

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 May 13, 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](mailto: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, Mary Shearer, Jack Rittenhouse\*  
Absent: Janet Grayck  
Historic: Corrine Fraez-Demil, Michael Iritz

\*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Assistant Director of Community Development  
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner  
Tiffany Robbe, Associate Planner  
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner  
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

---

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of April 22, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Rittenhouse, 4-0, Gracyk absent.

Committee Members' Report: None

Correspondence: E-Mail from applicant for the gas station/market regarding colors; workshop flyer from the Fire Marshal's office on emergency response and traffic calming in July.

Public Comment: None.

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

---

Public hearing began at 3:00

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

**HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

- I. HANSEN HOUSE, 718 North McDowell Boulevard**  
**AP No: 137-061-035 and 026**  
**File: 03-spc-0282-CR**  
**Planner: Kim Gordon**

Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee determination regarding the Showing of Hardship in order to allow the demolition of the residence located at 718 North McDowell Boulevard.

Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

Frank Denney, Cobblestone Homes: Presented background information and quoted from the Setterland & Associates analysis.

**Public hearing opened:**

Betty Hansen: I believe the community would be loosing something of historical significance – has built in water tower. Question why there is no insurance to cover assets.

Carolyn Hansen: This house is part of the Danish Community and Petaluma’s history.

Linda Carinalli: Am a descendent of the Hansen family. Believe there could be a win situation for everyone if the house was incorporated into the project.

Lillie Iverson Miller: Hope we can save the house to respect the Danish Community and Petaluma’s history.

Hanna Hansen: This house is a tribute to all the Danish immigrants – it should be a tribute to the Danish Community and to Petaluma’s history.

Maxine Durney: Sent a letter to the Community Development Department, quoted from letter.

**Public hearing closed:**

Frank Denney: Wish there was another outcome, asking the Committee to vote on the issue before you.

**Committee Discussion:**

1  
2 Committee Member Iritz: Appreciate the public comment. Do not believe this is an  
3 immediate and substantial hardship for Cobblestone Homes as required by the Zoning  
4 Ordinance. However, agree that it was not created by an act of the owner. Cannot vote  
5 for the demolition.

6  
7 Committee Member Farez-Demil: Agree with Committee Member Hiritz. Believe that  
8 the building is not compromised to the point of a “total loss” and can saved.

9  
10 Committee Member Shearer: Believe it is important to have a vestige of the history of  
11 Petaluma, particularly on the East side as a tribute to the founders. I cannot justify an  
12 immediate and financial hardship for Cobblestone Homes. Believe it can be restored and  
13 retained for the community.

14  
15 Committee Member Barrett: Spoke with Marianne Hurley, who was on the Historic and  
16 Cultural Preservation Committee in July 2003 when the house was deemed historic. Ms.  
17 Hurley reiterated her support to retain this house. I am thankful for members of the  
18 community who came here today and signed petitions. Why not preserve and build  
19 development around this house? Would not cost much more than if it was relocated and  
20 reused. Believe Cobblestone needed to take better care of the property, which they have  
21 owned for 2 years. Only see a financial hardship and cost may not be much different than  
22 if house had been relocated.

23  
24 Committee Member Kosewic: Believe you can sell the house. Could locate it on its own  
25 lot as part of developing the property. May still be able to relocate the house. The only  
26 hardship presented is financial which cannot be considered.

27  
28 Chair Rittenhouse: Very little left that is original in the house. I think it is a financial  
29 hardship, however, that is not what we are considering here. After a remodel, it will not  
30 be the historic Hansen House – only the memory is preserved. Would be quicker to build  
31 a new model.

32  
33 Denney: Agree with Chair Rittenhouse.

34  
35 M/S Kosewic/Barrett to deny the demolition/hardship request because 1) the only  
36 hardship presented is financial and the loss of profits which cannot be considered  
37 pursuant to zoning ordinance section 17.508 2) structural and fire damage is limited to  
38 the first floor, 3) only part of the house that needs to be brought up to today’s code  
39 standards is the part that was fire damaged 4) has local, historical value and is one of the  
40 few remaining farm houses on the East side. 5-1. (Chair Rittenhouse dissented)

---

41  
42  
43 **II. ST. VINCENT’S ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RENOVATION, Howard &**  
44 **Union Streets**  
45 **AP No: APN 006-244-004**  
46 **File: 04-SPC-0081-CR**

1 **Planner: Irene Borba**

2

3 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee approval  
4 for the renovation/reutilization of the existing old high school structure located at  
5 Howard & Union Streets.

6

7 The applicant has requested that the application be withdrawn.

8

9

---

10 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

11 **OLD BUSINESS:**

12 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

13

14 **III. MARINA OFFICE BUILDING, 785 Baywood Drive**

15

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

16

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

17

**Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

18

19 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
20 consideration of site, architectural and landscaping plans to construct a two-story  
21 29,966 square foot office/commercial building on a 1.46-acre site at the Petaluma  
22 Marina.

23

24 This item was continued from February 26, 2004.

25

26 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report.

27

28 Ron Nunn: Reviewed the issues from the previous SPARC hearing. Provide indoor area  
29 for bike parking and shower in each restroom, modified entrance to emphasize lobby,  
30 improved landscape area, and provided 2 picnic tables (one on northside and one on  
31 south) and additional benches. Concur with staff on striping and bike parking, can do a  
32 second outside covered bike rack at another entrance. Agree to reduce lighting to 20 ft.  
33 Propose to put mechanical equipment in new small concrete block building 8' tall with  
34 shiplap siding & trim at top, similar to existing parking lot structure. It would take up  
35 four parking spaces in main parking lot. Ok to cover trash enclosure with trellis - or not.

36

37 Parker Smith, Landscape Architect: Incorporated several plants from the original  
38 landscape plans for the existing Marina. Have also made a strong attempt to use native  
39 plants; now have 90% native plants. Have replaced some of the pear trees with live oaks  
40 to provide shade in the finger islands of the parking. Picnic table on the lawn  
41 problematic – adjacent to the lawn is better.

42

43 **Public hearing opened/closed:**

44

45 **Committee Comments:**

46

1 Committee Member Kosewic: It fits into the marina complex – glad to see what you  
2 have done.

3  
4 Committee Member Shearer: Concerned about the trash area and also how it will be  
5 picked up. I like the plan otherwise.

6  
7 Committee Member Barrett: Would like to have recycling as well at trash area. Like the  
8 idea of putting the trash enclosure out in the parking lot next to proposed mechanical  
9 equipment building instead of next to the building. Appreciate addressing the bike  
10 parking. Want simulated true divided lights on the upper windows. Suggested that 1  
11 picnic table go in courtyard by the fountain and 1 in the south area, will leave exact  
12 placement up to the applicant. Appreciate the changes made to the architecture and the  
13 landscaping.

14  
15 Chair Rittenhouse: Pleased with the modifications, addressed the entries, bike parking  
16 and showers. Don't understand overhang on the north and east side instead of the south  
17 and west sides. Like the structure for mechanical equipment in the parking lot, suggested  
18 moving trash enclosure there as well and add recycling. Landscape area next to building  
19 where trash was shown. We are not looking for all the small pane windows – want it to  
20 match the existing Marina building. Use simulated true divided light windows. Wish the  
21 copula was part of the lobby to provide a 2 story element.

22  
23 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested the panes match the existing windows and be  
24 simulated true divided light.

25  
26 O'Brien: Willing to eliminate the proposed trash enclosure at the building and use the  
27 existing trash enclosure. Would like to keep just cardboard recycling at proposed trash  
28 area at building.

29  
30 Chair Rittenhouse: Would like a separate trash enclosure for this building and  
31 landscaping where the proposed trash enclosure is now.

32  
33 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to approve as amended with a separate structure as described by  
34 the applicant to house the mechanical equipment, trash, & recycling located in the  
35 parking area to the south, and with simulated true divided light windows of similar size  
36 and proportion to the existing Marina windows.

37  
38 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS**  
39 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

40  
41 **IV. REDWOOD GATEWAY RETAIL CENTER – PHASE 1 CONDITIONS OF**  
42 **APPROVAL, 1363 North McDowell Boulevard at Redwood Way**

43 **AP No: 007-411-020, 21**

44 **File: 03-SPC-0271**

45 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**

46

1 Applicant is requesting review of the final landscape plan, and the exterior colors  
2 and details of the Kohl's building required by conditions of the Phase I SPARC  
3 approval.  
4

5 Jayni Allsep: Presented the staff report.  
6

7 Brian Wolfe, Architect: Presented the changes to the Kohl's exterior, including the color  
8 board, green screen and trellis detail. He also requested that the color of the wall behind  
9 the Kohl's sign on the south elevation be changed to the darker "H" color (Crown Point  
10 sand) so that the white sign shows up better.  
11

12 Ken Andrews, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan, particularly the trellis  
13 vines and tree selection of *Tristania laurina* (water gum) for the south elevation.  
14

15 Chair Rittenhouse: My concern on the south elevation is the expanse of building with  
16 minimal landscaping.  
17

18 Committee Member Kosewic: Can we get more trees with an elevated planter box?  
19

20 Brian Wolfe: We could do an elevated planter with *Tristania*.  
21

22 Chair Rittenhouse: Eliminate some of the sidewalk on the south elevation and put in a  
23 raised planter box.  
24

25 Andrews: Can have multiple trees if we use an elevated planter box.  
26

27 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggest vines pockets on the X cross-bracing element, eliminate  
28 some sidewalk to add additional trees in an elevated planter box.  
29

30 Consensus of Committee: Raised planters from the "pop-out" wall with stairs to the left  
31 of the Kohl's sign over to first column as shown on Exhibit "A". Raised planters to be  
32 constructed from Prairystone midnight – ground or split face; trees shall be at least 24-  
33 inch box, liquid amber or comparable in vertical height; planter area on North elevation  
34 of Kohl's near Major B shall be similar raised planter, with minimum 18-inch height to  
35 provide for seat wall.  
36

### 37 **Colors for Kohl's exterior:** 38

39 Committee Member Kosewic: Crown Point Sand is not my first choice, however, the  
40 planter box will add an element of color. Front looks fine, south wall is so dominating so  
41 the planter box will help on that elevation.  
42

43 Committee Member Shearer: Like the harmony and how it flows.  
44

45 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Terry, with the trees and the raised beds it will  
46 improve the color.

1  
2 Chair Rittenhouse: Ditto, am going to stop fighting that battle.

3  
4 Brian Wolfe: Confirmed that Committee was okay with a darker color behind the Kohl's  
5 sign on the south elevation, as previously discussed.

6  
7 M/S Barrett/ Shearer approve as amended with elevated planters along south elevation  
8 from the popout wall with sign and exit doors, to the southwest corner of the building,  
9 turning the corner to the west (front) elevation where planter can daylight into grade  
10 Raised planters shall be a minimum 24-inch height and sufficient for trees to reach  
11 parapet height. Planter shall be constructed of prairie stone masonry unit "midnight",  
12 ground or split face. Trees shall be planted 20 feet on center along south elevation,  
13 liquidamber or comparable species to provide vertical height to reach parapet, minimum  
14 24-inch box size; the planter on north side of the Kohl's building near Major B shall be  
15 raised planter made of same material and a minimum height of 18 inches. Darker color  
16 for panels behind Kohl's sign on south elevation is approved.

17 5-0.

---

18  
19  
20 **V. REDWOOD GATEWAY RETAIL CENTER – PHASE 2, 1363 North**  
21 **McDowell Boulevard at Redwood Way**  
22 **AP No: 007-411-020, 21**  
23 **File: 04-SPC-0126**

24  
25 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review for Phase 2 buildings  
26 and a Master Sign Program for the Redwood Way Retail Center to be constructed  
27 adjacent to the approved Kohl's building.

28  
29 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report.

30  
31 Brian Wolfe, Architect: Presented the architecture. Regarding recommendations in  
32 PBAC memo attached to staff report, 54 proposed bike rack spaces throughout the  
33 project.

34  
35 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested the applicant provide language in their lease to  
36 have the tenant provide bike parking.

37  
38 Brian Wolfe: On major B, requirement for 2 showers, ask that it be lowered to one.  
39 PBAC asked for benches for 160. We have provided seating for 101.

40  
41 **Public hearing opened/closed:**

42  
43 **Committee Comments:**

44  
45 Committee Member Kosewic: Prefer Alternative A with multi-tenant shops over Major  
46 C – is a little more whimsical. Am a little disappointed in Pier 1. Suggested doing a little

1 more with Pier 1 architecture, although I could live with it. I would be fine with your  
2 proposed bike parking and the bench seating. I do understand the need for showers  
3 though, however, one would suffice for Major B.

4  
5 Committee Member Shearer: Do think secured bike parking should be provided for  
6 employees who ride to work. Like the site plan – will be different from other shopping  
7 centers in town.

8  
9 Committee Member Barrett: Re: showers, if Tenant C is broken up it would not require a  
10 shower, however, if it becomes a larger tenant in the future, will need to have a shower.  
11 Need to honor the showers and the bike parking. Trash enclosure in parking lot needs to  
12 have some recycling component. I really like the other buildings and both alternatives.  
13 Particularly like shops E and F, however, am concerned about the North McDowell  
14 elevation. Take the approach like 4<sup>th</sup> Street in Berkeley or Restoration Hardware in the  
15 Village – need to have a face to the street. Think this is the only part that is weak –  
16 would like it to have more of a street presence.

17  
18 Chair Rittenhouse: The excitement of the preliminary drawings has been lost, but I  
19 appreciate the attempt at layering of materials and the colors. Find the rhythm more  
20 appealing in Alternative A-multi tenant shops for Space C. Michael's curved roof may  
21 not fit as well if you go to Alternative A. Pier 1 corner is a bit diluted – possibly look  
22 there for a tower element as an entryway to the center. Design concepts on the Shop  
23 spaces are intriguing – like the structural components. Regarding the North McDowell  
24 elevation – with the combination of landscaping and the architecture it provides focus  
25 back to the interior. If you are using planters in front of Shop E and F, would like raised  
26 planters. I feel the center will be mostly driven to, I would prefer to add indoor secure  
27 parking and not adding additional outdoor spaces. Am ok with one shower in Major B -  
28 Michael's. Am ok with outdoor seating for 101.

29  
30 Jayni Allsep: Suggested the trash enclosure be sized to accommodate recycling.

31  
32 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not want to make recycling a new condition on the site plan. If  
33 you can accommodate it, hope that you can. I concur with Brian that the sign company  
34 did a good job.

35  
36 Committee Member Kosewic: Pylon sign is a little high.

37  
38 Committee Member Barrett: Think it could be reduced by a quarter – I have no problem  
39 with the design.

40  
41 Committee Member Kosewic: Will leave up to the architect.

42  
43 Committee Member Barrett: Do not think you need the Redwood Gateway on the sign. I  
44 could live with 28 feet, however, I would prefer it to be reduced by 25%. Seems like  
45 overkill. It takes away from the architecture instead of enhancing it.

46

1 Brian Wolfe: Can go down to 25 feet height on the sign – want to keep the design as it is,  
2 just reduce size proportionally.

3  
4 Committee Member Kosewic: If you go with the shops, Pier 1 fits in. Prefer the green  
5 on the McDowell elevation.

6  
7 M/S Rittenhouse/Kosewic to approve Phase II of Redwood Gateway with one shower for  
8 Major B, covered/secured parking for bicycles should be in compliance with bike plan  
9 and worked out with staff and the bike committee;, 101-108 outdoor seating spaces.

10 Suggested using the same raised planters in front of Major D as conditioned for Kohl’s;  
11 Master Sign Program approved with condition that maximum height of pylon sign (Sign  
12 B) shall be 25 feet. 4-0.

---

13  
14  
15 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

16  
17 **VI. REPORTS:**

18  
19 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

20 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission : Riverview subdivision at McNear and  
21 Mission near St. John’s Lutheran church, continued to June 8, 2004.

---

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

- 25  
26 **Adobe Creek Center**  
27 **421 I Street demo**  
28 **Valente Appeal**  
29 **Agency Service Bureau Prelim**  
30

---

31  
32  
33 **Adjournment: 7:50**  
34  
35  
36