

1



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

Minutes

3

4 Regular Meeting
5 City Council Chambers
6 City Hall, 11 English Street
7 Telephone: 707-778-4301
8 FAX: 707-778-4498

February 26, 2004
3:00 p.m.
Petaluma, CA
E-Mail: cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us
Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

9

10

11 The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee encourages applicants or their
12 representatives to be available at the meeting to answer questions so that no agenda item
13 need be deferred to a later date due to a lack of pertinent information.

14

15 Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Janet Gracyk, Jack Rittenhouse*
16 Absent: Terry Kosewic

17

18 *Chairperson

19

20 Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
21 Tiffany Robbe, Associate Planner
22 Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

23

24

25 Approval of Minutes: Minutes of February 12, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S
26 Barrett/Gracyk, 3-0.

27

27 Committee Members' Report: None

28

28 Correspondence: None.

29

29 Public Comment:

30

30 Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

31

31 Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

32

33

34

35 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
36 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

37

38 **I. GATTI PARK, Sonoma Mountain Parkway between G&G Shopping Center**
39 **and Santa Rosa Junior College.**

40

AP No: 137-070-074

1 **Director of Parks and Recreation: Jim Carr**

2
3 The Parks and Recreation Department is requesting review and approval of the
4 restroom facilities and gazebo for Gatti Park.
5

6 Continued from January 22, 2004.
7

8 Jim Carr, Director Park & Recreation: Presented the changes to the project since the
9 January 22, 2004 SPARC meeting.
10

11 Gretchen Stanzel-McCan: Addressed the pitch of the restroom roof. The color of the
12 restroom roof will be the same blue as the gazebo and the play structures. The gazebo
13 will be open with no rails.
14

15 Committee Member Barrett: Believe Sheet #2 gazebo is a good choice.
16

17 Chair Rittenhouse: Of the choices I believe #2 is the best gazebo. It is clearly more
18 modern.
19

20 Committee Member Gracyk: Still believe the bathrooms should be done first with a more
21 quality design and materials and postpone the gazebo for a later date. Believe the East
22 side deserves something better.
23

24 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Janet, however, the reality of what can happen
25 is what is presented here today – think it is fine. I like Option 2 for the restroom and
26 choice 2 for the gazebo.
27

28 Chair Rittenhouse: I agree with Janet, however, there are budget constraints.
29

30 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to approve Restroom #2 and gazebo #2. 2-0, Gracyk opposed.
31

32
33 Public hearing began @ 3:20
34

35 **NEW BUSINESS:**

36 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
37

38 **II. MARINA OFFICE BUILDING, 785 Baywood Drive**

39 **AP No: 005-060-074**

40 **File: 03-SPC-0516-CR**

41 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**
42

43 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
44 consideration of site, architectural and landscaping plans to construct a two-story
45 29,966 square foot office/commercial building on a 1.46-acre site at the Petaluma
46 Marina.
47

1 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report and addressed some corrections to the staff
2 report.

3
4 Richard Coombs, Marina Office Park: Gave a history of the site and addressed the issue
5 of the pear trees on the site, the color of the siding and the trellis and fountain. Applicant
6 wanted to address specific conditions: #4, 5 and 6, 12 – do not agree to any indoor bike
7 parking – indoor secured spaces are difficult; do not agree with showers & lockers, the
8 kitchen, or posting about pesticide use.

9
10 Tiffany Robbe: Addressed the Bike conditions – staff recommended 2 bike spaces be
11 provided inside. Condition #5: showers are right out of the Bike Plan/General Plan –
12 number of lockers is not addressed in the bike plan. Customarily we require the same
13 amount of lockers as bike parking required. Kitchens have been adopted as conditions on
14 past projects, but this is a multi-tenant building. Bike committee's recommendations are
15 Attachment F.

16
17 Richard Coombs: There will be multiple tenants which make it difficult for showers.
18 Calculation should be per square footage of each office space as opposed to the entire
19 square footage of the building.

20
21 Parker Smith, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan. Holly oak and arbutus
22 marina used throughout Marina. Pears relate well to poplars used elsewhere.

23
24 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked the architect to address the design of the building and the
25 hierarchy of the lobby entrance.

26
27 Richard Coombs: Every door off of the courtyard will bring you into the lobby.

28
29 Les Gerard, Architect: The cupola also identifies the lobby area. Mechanical to all be in
30 cupola. Ceilings are dropped with mechanical within. Trash adjacent to west side lobby
31 entry.

32
33 Tiffany Robbe: Did not find a specific item requiring kitchen facilities in the Bicycle
34 Plan or a reference to the signs when applying pesticides outdoor. There is
35 policies/programs for showers and lockers.

36
37 **Public comment open/closed:**

38
39 Ed Anchordoguy: The City provides signage for 48 hours before and after application of
40 chemicals to landscaping.

41
42 Committee Member Barrett: Asked Mr. Anchordoguy to comment on the landscaping
43 for this project.

44
45 Ed Anchordoguy: Main concern is a hard freeze that may wipe out podocarpus.

46

1 Committee Discussion:

2
3 Committee Member Barrett: Covered indoor bike spaces would be an enforcement
4 nightmare in a multi-tenant building. Would agree to all outdoor spaces if they were
5 covered. Have never seen a kitchen space required. Do think needs more outdoor
6 amenities for employees of the building. Do not like the use of the natural color on the
7 siding – I would prefer to see the same white as the rest of the office park. Would like to
8 see the landscaping be more natural and as originally called out in the PCD.

9 Design of the building: It is an odd lot and therefore the entry or lobby is awkward. You
10 do not have a central focus point with the lobby. Do not believe the waste company can
11 access garbage easily. Like the trellis, however, most are on the north side where you
12 need it less. The outdoor area with the fountain is also on the north.

13
14 Committee Member Gracyk: On the building itself, I agree with Teresa. There is not
15 clarity about where the lobby or entrance actually is, columns & trellis not leading to
16 anything – needs to be looked at more carefully. Wall underneath north side balcony is
17 problematic. Siding and roof is good. Windows need to have some true divided lights,
18 as in existing buildings – would help the façade. The kitchen issue is difficult when there
19 are multiple tenants. Have seen a multiple tenant building where there is a shared
20 conference room and kitchen space for tenants. Possibly have a closet with hooks for
21 bicycles.

22 Regarding the site plan: circulation – need crosswalks to tie into trails. Unfortunate Mr.
23 Smith, the landscape architect, did not know about the original landscape requirements.
24 Replace groups of the Bradford pears with larger canopy trees to make a pattern. Suggest
25 large canopy trees where fingers are coming into the planting areas. Do not need to
26 completely throw out the new landscape plan – use more natives. Agree with Ed on the
27 podocarpus. I would encourage the applicant to have more outdoor amenities for the
28 tenants.

29
30 Chair Rittenhouse: Building itself: it is a difficult project because of the site plan and
31 constraints from the parking that is already established. There is difficulty for visitors to
32 the site – 3 doors into the lobby and 2 are tucked into a vestibule, which makes it difficult
33 to find. The 3rd is near a trash room. Trash is too small. Need a full sized dumpster for
34 this sized project. Design of the fountain is good, although it will be cold and dark
35 because on north side. You have overhang on the north side instead of the south side
36 where you need sun protection. Trellis is on east elevation instead of west elevation –
37 rethink that approach. Do not know if all the mechanical units can be handled in the
38 cupola. Building seems top heavy. I am the least comfortable with the west elevation –
39 needs articulation, entry is not lined up with the cupola. Understand what you want to do
40 with the materials and colors. Believe this site would look better if tied into the existing
41 Marina buildings with mullions and colors. Landscaping should be consistent with
42 overall plan. Closet with hooks could serve for 2 indoor covered bike spaces. Do not
43 believe the kitchen should be conditioned for this project. Would like to see more detail
44 on the trellises and their locations. Condition #5 is required in the General Plan and we
45 have been requiring of all applicants. Issue of the herbicide use sign – would like to look
46 into this further. Switch overhang to west elevation.

1
2 Committee Member Barrett: If the outdoor amenities were oriented toward the south or
3 west away from traffic it would be more beneficial to the site.

4
5 Committee Member Gracyk: Also wants white siding to match existing

6
7 Richard Coombs: The public space has been created as a wind buffer – which is
8 particularly problematic in this location. Site plan does have 6 outdoor benches as well
9 as the fountain seating. Asked what the committee thought of a seaside gray stain color?

10
11 Chair Rittenhouse: Not opposed to gray

12
13 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to continue to April 8, 2004.

14
15 Public hearing over at 4:30 pm
16

17
18 Public hearing began @ 4:40

19
20 **III. GATTI/STRATFORD PLACE SUBDIVISION, 710 Sonoma Mountain**
21 **Parkway**
22 **AP No: 137-070-079**
23 **File: 04-SPC-0070-CR**
24 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**
25

26 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
27 consideration of site and architectural plans for a proposal to construct Stratford
28 Place (Gatti Nursery) – a 46 unit single family and 46 unit townhouse subdivision
29 on a 17-acre parcel at 710 Sonoma Mountain Parkway east of the future Gatti
30 Park. This is a resubmittal of the project at this address denied by SPARC at the
31 1/8/04 meeting.

32
33 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report.

34
35 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Craig Spaulding, City Engineer to address conformance for a
36 Final Map.

37
38 Craig Spaulding: The Final map needs to be in substantial conformance with the
39 Tentative Map.

40
41 Ed Anchordoguy, Parks & Recreation: Will become a landscape district and public areas
42 to be maintained by the City. Have a problem with Virginia Oak at the creek. Mixed use
43 of native and non-native plants in the urban separator does not work. Suggested doing
44 either non-native or native and do not mix. Regarding spreading vine on Yorkshire –
45 want to know what it is. Removable, wood bollards do not hold up after time, use metal
46 where removable.
47

1 R.J. Wilson, Delco Builders: We have addressed comments and concerns specifically
2 regarding the alley, providing some relief with planting. Offsetting some of the buildings
3 to provide a better visual, adding parking for visitors and striping area for trash pick-up
4 day, and key pad to open middle unit garage door from alley.

5
6 Committee identified issues to be addressed:

- 7 Parking for deliveries
- 8 Trash pick up and storage
- 9 Door from alley into garages
- 10 Mailbox placements
- 11 Garbage, yard waste, recycling cannot be left in alley (add statement in CC&Rs)

12
13 Landscape architect: Provided optional plant palates for sun and shade; will change
14 species of trees to comply with approved street tree list; vines on Yorkshire to be from
15 list, like fardenburgia; town homes and single family homes will have sun and shade
16 palates; trees without adequate planter space will be changed out. Will change the native
17 and non-native combination at the Urban Separator. Will also address the removable
18 bollards. Will change Chinese Pistache at Capri Creek side of Yorkshire. Will provide
19 large canopy trees where there is room to do so (Churchill).

20
21 Chair Rittenhouse: What tree do you propose in the alley way next to the garages.

22
23 Landscape architect: Oleander in planter strip – would probably max out at 6 feet and
24 Crepe Myrtle in space between buildings.

25
26 Committee Member Barrett: Consider something more columnar?

27
28 Landscape Architect: I agree, however, it may require more maintenance.

29
30 **Public comment opened:**

31
32 Rob Lewis: Sak Mangement: Have concerns about the oleanders – have all died. Have
33 a concern about the town homes that face Capri Creek Apartments.

34
35 **Public comment closed:**

36
37 **Committee Comments:**

38
39 Committee Member Gracyk: Landscaping: Would like the applicant to address all of
40 Ed's concerns: suggest using native plants on urban separator, change oak to valley or
41 live oak. Tree choices: glad you are willing to use the list. Olives are a problem on
42 Belgrave for ADA clearance. Locust trees get insects. Appreciate the sun/shade planting
43 palette. Have a problem with S4 plants, medium shrubs – in only 2-ft wide planting
44 places these are too big. Columnar Junipers should be a stricta variety. For ground
45 cover, suggest catalina perfume. Still a problem with plants in the alley – is very narrow.
46 Crepe Myrtle will be problematic there. Trash pick-up will harm the trees in the alley

1 way during trash pick up. Sidewalks do not always connect to the paths, example on
 2 Yorkshire. Vines that you mentioned on Yorkshire would work – can do a mix to have
 3 color.
 4 You have made many efforts to make this project work, but it still has inherent problems.
 5 Efforts made seem to be propping the project up rather than fixing it. You are trying to
 6 make the trash pickup work, and the trees and the visitor parking – believe it still does not
 7 work. Trash pick up is a problem – there is not enough space to keep trash and recycling
 8 containers out of the driveways. Belgrave Street is not ADA compliant. Private
 9 landscaped areas maintained by the HOA will become an issue. Appreciate the effort on
 10 the architecture of the end units. Do not know where you go from here. Have not seen
 11 the lighting yet.

12
 13 Committee Member Barrett: Concur with Janet and Ed on the landscaping. Landscape
 14 keeps coming back without all the issues being addressed. Do not like the choice of
 15 oleander. Do not know if it is a possibility to designate that units closest to Belgrave put
 16 trash containers there instead of the alley. Janet’s metaphor of propping the project up is
 17 not a fix. Circulation is still a problem and trash day. Having “no-parking – during the
 18 day except for delivery trucks” designated at a few parking spaces seems like an
 19 improvement.

20
 21 Chair Rittenhouse: Had a meeting with the applicant where a number of issues were
 22 discussed. I made a number of suggestions and am happy that an attempt was made to
 23 address some of those issues. Unfortunately, I still have the same fundamental comments
 24 on the town homes re: trash pickup, deliveries to town homes, guest parking, man doors
 25 to all garages and massing. Applicant could have shifted units back and forth to get man
 26 doors. Casa de Sol in Santa Rosa is a similar project – very unappealing project on the
 27 alleyway, especially on trash day. I appreciate the attempt to deal with some issues,
 28 however, I cannot support this part of the project.

29
 30 M/S Gracyk/ Rittenhouse to deny town homes due to inherent problems with trash
 31 pickup, deliveries, rear access to town homes, site circulation, proximity of guest parking.
 32 3-0.

33
 34 Public hearing over @ 5:55
 35

36
 37 Public hearing began at 5:55

38
 39 **IV. PLAZA SOUTH/BANK OF AMERICA, 181 North McDowell Blvd.**
 40 **AP No: 007-340-007**
 41 **File: 03-SPC-0570-CR**
 42 **Planner: Irene Borba**

43
 44 Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural review approval for
 45 construction of a new 5,400 square foot structure for Bank Of America, to be
 46 located in the Plaza South Shopping Center at 181 North McDowell Boulevard.

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

Irene Borba presented the staff report

Architect, Gensler: Presented the project.

Chris Ford, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.

Committee Member Gracyk: Have concerns about the Ginko trees on the east elevation. Do not believe there will be room for the tree to grow. Would like applicant to take a look at this. Also, we do not usually recommend stamped concrete.

Public comment opened:

Fred Tar, 4 Tunzy Parkway: Have a business across the driveway from this building. Thanked the developer for changes to the shopping center. The only concern I have is the access way between Togos/Baskin Robbins and the new Bank of American building. Is a dangerous situation with cars backing out and cars coming in from North McDowell. Would suggest signs or speed bumps. Hope there is some discussion regarding this issue.

Public hearing closed:

Committee comments:

Irene Borba: The issue brought up by Mr. Tar has been looked by the City Engineer. He did not express concerns. Can be looked at again.

Committee Member Barrett: Appreciate the applicant taking our comments of preliminary review into consideration. The building looks great and will be an asset to the shopping center.

Committee Member Gracyk: Was impressed the first time and believe it will be fine. Comments on landscaping: Glad you have raised planters and benches. Reexamine the ADA issue with the Ginkgo trees. You have an opportunity for canopy trees to shade the parking area – please do that and provide shade. Have shrubs shown where there aren't any on the drawings. Recommend pavers or scored concrete instead of stamped concrete.

Applicant: Suggested a darker tan or buff color for the scored concrete.

Chair Rittenhouse: This was an outstanding preliminary application. For the record, I like renderings that look exactly like the landscape plan. Believe this will be a welcome addition to the center. Concur with scored concrete.

M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to approve the application as submitted. 3-0

Public hearing over @ 6:20.

1 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

2
3 **V. PLAZA SOUTH FACADE PHASE II, No. McDowell Blvd. at Washington**
4 **Street**
5 **AP No: 007-340-007**
6 **File: 03-PRE-0623**
7

8 Applicant is requesting preliminary review of plans for Plaza South for facade
9 upgrade at buildings A and G, new landscaping, and parking upgrades with
10 additional landscaping, Phase II of the shopping center renovations.

11
12 John McNellis, McNellis Partners: Introduced Jay Baptista, RDL: Presented the next
13 phase for the upgrading of the Plaza South facade.

14
15 **“Big 5 Elevation”**

16
17 Chair Rittenhouse: Weak element is the existing canopy across the front of Big 5.
18 Suggest simplifying the canopy. The arch on the east elevation is important to the video
19 store. What is overall direction?
20

21 John McNellis: You suggested coming in piece-by-piece and each storefront would work
22 for itself. Will end up with half new buildings and half remodeled.
23

24 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested using glass for the entire storefront at Peet’s or
25 whatever tenant is there. It would be a nice feature if the tower element were glass.
26

27 Chair Rittenhouse: If the façade is just a façade it looks like a movie set – make it an
28 element onto itself or have it be useful for the utilities. I like the metal awnings and
29 lights that cantilever out. Trellis is looking a little planted on – make it a more human
30 scale or a different pattern. Like the trellis pattern at the factory on the 101 elevation.
31

32 Committee Member Gracyk: Will have the same opportunity on the Silver Screen
33 elevation
34

35 Chair Rittenhouse: May want to put another tower element at the southwest end of the
36 Big 5 building. Cut hole in the tower so you can go right into the video store.
37

38 Committee Member Gracyk: Do not see a lot of variation.
39

40 Chair Rittenhouse: Can you get some parapet changes on the building next to the Bank
41 of America moving toward the center. Disjoint the two elements instead and let Bank of
42 America extend around the corner.
43

44 McNellis: Can ask the Bank of America to wrap the brick element around the corner.
45

46 Committee Member Barrett: That suggestion could work and will disassociate the new

1 modern building from the old existing building.

2

3 McNellis: Will be a hard trowl finish – the details will make the project.

4

5 Chair Rittenhouse: The “Big 5” box is very clunky – can still have an overhang that is
6 flat – looks confused at the corner elevation where Silver Screen is going. Beef up the
7 larger of the towers.

8

9 Committee Member Gracyk: Create the tower element at the southeast corner that could
10 be an arcade.

11

12 Committee Member Barrett: Ditch the second tower element on the Big 5 elevation and
13 beef up the southeast corner element.

14

15 **PetCo Elevation:**

16

17 Chair Rittenhouse: Can the sidewalk be modified the same way you did with Trader
18 Joes?

19

20 **Site Plan:**

21

22 McNellis: My inspiration is 3rd Street in Berkeley, the Ocean View District.

23

24 Committee Member Gracyk: How can you bring the character of 4th Street in Berkeley to
25 this shopping center? Ocean View has pedestrian amenities (pathways, benches, flower
26 pots, etc.) – can’t match the scale.

27

28 McNellis: We cannot duplicate that area, however, we will incorporate more landscaping
29 and some pedestrian access that is curvilinear.

30

31 Chair Rittenhouse: Would make a huge difference to curve the drive aisle and provide
32 more landscaping. Would like a landscape concept of where the shopping center is
33 going.

34

35 McNellis: Would like to come in for final approval on elevations. Will come in with
36 conceptual plan for the parking lot when we come in with Raley’s.

37

38 Committee Member Gracyk: Regarding Peets – exterior is 1 ½ story – interior space can
39 be 1 ½ story too – would be a more inviting plaza for Peet’s building.

40

41 Committee Member Barrett: Landscaping by the Bank of America and Peets need
42 landscaping every 8 parking spaces per the SPARC guidelines.

43

44 Committee Member Gracyk: If you have to put trees in every 8 spaces – will you meet
45 your parking requirements.

46

1 McNellis: Parking will go to 90 degrees and then can provide landscaping and still meet
2 the landscaping requirements?

3
4 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested more landscaping near Peet's and some of the
5 smaller storefronts and less landscaping near Trader Joes and Raley's.

6
7 Committee Member Gracyk: Keep in mind we want large canopy trees in the parking lot.

8
9 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe you are going in the right direction.

10
11
12 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

13
14
15 **VI. REPORTS:**

16
17 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

18 **Liaison Reports:** Tree committee is reviewing ordinances ; Planning
19 Commission recommended denial of the Paula Lane subdivision.

20
21
22 **VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

23 **Northbay Construction Maintenance Building**

24 **Petaluma Poultry parking lot reconfiguration**

25 **Northbay Sunspace**

26
27
28 **Adjournment: 7:20**