect. The improvements to the
40 massing are good. I am not a fan of window boxes. I agree with Larry on stamped
41 concrete. Don’t think you need the trellis on the side.

42

43 M/S Mills/Barrett to approve the project as submitted. 7-0.

44

45 Public hearing ended at 5:15

46

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

Started at 3:00 p.m.

SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS
COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

III. ROCKRIDGE POINT, Windsor Drive and Western Avenue
APN: 020-030-037, 020, 030, & 039
File: 03-SPC-0275-CR
Planner: Laura Lafler

Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review consideration and approval of modifications to architectural plans for conditions of approval of 123 acre project.

Laura Lafler presented the staff report.

Dan Hale, Architect: Presented the proposed vents which had previously been windows.

M/S Barrett /Mills to allow the vents in the dormers.

Ended at 3:15 p.m.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW:

IV. THE BIRCHES, 870 Wood Sorrel Drive
APN: 137-061-022 and 023
File: 04-PRE-0660

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee preliminary review of plans to construct a 24 unit PUD at 870 Wood Sorrel Drive.

Steve Lafranchi, Civil Engineer: Gave an overview of the project since the last preliminary review.

Tracy Anthony: Presented some elevation studies to the committee. Reviewed the changes to the site plan since the preliminary review.

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Mills: I like the density and the varied garages. I like the gate idea. There is a narrow driveway with a gate that opens outward – this may be a problem.

Committee Member Barrett: I believe it is better with the entrance in the middle of Yarberry. I think the rear entry garage is a good thing as well.

1 Committee Member Kosewic: Encourage applicant to go with more gates.

2

3 Committee Member Reed: Want you to define the front yard space with porches. Like
4 the Z lot configurations. Differentiation at the front of the units is lacking. You have an
5 opportunity to do cottage garden type landscaping. Make the street feel pedestrian
6 friendly.

7

8 Chair Rittenhouse: I like the stepped back garages. Like the shift of the driveway.
9 Streetscape will be very important to the project. The architecture presented looks like
10 Rohnert Park in the 1970's. Encourage you to find a new style.

11

12 Committee Member Mills: Suggested a paseo look.

13

14 Committee Member Barrett: Think about the placement of the upper most lots. Suggest
15 listening to Jack's direction on the architecture.

16

17 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested looking at Turnbridge and Turtle Creek Subdivisions.

18

19

20 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

21

22 **V. REPORTS:**

23

24 **Planning Staff Reports: SPARC Guidelines.** Will be presented to the
25 Committee in January or early February.

26 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission : Woodridge Subdivision was
27 approved ; Lomas was denied without prejudice.

28

29

30

31 **VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

32

33 **SBC Mechanical Upgrade**

34 **Petaluma River Trail**

35 **Southgate**

36

37

38

39

Adjournment: 5:40