

1



City of Petaluma, CA  
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

3

---

---

Minutes

---

---

4

Regular Meeting

September 23, 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](mailto: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.

14

---

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

17

\*Chairperson

19

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

23

24

---

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 9, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Mills, 3-0, Rittenhouse abstained, Kosewic absent for review of minutes.

27

Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Barrett asked about dirt on the Kohl's site. Irene Borba will check into this for Committee Member Barrett.

29

Correspondence: Irene Borba verified that the Committee received an e-mail from the Bike Committee re: Poultry Street project.

31

Public Comment:

32

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

33

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

34

35

---

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

38

39

**I. LAKEVILLE AUTO BODY, 1104 and 1106 Petaluma Boulevard North**

40

**APN: 019-030-001**

41

**File: 04-SPC-0341-CR**

1           **Planner: Phil Boyle**

2

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

6

7           Continued from August 26, 2004

8

9           Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

10

11          Committee Member Kosewic arrived at 3:15 p.m.

12

13          Committee Member Barrett: Asked that a statement of cooperation be included with the  
14          approval for future bike/pedestrian access.

15

16          Greg LeDoux, Architect: Reviewed the changes to the project since the last SPARC  
17          meeting.

18

19          **Public hearing opened/closed.**

20

21          **Committee Comments:**

22

23          Committee Member Mills: I believe there will be more noise to pick up the trash next to  
24          the building rather than at the northern property line, however, if staff's recommendation  
25          meets the intention of the code, I will go along with the trash enclosure next to the  
26          building. I like the color samples and appreciate that the applicant brought them to the  
27          meeting. I disagree with the location of the trash enclosure though I understand staff's  
28          decision.

29

30          Committee Member Barrett: If trash enclosure is a noise nuisance, it should be a  
31          nuisance for employees and not the neighborhood. I think the architecture is what it is,  
32          however, I am happy with color board and I like the addition of the Chinese Pistache.  
33          Want to add the language for the future bike access.

34

35          Committee Member Reed: Asked for vines on the trash enclosure to soften the impact. I  
36          am ok with the Chinese Pistache, instead of Sycamore. I would prefer to have 4 Chinese  
37          Pistache to replace the Crepe Myrtle.

38

39          Committee Member Kosewic: Agree with John's comments on the noise of the trash  
40          pick-up. Would rather see it where it is in the new drawing. Either location is ok. I have  
41          no problem with the architecture and the landscaping. I support Larry's comments on the  
42          landscaping.

43

44          Committee Member Rittenhouse: I think the applicant has met the intentions; sorry you  
45          didn't look at the architecture. Agree with Teresa about the noise nuisance.

46

1 M/S Mills/Barrett to adopt the Negative Declaration and approve the project with the  
2 following changes: language added regarding the future bike access; adding 2 additional  
3 Chinese Pistache in lieu of decorative Crepe Myrtle; trash enclosure to be placed next to  
4 the building; Boston Ivy planted next to the trash enclosure for shielding.

---

6  
7 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
8 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
9 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

10  
11 **II. POULTRY STREET MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL CONDOS, 300**  
12 **Poultry/North Water Street**  
13 **APN: 006-160-005; 025; 052; 053**  
14 **File: 04-PRE-0487**

15  
16 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
17 preliminary review of a 98-unit mixed use residential condominium project on  
18 2.44 acres located at 300 Poultry Street.

19  
20 Jim Ford, Fifth Resource: Prefers that the street be called Water Street North (and the  
21 project) and introduced the project. All live/works are 1000 sq ft.

22  
23 Committee Member Barrett: Think it is a good idea to make it Water Street North.  
24 Concerned about existing alley at south of west building. The CPSP called for mixed  
25 use. Why are you limiting to just 13% live/work units?

26  
27 Jim Ford: The economy suggests a stronger residential market. We have identified the  
28 best location in the project for the live/work spaces. The challenges for the site are to  
29 meet the density and parking of the CPSP.

30  
31 Committee Member Mills: Even though we are encouraging walking and other modes of  
32 transportation, concerned that only 98 parking spaces are required and not many more  
33 proposed. Is the public park being developed by the developer? Who is covering costs of  
34 river walk?

35  
36 Jim Ford: Developer will develop the park and Homeowners Association will maintain it,  
37 and it will have full public access

38  
39 John Fitzgerald: The River walk layout and landscaping were already in the mix before  
40 this project. Redevelopment will pay for the River walk and the project will take care of  
41 the streetscape improvements.

42  
43 Committee Member Mills: Concerned about lack of real “mixed use” – seeing too many  
44 projects in the CPSP that are just condos. You need to make sure the formal project is  
45 real mixed-use.

1 Jim Ford: Live/work spaces could be combined into retail space.

2

3 Committee Member Mills: We are looking for a variety of height and massing (more  
4 than just peaked and flat roofs). As it is, it looks like one giant warehouse. We are  
5 looking for variety and design quality.

6

7 Committee Member Barrett: Do you have any comments on Ms. Robbe's overview.

8

9 Jim Ford: We will address the technical elements with the Community Development  
10 Department. Regarding the north access around the west building, we are meeting fire's  
11 width requirement.

12

13 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked for clarification regarding the loop road. Is there a reason for  
14 garages and carports?

15

16 Jim Ford: We tried to soften the East side of the project a little with one-story carports.

17

18 Committee Member Kosewic: Asked about the trolley tracks going through the easterly  
19 on-street parking spaces. Don't have a problem with track realignment, but with loss of  
20 parking spaces if the trolley came back.

21

22 John Fitzgerald: When the trolley is in operation, there would be no parking during  
23 certain hours, probably weekends. Was the only solution to keep the tracks out of the  
24 traffic lane.

25

26 Committee Member Kosewic: There are no percentages given for mixed use in the  
27 CPSP. Don't know if we can call for higher percentages of mixed use.

28

29 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if Paul Marangella would address the parking  
30 structure noted in the CPSP at the north part of the project.

31

32 Paul: Do not have funds slated for a parking garage in the next five years. Doesn't mean  
33 we can't do a parking structure with an assessment district and redevelopment's  
34 assistance in the future.

35

36 Committee Member Barrett: If development predates the funding, how does this work.  
37 The first developers would not have to pay a fair share.

38

39 Paul: We are working with this developer to extract benefit for the City with this project  
40 and since applicant is providing parking required for their project, there may not be a  
41 nexus to require more.

42

43 Committee Member Mills: Was there thought given to recreation facilities?

44

45 Jim Ford: We are putting in the park triangle. There is an exercise room in the west and  
46 east phase.

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

**Public comment opened:**

Chris Stevick, 28 Liberty Street: Discouraging to see parking spaces over trolley tracks. Unless you draw the lines for the trolley in the project, you are not planning for the trolley. Ok with moving tracks, but wants plans and insurances for their relocation. Tracks in traffic lane would be better. Interested in double tracks. Presented to the committee members an evaluation of cultural resources along the proposed Petaluma Trolley Master Plan.

Committee Member Mills: There are trolley tracks in the middle of the street in San Francisco. Is there any reason not to put the tracks in the street?

Chris Stevick: Would be ok in the street, however, you just need to plan for where they will go.

Brian Rawson: Am excited to see development downtown, however, I would like to see more mixed use. You can possibly accomplish this with flex space. Believe rough spaces and industrial look would work well here. Not convinced that the balconies are appropriate. Would like to see more horizontal integration. Incorporate more skyways. Maybe the developer and the city could work together to create more parking. Concur with previous speaker on the trolley issues.

Wayne Vieler, 256 Petaluma Boulevard North: Strongly support the CPSP and the development of this property. Believe this project meets the intent of the CPSP. My concerns are about the impacts of the Poultry/Water Street improvements on parking. Existing businesses should have concerns addressed. At my parcel, 35 private parking spaces would be lost with street improvement/widening, which would reduce the allowable occupancy of my business (Kodiak Jacks). The neighbors on the Boulevard, Martha, Kentucky, and Prospect Street complain now of spill over parking. Request that mitigations be made to offset lost parking. I believe it is important that prospective residential buyers know that there are 24 hour commercial uses with noise impacts.

Larissa Goliti: I own property that Wayne Vieler and others rent. My concern is also with parking (relating to street improvement). In the Water Street south area, businesses are not required to providing parking, however, Water Street north is - and the plan line for the road would wipe out parking. If her private parking spaces are taken, wants written statement from the City that she can count the public replacement spaces for her tenants.

Paul Marangella: Have had discussions with property owners between Washington St and the Mahoney property and they are supportive of street as shown in CPSP. The plan line that you have before you is part of the CPSP. It was an oversight that we have not spoken with the property owners north of the Mahoney Building. The developer is doing what is required of him in the CPSP. There will be private parking that is impacted; however, that is not a function of the development; it is a function of the CPSP.

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

**Public comment closed:**

**Committee Comments:**

Committee Member Kosewic: If residents of proposed project are told they only get 1 parking space, only people with 1 car will buy there. The intent of this type of density is to not be dependent on a car. Existing business need to have parking – can't take away existing private parking for street. Believe it is important to change the name to Water Street, don't even know if you need north and south. I am an advocate of useable, outward facing outdoor living spaces. I think it's important for the trolley to go down the middle of the street and not give up the parallel parking spaces. We don't have much detail on the architecture. Regarding the layout, I think it's workable.

Committee Member Reed: It would be helpful to have a sense of the district as a whole rather than just isolated development. Believe the trolley should go where it functions best. Want to know how this project edges on the River Enhancement Plan. Believe this may be an opportunity to provide a parking garage with access to the top floors from PBN. I want to know more about the pedestrian connections to PBN. Believe this can be an extension of Water Street improvement going on to the south. The river loop road does not make sense to me. Suggest that it not go through except for fire or emergency. Create a straight in and straight out situation. Building should front on Water Street which is more viable for retail. Wants a mix of massing from 2 to 4 stories on the site, as the CPSP suggests. As proposed, the massing of the buildings is monotonous. Like the covered bridge. The east portion of the project seems to have more potential for retail/commercial. Agree with Mr. Vieler's comments about designing with existing noise in mind and about encouraging a mix of uses – including industrial at river, like Hamilton's cabinet shop. The area that abuts the existing industrial uses would be best served with retail/commercial/industrial uses.

Committee Member Barrett: If the parking structure here is not in the five year plan, we need to rethink the five year plan. Garage should supply the private parking lost with adoption of the Water St plan line. I have no problem with the parking for the development itself; however, Water Street as proposed is negatively impacting existing businesses. On Bldg E in the west phase, rethink elevation and use at alley easement, you have garage doors instead of building fronts. The garages could be roll up commercial spaces – you need to be more adventurous. Increase the mixed use percentage of project - there are different kinds of commercial uses that could fit in here. CPSP demands convertibility of space - need flex space that can be converted. Don't skimp on bike and pedestrian amenities (especially with limited parking). The spirit of the CPSP is to embrace the industrial uses and fit in with them. Need to integrate the CPSP, the bike access, and the River Enhancement Plan. Makes no sense to put tracks in the parking area – will want parking spaces especially on the weekends. Agree with Mr. Stevick – need to have proper historical documentation of the tracks before they are touched. Need to make a fair share contribution to bike and pedestrian access/paths. Agree with previous architectural comments from the little we have seen.

1  
2 Committee Member Mills: Everyone has covered what I wanted to say. Water St  
3 impacts to existing private parking needs to be resolved. Regarding the architecture - you  
4 need more up & down and in & out - not just two big boxes. Incorporate more active  
5 physical outdoor space. Consider bocce ball court or something in the courtyard and a  
6 basketball court on the top of one of the flat roof buildings.

7  
8 Chair Rittenhouse: Appreciate Tiffany's report. Committee has covered the offsite and  
9 access issues. Continue the level of operation of off-site uses (no net loss of parking). I  
10 want to address the site. Not sure this is what we want as far as uses. What is the mixed  
11 use - is flex space mixed use? Is that really what we want? I think there may be a higher  
12 and better use. The bulk and massing is a problem - it is too uniform. Look at adding  
13 ramps in rear of PBN dealership to 2-level parking garage buried in west building, could  
14 add 60 parking spaces, two level parking garages are not too difficult. Move those units  
15 which now face into the hill above the east side carports. Should be an alley at the loop  
16 road. A story in the smart code is 14 feet - vary heights within building to push roof line  
17 up and down. Don't think individual garages on the alleyway are ok here - put parking in  
18 parking garage. Character of the buildings needs to have a coarseness consistent with the  
19 surrounding metal fabric, needs some mixture of elements, less blockiness, a layering of  
20 forms, and should be sculptural. The bridge is good. Need to get the trolley out of the  
21 parking spaces. Increase parking with second level in parking garage. Could even  
22 increase the unit count.

23  
24 Committee Member Mills: Why not put in two story parking and possibly lease some  
25 spaces out. If more parking on west side with more units on east side, consider a bridge  
26 over Water St.

27  
28 Jim Ford: You are suggesting we treat it as one development and add parking to the west  
29 phase and tuck it under the residential.

30  
31 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggest picking up elements of the grain tower for the  
32 bridge.

33  
34 Committee Member Reed: Wanted to poll the committee on the loop road. I feel it puts  
35 a road between the river and the buildings.

36  
37 Rittenhouse: I am not overly fond of it.  
38

---

39  
40 **III. DEER CREEK PLAZA, North McDowell Boulevard**  
41 **APN: 007-380-005; 007-380-027**  
42 **File: 04-PRE-0516**  
43

44 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
45 preliminary review of approximately 325,353 square feet of retail or commercial  
46 development on a 36.55 acre site.

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

Steve Arago, CSW Stuber-Stroeh: Introduced the project team. Presented the site plan and changes to the site plan to show the future Rainer Avenue.

Craig Johnson, Architect: Presented the elevations and the architecture.

Steve Arago: Presented the public spaces throughout the site.

Committee Member Barrett: Asked if the applicant could identify any tenants.

David Casty: Downy Savings and Loan will be a tenant in Pad A, the major 1 is Lowe's Home Improvement and no other tenants have been identified.

Committee Member Mills: Asked if there will be access to Major 1 from Lynch Creek Way.

David Casty: Yes.

Chair Rittenhouse: Asked if the pedestrian amenities shown on the site plan that came with the packet will be put in if we are looking at the alternative site plan.

Steve Arago: We want to put in these amenities, however, we just modified the site plan and have not had time to develop it further.

**Public comment opened/closed.**

**Committee comments:**

Committee Member Barrett: PBAC submitted comments, did you receive these?

Steve Arago: Yes and we believe there is a misunderstanding and we are providing all the seating, however, it is a combination of seat walls and other types of seating. Our paths are 6 feet because our area for amenities on parcel B has become smaller and they want to maintain as much greenery as possible. They are proposing paths on both sides of the drainage channel.

Committee Member Kosewic: Would like more curvilinear look on Majors 4, 5 and 6. If you move one pedestrian path you could achieve the original site plan. I like the effort put into the common areas, especially the water features. I like the effort put into the architecture on Major 1, however, the high gable detracts from the building – wish you could lessen the corporate identity. It would be an advantage to the shopping center. Prefer C4 over the alternate plan. Parking on the alternative is abrupt. Believe you have come a long way from the original plan. If you need the alternative plan, just add a little bit of curve.

Committee Member Reed: I was having a little trouble with the size of the project. I

1 think it's appropriate that you changed the scale on North McDowell. I would like to see  
2 the North McDowell side organized better. I would like the McDowell frontage to have a  
3 little commercial feel to the street. Organize the outdoor seating to have more of a  
4 district up in that area. Believe this is a great opportunity to incorporate some LEED  
5 standards. Suggest filtering the water with swales. There is so much parking which is  
6 used so little except at Christmas. Create some pervious treatment to reduce some of the  
7 parking. I like bringing the swale out to the street, can create some seat walls with large  
8 rocks. Suggest going as dense with the planting as possible. Pack the area with redwood  
9 to create a dense open space. Suggest more planting all around that swale and Highway  
10 101 to soften up some of the massing.

11  
12 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe the off ramp helped your site plan. Pleased how you have  
13 begun to develop McDowell as a more quaint shopping area. Look at the Lynch Creek  
14 access because all the contractors will use that. The main entry to overall site plan is very  
15 nice. It gets lost when you get to the end of that small zone. It dumps you into the  
16 parking lot. That transition should slowly change and bring you into the majors and it  
17 will tag into the potential for filtration and other things Larry was talking about. The  
18 lateral circulation needs to be enhanced almost as a separate street that brings you  
19 through the project. Put landscaping next to that lateral through way. The road into  
20 Major 3 should go straight out to future Rainier. Agree with Larry about the organization  
21 of the small shops on North McDowell. I appreciate the sketches. We asked for a more  
22 modern architecture and I appreciate the layering that you have done. I see modern  
23 buildings and modern forms; however, the public spaces seem very traditional. I would  
24 like to see a modern streetscape or plaza to accommodate the modern architecture.  
25 Believe the water feature complements the architecture. Look at the paving materials  
26 with a more modern approach.

27  
28 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with a lot of what has been said. I like the way  
29 North McDowell has been treated. I also like the design of the buildings on North  
30 McDowell. Agree with Larry that the swale area will be very dry and will be yellow and  
31 brown instead of green. I think the redwoods would be a good idea to draw people with  
32 the coolness. I like the water feature but I think it should be able to stand alone if the  
33 water is shut off. The slides that were shown are not like the topography of the site. A  
34 more modern look for the outdoor spaces would be preferable. Lynch Creek and Rainer  
35 will be used a lot so they need to be looked at closely. This is almost two sites with the  
36 McDowell section and the Big Box section. The big box section is what needs more  
37 help. There is a strange area between Major 3 and 4 – is a lost area, mitigate by not  
38 having the majors in a row, possibly a pass through into the green area with a coffee  
39 shop. Make the walk way pleasant so you have an outdoor area there as well. The back  
40 sides of Shops 4, 5 and 6 need softening so they do not look like a big box. Thanked the  
41 applicant for keeping the oak trees.

42  
43 Committee Member Mills: Most of the comments are very valid. I complement the  
44 randomness of the shops on North McDowell. Want to echo what Teresa said about the  
45 backs of the buildings facing 101 (4, 5, and 6) as well as major 1. Like the idea of  
46 softening the walk way from front to back and the cross way from parcel 3 to parcel 1.

1 Do not agree with a pedestrian access from shop 5 to the Major 1 at the east end. Agree  
 2 with Teresa that people will not walk the site from major 4, 5, and 6 to McDowell.  
 3 Parcel B looks rather large and you could possible have a step down seating area so there  
 4 could be some small shows. You could tie it into the modern features that Jack alluded  
 5 to.

6  
 7 Committee Member Kosewic: I also like the randomness of the buildings on North  
 8 McDowell.

9  
 10 Committee Member Reed: My comment was more about the randomness of the  
 11 circulation not the randomness of the buildings. Pad A seems so separate from the other  
 12 buildings on the front of North McDowell. Pad A is a real opportunity for an  
 13 architectural feature.

14  
 15 Chair Rittenhouse: Possibly slide Pad B back and bring Pad E over as your bank and an  
 16 architectural feature and move the all retail together with the public spaces.

17  
 18 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Larry and Jack on the randomness of North  
 19 McDowell. The bank could be a real stand alone building. I suggest looking at the new  
 20 Bank of America being built down the street.

21

---

22

23 **IV. CASA GRANDE – CENTEX HOMES, adjacent to 333 Casa Grande Road**

24 **APN: 017-040-029**

25 **File: 04-PRE-0499**

26

27 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
 28 preliminary review of 204 homes comprised of 75 town homes, 30 workforce  
 29 town homes and 99 single family homes on approximately 16.89 acres.

30

31 Trece Herter with Centex Homes: Introduced the project team. Gave some background  
 32 on Centex Homes and gave an overview of the project.

33

34 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested a bike lane at least on the alleyway through the  
 35 site to the high school.

36

37 Chair Rittenhouse: The issue of the path and the connectivity through the site to the high  
 38 school needs to be resolved up front.

39

40 Committee Member Mills: Asked how the landscaping in the paseos will be maintained?

41

42 Trece: Home Owner's Association will maintain the landscaping.

43

44 **Public comment opened closed.**

45

46 **Committee Comments:**

1

2 Committee Member Mills: The presentation made it much clearer as to what you are  
3 doing. I like the concept. Split up your clusters into 5 and 5 instead of 10 and 2, etc. to  
4 eliminate the problem with UPS delivery. As a buffer for Crinella you can have fewer  
5 windows on that side and provide screening with trees. Possibly give the neighbors more  
6 space. A bike path all the way around would be nice although the school may not agree  
7 with that. Driveway and alley way widths may be too small.

8

9 Committee Member Barrett: The project feels a little dense because of the single family  
10 homes in the middle. The site problems have to do with too many clusters in a row.  
11 Suggest some kind of passage between that part of the development. The route to the  
12 school should mimic what is already there. If the school is encouraging connectivity, I  
13 think we should go there. I have no objection to a bike path in the Crinella area. Meeting  
14 with the neighbors is crucial to making the project work.

15

16 Committee Member Reed: Do not believe a higher density is bad, however, you need  
17 more open space to make it function. It is imperative to maintain the connection through  
18 the site to the school. The buffer to Crinella is also very important – dense trees are  
19 important. It will be a pathway. Is there a conflict with the workforce housing next to  
20 the ball fields because of lighting, etc? The distribution of open space feels funny. The  
21 paseos may be a little too long; break up with perpendicular walkways. Possibly provide  
22 shared neighborhood opportunities.

23

24 Committee Member Kosewic: Believe the paseos will be a difficult sell. Don't know  
25 why the single family homes and the town homes are separated. Possibly mix the two to  
26 change the streetscape, may provide better traffic flow. This mixture could break up the  
27 monotony. Possibly make it a little less dense. If you need the density, break it up. I  
28 would leave it up to the school about the connectivity through the site.

29

30 Chair Rittenhouse: Would like to have a couple of ideas brought forward. I am not a big  
31 fan of paseos. I do not think 20' alleys work. I don't think deliveries work well. Look at  
32 the Gatti subdivision as an example; we worked through the internal issues. Pay  
33 particular attention to the Crinella massing. Put the single family homes on the perimeter  
34 of the site and create a center to the project with the town homes. You can create a  
35 transition from 2 stories to the town homes. The open space is dead space. Need to  
36 gather it up and put it into one place. You need inter-connectivity through the site with  
37 lateral pathways. How you deal with Casa Grande Road needs to be looked at – is  
38 completely different than the interior edge.

39

40 Architecturally, on the multifamily units, look at your plate line – very blocky, need to  
41 see how you treat the end of the buildings because they are facing the open space. Like  
42 some of the interior plans on the town homes. In terms of the SFD designs – they do not  
43 create a unique neighborhood by throwing together 5 prototypes. I'm not sure what the  
44 character is – it is not unique for Petaluma.

45

46 Committee Member Barrett: Need more open space. Terry and Jack's ideas of

1 interspersing the types of units are interesting. If you move the single family homes to  
2 the edge near the school and the ball fields you could have a lot more open space in the  
3 project.

4  
5 Committee Member Mills: If you push units back, make the last unit the most  
6 undesirable.

---

8  
9 **V. DISCUSSION REGARDING 2 SPARC REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE  
10 ON A COMMITTEE FOR CALTRANS FOR THE DESIGN OF THE  
11 NOVATO NARROWS**

12  
13 Jack, John and Terry volunteered.

---

15  
16 **VI. REPORTS:**

17  
18 **Planning Staff Reports: None**  
19 **Liaison Reports: PC reviewed Park Square, was continued to a date**  
20 **uncedrtain.**

---

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

24  
25 **Maria Commons/Greenbriar Apartments – Preliminary Review**  
26 **Plaza South Shopping Center (Phase II), Raley’s – Preliminary Review**

---

28  
29 **Adjournment: 8:01**

---

30  
31  
32 Adjournment :

33  
34  
35  
36 S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes04\092304.doc  
37  
38