

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 September 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](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, John Mills, Larry Reed  
Absent: Jack Rittenhouse\*

\*Chairperson

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

---

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of August 26, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Mills/Barrett, 4-0

Committee Members' Report: None.

Correspondence: E-mail from Janet Gracyk re: 1<sup>st</sup> Street Townhomes and e-mail from Willie McDevitt of MMM Business Condos regarding the path requested by the Bike Committee were distributed at places.

Public Comment: None

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

---

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

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

**I. MARY ISAAK CENTER, 900 Hooper Street**  
**APN: 007-171-008**  
**File: 02-SPC-0087**  
**Planner: Betsi Lewitter**

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural review of the landscaping, water feature, patio fence details and awnings for the Mary Isaak Center located at 900 Hopper Street.

Public hearing began at 3:00 p.m.

Betsi Lewitter presented the staff report.

Committee Member Barrett asked about planting vines on the fence on the west elevation.

Dave Hazelwood, Landscape Architect: There is no room to plant any vines; the fence is against the curb on one side and the City’s Corporation yard is on the other.

Committee Member Reed: Clarified that the fence on the west elevation is on the property line. Like the landscaping plan. Felt there would be more benefit from birch trees on south elevation to help screen the exposed wall rather than evergreen pear.

Dave: Planted tall narrow pears because the soil is not good and pears will most likely survive. Planted birch in the front for screening.

Committee Member Barrett: Asked about the substitution on the sunshades.

Architect: Needed to replace metal louvers with canvas awnings due to difference in cost. The architect presented a sample of the fabric to committee.

Committee Member Mills: Believe it would be better to put in a metal awning and save on the maintenance of replacing fabric awnings.

Architect: Fabric is significantly cheaper.

**Public comment opened/closed**

**Committee Comments:**

Committee Member Barrett: Landscaping is fine, not happy about chain link fence, wish there was some way to remedy. Bigger issue is sunshade – want it to have a permanent sunshade. Fabric is a maintenance nightmare – will be a problem. Cost is outside our purview. I will stay with the original recommendation.

1 Committee Member Mills: Believe in the long run it will cost a lot less to put in the  
2 metal sunshades.

3  
4 Committee Member Reed: Agree that metal sunshades will be better. As it relates to  
5 trees, the trees will relieve the fabric awnings of some sun damage.

6  
7 Committee Member Kosewic: I put fabric awnings on my store 12 years ago, have  
8 washed twice. They are guaranteed for 10 years but should last 20-25 years.

9  
10 Committee Member Mills: Can you can get 10 year guarantee for fading and stretching?

11  
12 Committee Member Reed: Wanted to confirm that there will be tall trees where the  
13 sunshades are.

14  
15 Landscape Architect: Confirmed that statement.

16  
17 Committee Member Mills: If the reason for fabric awnings is to save money, I do not  
18 think it will do that in the long run.

19  
20 Committee Member Barrett: Fabric awnings are not what we approved.

21  
22 Committee Member Reed: The issue for the chain link fence is irrigation; do not know  
23 how easy it would be to put in a drip line.

24  
25 Betsi Lewitter: Clarified that the fence is a deer fence and not chain link.

26  
27 M/S Mills/Reed to approve the project with the condition that the applicant put in metal  
28 sunshades as approved instead of a fabric awning. 5-0

29  
30 Public hearing ended at 3:30 p.m.

31  
32

33 **II. MC DOWELL TOWNHOMES, 325 North McDowell Boulevard**  
34 **APN: 007-350-013**  
35 **File: 04-PRE-0391**

36  
37 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
38 preliminary review of a 35-unit condominium project on 2.22 acres located at 325  
39 North McDowell Boulevard.

40  
41 Michael Hooper: Gave the background and overall presentation of the project, density  
42 and site.

43  
44 Steven Ohlhaber, Strauss Architects: Presented the architecture.

45  
46 Michael Hooper: Discussed live/work opportunity in this type of development. Asked  
47 for the committee's impression on the scale, design, access.

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

Discussion regarding assess easement on the northern and southern end of the property.

City engineer has recommended that the utility wires in front of the project be undergrounded.

Committee Member Barrett: Asked about access for emergency vehicles and garbage trucks.

Steve: Will create a landscaping area for residents to put their trash.

Committee Member Barrett: Garbage trucks pick up containers – they do not get out of the trucks. You need to create a space for a dumpster or garbage cans.

**Public comment opened/closed.**

**Committee comments:**

Committee Member Mills: Do not see anything positive about this project. Do not believe anyone would want a town house fronting on North McDowell – it is too busy. Parking needs to be in front to separate from the Street, create a true live/work area. If it is affordable, it will become an eyesore. Do not see any redeeming qualities in the architecture. Go back to mixed use in the front and go for 3-story high density in the rear.

Committee Member Reed: The plan is so tight. Believe John is right that a mixed used project would be better on McDowell. McDowell is a tough street – you will want very substantial street trees in front. Push the town homes on McDowell back. Believe saving the trees on McDowell is a good idea and burying wires will help. The Lynch Creek side is very nice, the best that you have on the whole site plan.

Committee Member Barrett: Agree with the comments that have been made. Agree that the Lynch Creek side is the best asset, orient to that side and have garages facing the southern access that is shared with the Plaza North Shopping Center. There was not a lot of thinking about the actual site. Need to stop letting ugly buildings happen on McDowell. Applaud you for keeping the redwood trees. Treatment at northern entrance should be mimicked at southern end, use the G&G shopping center as an example. Looks like a monotonous slum. I like the idea of sunshades, however, have variable sunshades. The roofline is very boring. Incorporate more LEED ideas for the architecture. The project is lucky to have Lucchesi Park across the street. There is no community feeling in the way the site is set up now – no one sees their neighbors. Need to build a community.

Committee Member Kosewic: Equating density to units and not square footage. Referred to McNear Hill where you would see a white picket fence. This is another opportunity for a white picket fence. Bury some plate heights and change the rooflines.

1 If you have separate foundations, you can bury plate, decrease the density and make a  
2 few less than 1800 square foot units. You need at least 8 ft. for a front yard. Need a  
3 large front porch. On bonus rooms, if they are used for commercial, bring a few out  
4 where the front porch line is. Create some diversity. You have a lot of green around  
5 you, however, you need to create some access to the green space around you. The south  
6 driveway will probably be a right hand turn only. Believe it's workable but has a long  
7 way to go.

8  
9 Committee Member Mills: Think Teresa's idea of eliminating the parking behind the  
10 front units and creating a front yard area is good. Then you can push the units 15 feet off  
11 McDowell. There is no yard anywhere except up against Lynch Creek. Look at McNear  
12 Hill as an example. If you put a picket fence on McDowell they will be destroyed.  
13 Suggested looking at a Burbank Housing project near Mountain Home estates as an  
14 example. Everyone keeps talking about live/work, however, I haven't seen any yet. This  
15 is a perfect spot for live/work

16  
17 Committee Member Reed: Want to reinforce what Teresa said about using some LEED  
18 criteria; articulate the parking courts and make them interesting.

---

19  
20  
21 **III. CENTRAL ANIMAL HOSPITAL, 203 D Street**  
22 **APN: 008-123-001**  
23 **File: 04-PRE-0438**

24  
25 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
26 preliminary review of a façade upgrade to the Central Animal Hospital located at  
27 203 D Street.

28  
29 Matthew Carter, Property owner. Gave some background and presented the project.

30  
31 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if there could be an access in the rear near the  
32 parking.

33  
34 Matthew Carter: Parking on D Street will remain.

35  
36 **Public comment opened/closed.**

37  
38 **Committee Comments:**

39  
40 Committee Member Barrett: Asked about the difference in the elevation of the D Street  
41 wall from one plan to the other.

42  
43 Architect: Was changed, will be 27" matching the height of the wall that is already there.

44  
45 Committee Member Barrett: Asked about the court that was referred to on the plan.

46  
47 Matthew Carter: Once we were approached by Redevelopment about the street

1 improvements they were doing, we wanted to make an outdoor area.

2

3 Committee Member Barrett: Do not believe 27” is enough of a buffer. I would like to  
4 see what you are intending to do there and what materials will be used.

5

6 Matthew Carter: We may eliminate the outdoor space until the future and just do the  
7 front entrance at this time.

8

9 Architect: We are hoping to do this at an administrative level.

10

11 Committee Member Reed: May help you to put street trees in front. You have an  
12 opportunity to make some private space with a small hedge. I would encourage you to  
13 simplify it – put in street trees and look at the elevation of the building.

14

15 Carter: Are there concerns about the new entrance?

16

17 Committee Member Reed: Is changing the entrance the only thing you are going to do?

18

19 Architect: Screening for mechanical equipment and the new entry.

20

21 Committee Member Reed: The building has simple elements, adding a barrel vault does  
22 not unify the building. Use a simpler gable and simple material.

23

24 Committee Member Mills: Like the variety and that it accentuates where the entry is – it  
25 adds some flavor to the corner. Don’t think loose gravel is a good idea, possibly stamped  
26 concrete. Like the idea of a private court, however, suggested letting people come in  
27 with their animals to possibly sit and have lunch.

28

29 Committee Member Barrett: Agree more with Larry on the new entrance. I believe you  
30 would be better served by extending a vertical element or reproducing some other kind of  
31 gable. Barrel vault does not seem to work with this. This is a very simple building;  
32 choice of corrugated metal is a good idea. Extending windows is a good idea. Entrance  
33 needs to be simpler – echo some other elements that are already there. Agree about the  
34 gravel. You can leave the private space for later. Larry’s idea for a hedge is a good idea.  
35 You can use planters also because they are not permanent. The combination of gable, flat  
36 roof and barrel is too much.

37

38 Committee Member Reed: There is an integrity and simplicity to the old building so add  
39 to that without making it stand out too much.

40

41 Committee Member Kosewic: When I first looked at it, I thought the entry looked like a  
42 modern hotel. Was not sure what you had in mind. Need a simpler look not so much for  
43 the building but for its purpose. I think taking the lattice out helps. Believe it is too  
44 elegant for an animal hospital. I wouldn’t stop you from building it the way you have  
45 drawn it.

46

1 Architect: Believe the corrugated façade gives it a simpler look.

2

3 Committee Member Mills: If you changed the barrel to a gable, we would probably have  
4 a consensus on the committee.

5

6 Committee Member Reed: Do not believe you need all the signage in the front. We are  
7 trying to make it a pedestrian friendly street. Make the space in the front of the building  
8 as a court for employees or customers.

9

10 Committee Member Kosewic: Agree with the other comments about gravel.

11

12 Matthew Carter: Can we make the changes and do we need to come back to SPARC?

13

14 Committee Member Barrett: Can submit for a formal application although you will want  
15 to have your plans reflect what you are actually doing so that the elevations and floor  
16 plans are in agreement.

17

18

---

19 **IV. PINNACLE RIDGE SUBDIVISION PUD, 2762 “I” Street**

20

**APN: 019-401-019**

21

**File: 04-PRE-0457**

22

23 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
24 preliminary review of an 11-lot subdivision on 15.56 acres located at 2762 “I”  
25 Street.

26

27 Steve Lafranchi: Want to give the committee an opportunity to look at the site design  
28 prior to it becoming a map and PUD.

29

30 Dick Downing, Pinnacle Homes: Clarified that the slide areas will be reconstructed and  
31 will not be built on, but will be landscape areas or open space.

32

33 Susie Dowel: Landscape Architect presented the proposed landscape plan.

34

35 **Public comment opened/closed.**

36

37 **Committee comments:**

38

39 Committee Member Mills: I have no comments.

40

41 Committee Member Barrett: Commend the applicant for the 300 foot urban separator.  
42 Think that the new fire hydrant system is a creative solution and am glad you have  
43 worked with the Fire Marshall’s office. Believe you are going in the right direction.

44

45 Committee Member Reed: Believe you have designed the site in a very sensitive  
46 manner. Suggested continuing the oak seedlings along I street or ¾ of the way up the

1 site. Assuming all the slide area will be a natural terrain – will that be written into a  
2 contract?

3

4 Dick Downing: Will be put into the CC&R's and homeowner's will know. We have no  
5 objection to putting in oaks seedlings and believe it would be a nice entrance and exit into  
6 the City.

7

8 Committee Member Kosewic: Applicant needs to meet with the Bike committee.

9

10 Committee Member Reed: Like that you are saving the elm, however, a retaining wall is  
11 going in, have arborist, John Meserve monitor this.

12

13 Committee Member Kosewic: Believe you have addressed all of the concerns that  
14 SPARC usually has. I am looking forward to seeing the architecture.

15

16

---

17 **V. FIRST STREET TOWN HOMES, 401-2<sup>ND</sup> Street**  
18 **APN: 008126003, 004, 005, 008, 010, 012, 013**  
19 **File: 04-PRE-0534**

20

21 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
22 preliminary review of a 1.45-acre site between First and Second, F and G Streets  
23 into 48 town home units.

24

25 Frank Denny, Cobblestone: Introduced the project.

26

27 Justin Hansen, Dalin Group: Presented the unit plan and the architecture.

28

29 Bonnie Diefendorf, Engineer: Addressed the elevations, stoops and the streetscape.

30

31 Committee Member Reed: Asked if the streetscape reflects the City's Master Plan for the  
32 streetscape in this area.

33

34 Bonnie Diefendorf: Yes, it directly follows what the Central Petaluma Specific Plan asks  
35 for.

36

37 Committee Member Reed: Who is doing the design of the street improvements?

38

39 Vin Smith: Redevelopment's improvements are for 1<sup>st</sup> Street, past F.

40

41 Committee Member Barrett: Asked for clarification on the materials and purpose of the  
42 wall.

43

44 Frank Denny: Sound wall will be prefab and cementitious. The sound wall is to separate  
45 the property from the surrounding properties.

46

1 Committee Member Barrett: If there are cobblestone curbs, will it be replaced?

2

3 Bonnie Diefendorf: Yes, if we find cobblestone, we will replace it.

4

5 **Public comment opened:**

6

7 Tamara Norman, 501 Keller Street: Am here because I care about the warehouse district.  
8 Believe it has symbolic interest for the City. Asked the committee to take care reviewing  
9 the project, the design, the proportions and the materials – need to honor the area. The  
10 developer should put in cobblestone to reflect the history whether or not the cobblestones  
11 are there now. This site was noted as a possibility for the “D” Street fire station  
12 relocation.

13

14 Patricia Tuttle Brown, 513 Petaluma Blvd. South: Am a neighbor of the project and am  
15 submitting 3 items for the public record. Want to state that the Hamilton cabinet site  
16 needs to be rehabilitated as part of this development per the following: 1) PBAC  
17 conditions submitted to Kim Gordon on May 13, 2004 quoting the CPSP regarding the  
18 commitment to maintaining mixed uses and a commitment to maintaining the historic and  
19 “architecturally interesting” character of the area, including “restoration of sites  
20 deteriorated by neglect and mis-use.” The project falls short of this goal since it is all  
21 residential and is proposing to demolish the Hamilton Cabinet shop. 2) A letter dated  
22 June 22, 2004, from Katherine Rinehart, historian, recommending that The Hamilton  
23 Cabinet Shop be evaluated for its potential significance as a contributor to a historic  
24 district; that the Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee rather than the Site Plan  
25 and Architectural Review Committee review this development proposal; and that  
26 Cobblestone Homes be encourage to adaptively reuse the Hamilton Cabinet Shop  
27 building and incorporate it into their development. 3) Letter from Marianne Hurley  
28 expressing concern over the prospect of another demolition within the Riverfront  
29 Warehouse District. Ms. Hurley reiterated that Petaluma has already lost many buildings  
30 in the area and the importance of these buildings as part of the context for the entire area.

31

32 The CPSP supports preservation in Chapter 9. Ms. Brown read Policy 3.1 of Chapter 9  
33 “recognizing the industrial complex of structures along First and Second Streets” and  
34 stated that this is not a mixed use project. Reiterated that the project needs to retain the  
35 Hamilton Cabinet Shop and needs to be mixed use. This is one of the 4 sites being  
36 looked at for the new Fire House. The Hamilton Cabinet site needs to have a night  
37 watchman. We have had 4 historic buildings burned down. We need to have protection  
38 for the Hamilton Cabinet Shop. Asked the committee to stop the demolitions. Project  
39 should be conditioned to replace any cobblestone curb removed per City requirements.

40

41 Katherine Rinehart, Historian: Have been researching the warehouse district since 1997.  
42 The 1<sup>st</sup> Street town homes is proposing to eliminate Hamilton Cabinet Shop which may  
43 not be individually significant but does contribute to the fabric and overall character of  
44 the district. Asked the developer to incorporate the Hamilton Cabinet Shop into the  
45 proposed project.

46

1 Janet Grayck, 615 Prospect: I am in agreement with some of the other speakers. Some of  
2 the warehouse district needs to be preserved, particularly the Hamilton Cabinet Shop.  
3 Need to respect the historic fabric of the area. Want mixed use. Look at decorative  
4 concrete. Too monotonous. Garage entries with plantings are not consistent with the  
5 renderings. Planting areas are very narrow.

6  
7 Stuart Hyde, 800 Middlefield Drive: Agree with what everyone has said. I have been  
8 inside the Hamilton Cabinet Shop – it is constructed from old growth redwood that is no  
9 longer available, can incorporate into the development, can reuse – would be a gesture of  
10 goodwill toward the community. Spoke with the Historic Preservation Group- they  
11 highly recommend reusing Hamilton Cabinet Shop. The community has a vested interest  
12 in reusing this building.

13  
14 Jane Hamilton, 110 G Street: It is difficult to be here and not see all of what the  
15 committee is seeing. The design needs to come up several notches in quality – I hope for  
16 a higher level of architectural standards. It is a special area of the City. Materials seem  
17 to be a hodgepodge. Too much going on. The roof and massing on 1<sup>st</sup> Street are too  
18 overbearing, needs to be brought down some. Would rather see 40 units and break it up  
19 with a view corridor to see Sonoma Mountain. The roofline and building is huge – it will  
20 close everything in. The shingle roof does not work. Pedestrian circulation is very  
21 important here. It is imperative to think about parking in the neighborhood and not just  
22 for this project. There is already a parking problem. The CPSP calls for commercial on  
23 the ground floor, especially on a development this large. Do not know about the  
24 interpretation that mixed use is an option and not a requirement. The development needs  
25 to be interactive with pedestrians with retail on the ground floor. Cobblestone curbs due  
26 not exist on 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> and G Streets. The sound wall would look out of place. Should  
27 probably be a wooden wall. It needs to fit with what is there and what benefits the entire  
28 community. There was talk of uncovering the creek at F Street and I believe that is  
29 possible and it is a good idea. Hamilton Cabinet Shop needs to be retained as part of our  
30 history. The building has been here for a long time. I am not against development  
31 happening there, just want it to be good quality.

32  
33 Joe Durney, 618 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Street: Want to support Jane's idea of uncovering the creek at F  
34 Street. It could be a wonderful amenity to the proposed development. Hope the  
35 developers will consider that and saving Hamilton Cabinet Shop.

36  
37 Brian Rosen, 1000 Mountain View: Like the idea of ownership units in the area. Want  
38 the architecture upgraded. Want more vertical articulation in the roofline, possible  
39 vertical orientation on the units. Get away from the repetition. Like the density, could  
40 be reduced a bit. Would like more mixed use per the CPSP. Raise the project up to  
41 standards in the nearby building done by Tim Tatum.

42  
43 **Public comment closed.**

44  
45  
46

**1 Committee Comments:**

2  
3 Committee Member Reed: I was a member of the CPSP Committee. Felt that public  
4 comment was very articulate regarding this district. There is great potential in this  
5 neighborhood. I am concerned at reducing the resource of historic buildings. How is this  
6 plan reflecting the amenities of this district – had difficult seeing this. Mixed use is very  
7 important for the district – this proposal is all residential. I don't see the integrity of the  
8 neighborhood, such as 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> street in massing or land use. Feel we need to vary the  
9 uses on the site, different variations on different streets. Reusing Hamilton Cabinet Shop  
10 would be an amenity for the project. It would be helpful to have a master plan of the  
11 district and how you address pedestrian and bike circulation. Vary the units and the  
12 articulation. The one picture of this area in the CPSP shows quite a variety of unit types,  
13 lots more trees, and 1 and 2 story uses – do not see this in this application. Seems more  
14 appropriate than this project.

15  
16 Committee Member Kosewic: Asked how many sq. ft of retail in the Theater District.

17  
18 Vin Smith: Approximately 120,000 square feet.

19  
20 Committee Member Kosewic: Retail space is almost zero now – should be no problem  
21 renting retail space.

22  
23 Vin Smith: Want to set the record straight – it is not as easy as you think. It is difficult  
24 for a prospective tenant to commit to the cost of tenant improvements, relocation and new  
25 business start-up.

26  
27 Committee Member Kosewic: Approved the demolition of warehouse 14 where the lofts  
28 are and approved the demolition of the warehouses where the apartments are going in. A  
29 sheet metal warehouse building is difficult to do adaptive reuse. All the other buildings,  
30 the ceramic tile buildings, have some form and shapes that can be reused. There is no  
31 mention of Hamilton Cabinet Shop in the application. Asking for retail now is a stretch.  
32 There are many buildings that can be preserved and there are viable alternatives. Can  
33 understand why people are afraid of setting a precedent. Hamilton Cabinet Shop is an  
34 important part of this project.

35  
36 Committee Member Barrett: I do think this building is critical and should not be  
37 overlooked. Comments made before are important, why emulate buildings that you are  
38 tearing down. Incorporate what is around you into the project. Want to see Hamilton  
39 cabinet shop incorporated into the project. Part of what would attract people is  
40 adaptively reusing the Hamilton shop – will add to the project rather than detract from it.  
41 The notion of mixed use is not in the CPSP as a nice idea, it is a requirement here.  
42 Possibly reuse Hamilton shop as a compromise. Do agree that Historic SPARC rather  
43 than SPARC should review the project. This project brings a subdivision attitude to an  
44 infill project. The developer needs to break out of the mold of the subdivision – look at  
45 incorporating Hamilton Cabinet Shop to increase the value of the project. Be more fun  
46 and creative. I believe looking at the Tatum development nearby is a good benchmark

1 and reflective of what is in this district. When the architecture is driven by 3 bedrooms  
2 and a loft, people will have 2 cars. Mixed use will help solve this problem. Look at the  
3 units with a more creative solution. Thought Ms. Hamilton was generous regarding the  
4 height of the buildings. You need to complement what already exists - more varied  
5 roofline, breaks in the building. Do not think a subdivision style cement sound wall is  
6 appropriate for this location. Don't know how to weigh in on the fire department issue.  
7 Did not know this was site was being considered.

8  
9 Committee Member Mills: Agree on the sound wall – need to come up with a better idea.  
10 The material does not work. The building needs to come up to an extreme level of  
11 architecture. Want more lofts rather than fewer, so that it is more in keeping with the  
12 neighborhood. I am concerned about the idea that 1<sup>st</sup> Street is supposed to be mixed use.  
13 Agree with Terry that there will be a lot of other Mixed Use in the area. You can reuse  
14 the Hamilton Cabinet Shop to get the retail into the project and save the building.  
15 Adaptive reuse is possible as evidenced by the Victory Chevrolet building and the ice  
16 house. Blending and using the Hamilton Cabinet Shop would make an unbelievable  
17 restaurant or an architectural office. Could save the floor and trusses. I wouldn't insist on  
18 it, however, the committee will. Reiterate that the architecture needs to be of the highest  
19 standards.

20  
21 Committee Member Barrett: Need to put in the cobblestone curbs.

22  
23 Committee Member Kosewic: I am in agreement about the sound wall. Needs to be a  
24 different material. Okay with parking-if can't park will bike. Regarding the architecture  
25 – need to lose the symmetry. It's one big apartment house, not individual units. Do  
26 something to break up the roof. There is so much potential. This is a historic area, use  
27 historic materials and more historic design. Petaluma was built when there was no  
28 planning so you have a lot of variety. I like the blending and the mixing. You have two  
29 or three plans types, however, basically they are all the same. Want it to look like it was  
30 not all built at the same time. The lofts are a good example of a mix of architecture.  
31 Floor plans are unique, make the architecture unique also.

32  
33 Jane Hamilton: The CPSP requires commercial/retail on the ground floor.

34  
35 Vin Smith: The CPSP requires architectural treatment, however it does not require any  
36 specific land use anywhere on any parcel. You can have residential on the ground floor.

37  
38 Kosewic: Incorporate what has been built already into your plans. Cannot just look at  
39 this one building – needs to see the building and what is surrounding it. Need an  
40 understanding of what else has been approved in the CPSP.

---

41  
42  
43 **VI. REPORTS:**

44  
45 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

46 **Liaison Reports:** Scoping meeting on the 15th Tole Ranch Park.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

---

**VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

- Lakeville Autobody**
- Poultry Street**
- Casa Grande-Centex Homes**
- Deer Creek Plaza**

Adjournment : 7 :01

S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes04\090904.doc