



**City of Petaluma, California**  
City Council Chambers  
City Hall, 11 English Street  
Petaluma, CA 94952

Telephone 707/778-4301 / Fax 707/778-4498  
E-Mail [planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us](mailto:planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us)  
Web Page <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

---

1  
2 **Planning Commission Minutes**  
3 **October 22, 2002 – 7:00 PM**

4  
5 Commissioners: *Present:* Asselmeier, Barrett, Dargie, Glass, McAllister, von Raesfeld  
6 *Absent:* O'Brien

7 \* Chair

8  
9 Staff: George White, Planning Manager  
10 Laura Lafler, Project Planner  
11 Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary  
12

---

13  
14 **ROLL CALL:**

15 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

16 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of September 24, 2002 were approved as  
17 amended.

18 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Kenneth Roman, 1884 Adobe Creek Dr., presented a letter to  
19 the Commission re: Southgate project at Frates Road. Discussion took place regarding  
20 placing Southgate on a future Planning Commission Agenda.

21 **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** The Opportunities and Challenges Report for the General  
22 Plan was passed out at places with a letter of instruction.

23 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** Chair Glass – stated that a kickoff to review  
24 development impact fees begins October 31, 2002.

25 **CORRESPONDENCE:** Letters in opposition to Rockridge Pointe were distributed at  
26 places – Laura Lafler will read into the record.

27 **APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was read.

28 **LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.  
29

---

30  
31 Time public hearing began: 7:10

32  
33 **NEW BUSINESS;**

34 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

35  
36 **I. ROCKRIDGE POINTE, Windsor Drive & Western Avenue**

1           **AP No: 020-030-037, 039, 013, & 015**  
2           **File: ANX00004; PUD00004; PRZ00001; TSM00003**  
3           **Planner: Laura Lafler**  
4

5           The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to  
6           the City Council to approve a proposal to prezone the property to Planned Unit  
7           Development (PUD), to annex to the City of Petaluma, and to subdivide a 123-acre parcel  
8           into 62 residential lots.  
9

10          Laura Lafler presented the staff report.  
11

12          Vin Smith, presented the project and the issues identified at the meeting of September 24,  
13          2002.  
14

15          Chair Glass: Asked the applicant about a path through the property to the Junior High.  
16

17          Vin Smith: Showed the graphic with the access point from the new development to  
18          Western Avenue.  
19

20          Commissioner Barrett: Asked why applicant did not install story poles?  
21

22          Vin Smith: Responded to draft minutes given to him and not his notes from the meeting.  
23          He did not know the Planning Commission wanted story poles.  
24

25          Commissioner McAllister: Asked to see sections with structures and relationship of  
26          structures to existing residences and adjacent properties.  
27

28          Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked is there a compromise that could be worked out  
29          regarding the safety issue while still having a public access path near the detention basin  
30          area.  
31

32          Commissioner Barrett: Asked the applicant why sections and story poles were not  
33          provided. Shy visual simulation from Chileno Valley Road not provided.  
34

35          Vin Smith: Responded that he did not provide the sections or story poles and that the  
36          project area is not visible from Chileno Valley Road.  
37

38          Chair Glass: Asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing.  
39

40          M/S von Raesfeld/Dargie to reopen the public hearing. 6-0.  
41

42          Public hearing opened:  
43

44          Peg Schafer, 37 Cleveland Avenue: Presented pictures and discussed flood issues from  
45          Marin Creek. There are a number of houses at risk from flooding of Marin Creek. Have  
46          concerns about traffic as well and the safety of pedestrians. Discussed house sizes and  
47          affordable housing.

1  
2 Scott Braun, 1161 Western: Have concerns about drainage – removing water from creeks  
3 will affect trees on his property. Would still like story poles to see how visible the houses  
4 will be. Have concerns about house size as well and use access in new residences.

5  
6 Paul McGavin, 297 Cambridge Lane: Think most of the issues have been addressed by  
7 the developer. The folks who live on Western and Cleveland and are outside of the City  
8 limits are being left out. The stretch of Western Avenue between Windsor Drive and  
9 Chileno Valley Road needs improvement. Need to redirect traffic off Windsor Drive.

10  
11 Susanne McGavin, 297 Cambridge Lane: Would like to condition the project so that the  
12 large construction vehicles will not go through Victoria. Also, would like to limit hours  
13 of construction traffic. Don't think there is much of a visual impact from Chileno Valley  
14 Road. Asked for parking on Windsor Drive if possible. Thanked the developer for  
15 working with the residents of Victoria.

16  
17 Peter Gang, 381 Cleveland: Submitted a letter to the Commission – has been following  
18 the project and feel there are items that have not been addressed by the developer.  
19 Suggested signboards and story poles be required for a project of this magnitude.  
20 Neighbors are outraged and did not know of the last meeting. Need to balance the need  
21 of the community and the developer. There is a need for more affordable housing and a  
22 better mix of housing sizes. One of stated goals is to minimize visual prominence – then  
23 install story poles to show the neighbors. Would like to see smaller houses and smaller  
24 lot sizes. Make all the open space accessible to the public. Reiterated the concerns  
25 regarding traffic, especially on Western Avenue. Need to work with the county to have  
26 safe pedestrian access on Western Avenue.

27  
28 Lisa Ludwigsen, 263 Cleveland Avenue: The developer is putting a city subdivision in  
29 the country. Cleveland Lane is perilous to walk on. Live near Marin Creek – have  
30 concerns that the new development will impact Marin Creek and would like assurances  
31 that the creek flow will not increase. Would like new development to include playing  
32 fields. Fence around the detention basin will have a visual impact. Wetlands present  
33 opportunity.

34  
35 Edward Giordano, 1764 Western Avenue: Put in \$5,000 worth of drainage  
36 improvements underneath his house. Want to know if independent review of hydrology  
37 has been requested. Bought in this area because it was rural. Has an alternative site  
38 been proposed that would be more appropriate?

39  
40 Elaine Lucia, 1777 Western Avenue: Showed the developer's graphic of the open space.  
41 Discussion at the last meeting regarding traffic on Western Avenue - burden should fall  
42 on the developer. Traffic will affect all of the homes on Western Avenue. Pedestrian  
43 traffic along Western going to three different schools in the area. Would still like story  
44 poles to see the impact of the project. Developer has spoken with all the Victoria  
45 residents, however, has not approached any of the residents on Western. Seasonal creek  
46 will affect all of the old bays and oaks on our property if water decreased.

1 Larry Braun, 2461 Western Avenue: Just beyond Windsor Drive on Western Avenue.  
2 Would like an effort to have trails for horses to access Helen Putnam. My property is  
3 next to the sewer station for Victoria – would like the opportunity to hook into this sewer  
4 system. Would like improvements on Western between Windsor and Chileno Valley  
5 Road. Marin Creek needs to be cleaned out – think the developer needs to do this.  
6 Concerned about an open water source – has disease potential with mosquitoes. Speed  
7 limit is a concern – speeds need to be reduced on Windsor Drive and Western Avenue.

8  
9 Elizabeth Mori, 407 Melvin: Represent PBAC – reiterated the Bike Committee’s  
10 concerns about the public open space access. Four issues: through travel – recommend  
11 cul de sac and the park connect with one another; also connect to Parcels C, D and A.  
12 Would like access behind lots 42 and 48 to connect Parcel C and Parcel D and paths on  
13 the Marin Creek detention basin. When parcel I is transferred to the County, include  
14 condition for signage so pedestrians know there is access and remove fencing between  
15 Helen Putnam and Parcel I. Have concerns about traffic on Western, especially  
16 concerned about safe routes to schools. Parcels A & C should be open for public access  
17 in perpetuity. There was discussion of a future road by LAFCO to access adjacent  
18 parcels – bike committee is against this.

19  
20 David Kualheim, 258 Edinburgh: Do not like the bike path – is looking straight down  
21 into our yards – is connecting to nothing. Would like a row of trees as a buffer if the path  
22 is open to the public. Don’t understand why public needs access to property.

23  
24 Bruce Hagen, 145 Greveillia: Member of the bike committee. Reiterate other comments  
25 from the bike committee. Want the opportunity to have public open spaces. Live in  
26 Westridge Knolls – there is a lot of open space just as proposed by this development.  
27 Westridge Knolls has many loop trails around the entire development. This would be an  
28 amenity for these homeowners as well.

29  
30 David Stirrat, 1981 Western Avenue: Homeowners on Western are without  
31 representation in relation to proposed annexation.

32  
33 Amy Lear, 2324 Western Avenue: Clarifying flooding issues. Would like development  
34 to have smaller homes – more energy efficiency. Would like permeable paving. Trucks  
35 being routed to Western and this is a concern to those of us who live on Western. Parcels  
36 41 through 47 – no longer have a setback.

37  
38 David Hergenrother, 234 Edinburgh: Drainage issues on open space Parcel D – existing  
39 drainage issues which are not addressed. Not opposed to paths and public open space.  
40 How delineate between public right of way and private open space with a split rail fence?  
41 Lots 14, 15, and 16 visible to the street – 16 will dominate the view from the street.  
42 Regulations regarding steepness of paths. Oppose the project as currently proposed.

43  
44 Public comment closed.

45  
46 Chair Glass: Gave some history and an overview of the project.

1 Vin Smith: Regarding open space – have made recommendations and desire to have all  
2 the open space be public, including the 2-acre park. Trails shown on vesting tentative  
3 map are dedicated open space.

4 Drainage facility was designed for a larger project and was never reduced even though  
5 the project area was reduced – feel it is sufficient to address concerns.

6  
7 Chair Glass: Asked Craig Spaulding to weigh in on the drainage concerns expressed by  
8 the public.

9  
10 Craig Spaulding: Condition # 47 addresses the drainage issues and will be addressed by  
11 the Sonoma County Water Agency.

12  
13 Chair Glass: Asked Mr. Spaulding to address Mr. Braun’s concerns about water leaving  
14 his property by the flow of water from the site and the transfer of flows.

15  
16 Vin Smith: Showed the property in question – have spoken with the property owner and  
17 both are happy with the plans as proposed.

18  
19 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked if minor improvements were done on county roads  
20 when Victoria was developed.

21  
22 Craig Spaulding: Did not know – was not with the city at that time.

23  
24 Commissioner McAllister: Asked about drainage regarding Cleveland Avenue and  
25 Marin Creek flooding.

26  
27 Craig Spaulding: This development will not add additional runoff. Do not believe the  
28 developer needs to clean out Marin Creek.

29  
30 Commissioner Barrett: Asked about setback of homes that was brought up during public  
31 comments.

32  
33 Vin Smith: Setbacks: 73 feet for lot 42 and 112 feet for lot 38.

34  
35 Commissioner Asselmeier: Have serious concerns about the traffic – am unclear what  
36 the developer is able to do on Western from Windsor to Chileno Valley Road. Would  
37 like the City to see if there are additional areas that should be included in annexation.  
38 Seems we should have a solution before we approve this project. Also heard comments  
39 about the homes and the affordability. Asked how much would go toward affordable  
40 housing.

41  
42 Vin Smith: Development is estate lot subdivision – unrealistic to have 1200 square foot  
43 houses in this type of subdivision. Will sell for whatever the market rate will bear at the  
44 time and would certainly be greater than \$500,000. Would contribute \$150,000 toward  
45 affordable housing fund.

46  
47 9:20 break

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

Meeting resumed at 9:25

Commission Comments:

Commissioner von Raesfled: Commendable redesign effort from the previous project. Issues: two categories: site issues: expanded language regarding nature of contouring on the knolls. In prominent areas two knolls and detention basin – it should not be engineered grading. Do not see why detention pond cannot serve both a function of detention basin and a rural landscape amenity. Want to be able to get off Windsor Drive and walk through project. Would like park be designed as part of the project. Would like to see the bike paths connected – provided a graphic to show possible reconfiguring of some lots to connect the open space areas. Suggested a range of fences to be considered by SPARC for lots 1-4 and 14, 15 and 16 so that “miles” of fencing are not so visible. Need side yard fencing and landscaping on corner lots.

Regarding architecture – need clear, inspired and well thought out architecture. Some sensitive lots – critical rear elevations on lots 1-4. Lots 13-17 sit on the fill promontory – need to be unique homes – will be prominent. Corner lots offer opportunities – needs to be taken advantage of. Subdivision could benefit from a unit that is further articulated, rather than regular geometry.

Commissioner McAllister: Not sure I can make the findings for the Rezoning and PUD. Do not think it has been adequately addressed. Referred to staff report regarding the required findings. Packet was similar to last packet – additional materials provided were superficial. Sections provided were useless. Sections and story poles were ignored. Do not think Victoria residents can really tell what this is going to look like. Other jurisdictions demand a lot more in terms of what a development will look like. Want to see open space networks that weave through developments – would really like this to be better. Need to see exhibits that show what community is getting. Need to go further with quality of development. Gave an example of a development in Davis with meaningful open space. Visual quality unchanged from the last packet, grading has been improved but it is not the only issue. Need a broader continuum of house sizes – would help the visual quality. Need story poles on prominent lots, 14, 15, 16 and 17. These homes would impact Edinburgh homes more than the open space path. Agree to have a connection all the way through. Would like a connection from cul de sac – want lots 46, 47 and 48 to connect to the park. I support making the detention basin more of a landscape element and an amenity and completing the trail network and connecting to the county with Parcel I. Support public ownership of open space. Need a well thought out landscape plan for all the parcels – a rustic, designed park – would direct SPARC to a native, rural landscape. No landscaping proposed between the project and the north neighbors. Rural property does not need to be treated in an urban way – rigorous lining of streets with trees not appropriate. Grading does not address keeping the tree clusters in park– preservation of trees needs to be addressed by a certified arborist. Think rural vernacular is appropriate here rather than the houses represented. Concerns about traffic – particularly pedestrians and safe route to schools.

1 Commissioner Barrett: Think it is important to give SPARC strong direction. Feel the  
2 developer has moved a long way and would ask you to move further. Want to see story  
3 poles – not just for lots 14 through 17 but also lots 43 through 48. Concerned about ridge  
4 line development – want to make sure we are doing the right thing. Project is visible  
5 from Chileno Valley Road. Am comfortable that we will not add to flooding problems  
6 on Cleveland Lane. Send Bike Committee’s recommendation re: Parcel I on to the  
7 county. This is not different than Westridge and would like this development to do the  
8 same in terms of open space and paths. Want to see it conditioned that it is the most  
9 energy efficient. Western Avenue is a real concern here – am concerned about directing  
10 traffic to Western Avenue from Windsor Drive into downtown. Think the City needs to  
11 address this issue even though it is county property. Can’t approve a project that creates  
12 an unsafe condition.

13  
14 Commissioner Dargie: Think the open space should be public. Convinced the project  
15 will not cause more problems for the downstream neighbors. Do not think 62 more  
16 homes will cause more traffic on Western to Chileno Valley, however, will add traffic to  
17 Western going into town. Think we do need story poles, computer animation is not  
18 sufficient. Detention basin should be a landscape feature. Definitely improve the park  
19 before dedicating to the city.

20  
21 Commissioner Asselmeier: In agreement with all comments thus far. Would like to add  
22 condition of approval that the bike committee memo dated today be incorporated. If  
23 excluding the road to access adjacent parcels would put the city in a difficult position –  
24 would not condition it. Need story poles and notices on the property – should be put up  
25 now. In lieu housing fees of \$150,000 do not seem adequate – would like to see that be  
26 increased. Would like the home and lot sizes to be reduced. Have concerns about  
27 whether this is in conformance with the general plan. Would like open space to be  
28 public. Think there should be a way to move around and through the project within the  
29 open space. Integrate the open space in a more holistic way. Trail behind parcels 38  
30 through 43 – could show off wetlands. Detention basin should be an amenity. Refer the  
31 applicant to Village Homes in Davis – good idea for the detention pond. Parking along  
32 Windsor near Parcel I if possible. Recommend that the applicant speak with the county  
33 and city about an agreement for a fair share contribution for improvements to Western  
34 Avenue.

35  
36 Chair Glass: Agree with other Commissioners comments. Do not see moving forward  
37 without story poles.

38  
39 Commissioner von Raesfeld: What are we asking with story poles? Is it an issue of  
40 whether the lots should be there?

41  
42 Commissioner Barrett: Is an issue of visibility and the ridgeline.

43  
44 Commissioner Dargie: Agree with Commissioner Barrett

45  
46 Commissioner McAllister: Agree with Commissioner Barrett. Have concerns with Lots  
47 15 and 16.

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

Commissioner Dargie: Need to establish where we want the story poles.

Vin Smith: Would be willing to put up story poles on key lots for the SPARC process, however, do not think is appropriate for Planning Commission. This has never been requested in the two years prior. Feel as though we have met the demands regarding traffic, drainage and grading. Would put story poles on lots 1 through 5 and 14 through 17 at SPARC. Do not want to put up story poles regarding the land use process.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Identified the following issues:

- Story poles
- Western Avenue traffic – contribute fair share
- Contouring issues – golf course not engineering
- Detention pond as landscape feature integrated into the project
- Designing and building the park with trails and benches before dedicating to the City
- Contiguous open space concept
- Submit to SPARC proposed fencing for variety of conditions
- Side lot landscaping and fencing for corner lots
- Open space given to City – irrevocable offer
- SPARC review of Lots 1-4, 14-17 rear elevations and corner lots
- Further articulated units with multi-volume concepts
- Cohesive landscape plan – do not look at it as separate parcels
- Include PBAC recommendations

Planning Commission liaison to SPARC can ensure conformity.

Commissioner McAllister: Wanted clarification on contiguous open space concept – do you agree with Commissioner von Raesfeld’s plan.

Vin Smith: Agreeing to the plan as presented by Commissioner von Raesfeld.

Commissioner Barrett: Have problems with discussion regarding the lots – would like access between adjacent properties at the north end of the project.

Commissioner McAllister: Have concerns about moving the project on without seeing it – do not necessarily agree with the placement of lots 15 and 16 or views of Lots 1 through 4. Applicant should consider single story homes on periphery.

Commissioner Barrett: Referred to Council minutes from March 4, 2002 regarding integration of project with the surroundings.

Commissioners Asselmeier, Dargie, McAllister and Barrett: Want to see story poles.

Commissioner Asselmeier, Barrett, Glass: Want all PBAC recommendations included.

1 Chair Glass: Can single story homes be on the prominent lots?  
2

3 Commissioner McAllister: Want story poles that reflect the height and mass of the  
4 houses.  
5

6 Vin Smith: Want to move the project forward.  
7

8 Dargie: How visible will the houses be?  
9

10 Vin Smith: They will be less visible due to the grading that has been done.  
11

12 Commissioner McAllister: Can we condition this with story poles?  
13

14 George White: Can require story poles to be in place before the City Council meeting.  
15

16 M/S von Raesfeld/Asselmeier to forward a recommendation to the City Council to  
17 approve the project per the findings and conditions of approval and the following  
18 additional recommendations:  
19

20 • All proposed open space parcels, with the exception of the parcel to be dedicated  
21 to the County as part of Helen Putnam Park, shall be dedicated to the City as  
22 public open space.  
23

24 ▪ The applicant and staff should work with appropriate County staff to develop a  
25 formula for fair share contributions from the applicant for addressing increased  
26 traffic on Western Avenue especially in the vicinity of existing schools.  
27

28 ▪ The design, development and dedication of the proposed public park, including  
29 trails and benches, shall be completed prior to the occupancy of any individual  
30 housing unit.  
31

32 ▪ The conceptual unit development plan shall be revised as follows:  
33

34 1. Show a contiguous open space concept with a cohesive landscape plan –  
35 do not look at the property as separate open space parcels.  
36

37 2. Recommend possible relocation of Lot 15 to the end of the cul de sac "G"  
38 Court.  
39

40 3. Integrate detention pond into the project as a landscape feature  
41

42 4. Respond to concerns about contouring and propose solutions that are more  
43 like grading for golf courses than just engineering  
44

45 5. Lots 43-48 – need particular attention to the rear of these lots – revise  
46 architecture and elevations to reflect rural vernacular recommendations  
47 from SPARC.

• Applications materials for SPARC shall include:

1. Proposed fencing for variety of conditions

- 1                   2. Side lot landscaping and fencing for corner lots
- 2                   3. Particular attention to the most visible elevations for rear and corner lots,
- 3                   specifically Lots 1-4, 14-17
- 4                   4. Provide further articulation on individual proposed residences with multi-
- 5                   volume concepts
- 6
- 7

8           In addition, story poles will be in place at least 10 days before the hearing for Lots 38-  
9           45, Lots 1-4, Lots 14-16, a sign placed at bottom of hill on Windsor Drive describing the  
10          proposed project, graphics enhanced with an illustrative plan, and 62-lot desired density.

11  
12          All in favor:

13               Commissioner Dargie:        Yes  
14               Commissioner McAllister:   No  
15               Chair Glass:                Yes  
16               Commissioner Barrett:     Yes  
17               Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes  
18               Commissioner Asselmeier:  Yes

19  
20                                **Draft Findings for Approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration:**

- 21
- 22          1.       An Initial Study was prepared and demonstrated that there is no substantial  
23               evidence that supports a fair argument that the project, as conditioned, would have  
24               a significant effect on the environment.
- 25
- 26          2.       That the project does not have the potential to affect wildlife resources as defined  
27               in the State Fish and Game Code, either individually or cumulatively, and is  
28               exempt from Fish and Game filing fees.
- 29
- 30          3.       The project is not located on a site listed on any Hazardous Waste Site List  
31               compiled by the State pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government  
32               Code.
- 33
- 34          4.       The Planning Commission reviewed the Initial Study and considered public  
35               comments before making a recommendation on the project.
- 36
- 37          5.       That a Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared to ensure compliance  
38               with the adopted mitigation measures.
- 39
- 40          6.       The record of proceedings of the decision on the project is available for public  
41               review at the City of Petaluma Planning Division, City Hall, 11 English Street,  
42               Petaluma, California.
- 43

44                                **Draft Findings of Approval for Prezoning:**

- 45
- 46          1.       The proposed Prezoning of the Rockridge Pointe property to PUD is consistent  
47               with the Petaluma General Plan, and is in general conformity with the zoning  
48               regulations of the City of Petaluma as described in the project staff report.



1 **From the Planning Division:**  
2

- 3 1. The plans submitted for building permit review shall be in substantial compliance  
4 with the Vesting Tentative Map, Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary  
5 Grading Plan, dated September 3, 2002, received September 4, 2002.  
6
- 7 2. All mitigation measures adopted in conjunction with the Mitigated Negative  
8 Declaration for the Rockridge Pointe Project, revised September 4, 2002, are  
9 herein incorporated by reference as conditions of project approval.  
10
- 11 3. Upon approval by the City Council, the applicant shall pay the \$35.00 Notice of  
12 Determination fee to the Planning Division. The check shall be made payable to  
13 the County Clerk. Planning staff will file the Notice of Determination with the  
14 County Clerks office within five (5) days after receiving Council approval.  
15
- 16 4. Architecture plans shall be reviewed and approved by SPARC including building  
17 location, entries, compatibility with surrounding residences, architectural design  
18 and landscaping.  
19
- 20 5. The applicant shall be required to utilize Best Management Practices regarding  
21 pesticide/herbicide use and fully commit to Integrated Pest Management  
22 techniques for the protection of pedestrian/bicyclists. The applicant shall be  
23 required to post signs when pesticide/herbicide use occurs to warn pedestrians and  
24 bicyclists.  
25
- 26 6. Parcel C shall be dedicated to the City of Petaluma as a park.  
27
- 28 7. Parcels A, including the Detention Basin, shall be maintained by the Homeowners  
29 Association.  
30
- 31 8. The applicant shall dedicate Parcel I to Sonoma County as an addition to the  
32 Helen Putnam Regional Park. Evidence of an initial offer letter and acceptance  
33 shall be submitted with the Final Map.  
34
- 35 9. The proposed park at Parcel C shall be constructed prior to receiving occupancy  
36 for 80 percent or 50 units of the total 62 units.  
37
- 38 10. All construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday  
39 through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction shall be  
40 prohibited on Sundays and all holidays recognized by the City of Petaluma, unless  
41 a permit is first secured from the City Manager (or his/her designee) for additional  
42 hours. There will be no start up of machines nor equipment prior to 8:00 a.m.,  
43 Monday through Friday; no delivery of materials nor equipment prior to 7:30 a.m.  
44 nor past 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; no servicing of equipment past 5:30  
45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Plans submitted for City permits shall include the  
46 language above.

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

- 11. Construction and demolition debris shall be recycled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize impacts on the landfill.
- 12. CC&Rs shall be submitted to the Planning Division for review and approval prior to approval of the Final Map.
- 13. Concrete ditches and drainage structures draining the open space areas shall be tinted earth colors.
- 14. The applicant shall construct a public trail through Parcel I consistent with the Sonoma County Regional Park standards to connect to Helen Putnam Park. The public trail shall be completed prior to final occupancy of the project.
- 15. Prior to recording the Final Map, the developer shall submit names for the internal streets and cul-de-sacs to the Planning Division for review and approval
- 16. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining all drainage inlets, clean-outs, berms, debris basins, slide repair areas, v-ditches, sub-drain and other facilities located in the project area. CC&R's shall include a provision requiring that the city consent to any revisions regarding maintenance.
- 17. The CC&R's for the project shall provide that the Homeowners Association shall be responsible for performing ongoing maintenance and or repair of geologic conditions, debris basins, ditches
- 18. Plant materials to be installed as part of the Landscape Plan shall consist of a minimum of 15 gallon can size for trees and 5 gallon can size for shrubs.

**From the Engineering Division:**

*Frontage Improvements*

- 19. Half-street frontage improvements along the northeasterly side of Windsor Drive shall include but not be limited to, 5-foot wide striped on-street bike lane, curb and gutter, sidewalk, streetlights, handicap ramps, curb return at Western Avenue, striping, channelization, signing, landscaping and roundabout (per Traffic Impact Study dated December 2000 by W•Trans).
- 20. Half-street frontage improvements along the southeasterly side of Western Avenue shall include but not be limited to, 5-foot wide striped on-street bike lane, curb and gutter, sidewalk, streetlights, handicap ramps, striping, channelization, signing and landscaping.
- 21. The City requires a traffic index of 6 (T.I. = 6) for Western Avenue. A geotechnical report addendum is required and shall identify the existing pavement section and

1 traffic index for the existing County of Sonoma portion of Western Avenue along the  
2 project frontage. In the event that the existing pavement section does not meet T.I. = 6  
3 standards, the developer shall be responsible for reconstructing the existing portions  
4 of Western Avenue, from centerline, along the project frontage. An asphalt overlay  
5 conform shall be required as necessary to provide a smooth street crown and insure  
6 positive cross sectional drainage of 2% minimum.  
7

8 22. In the event that the Local Agency Formation Commission requires annexation of  
9 adjacent assessor parcel numbers 020-030-013 and 020-030-015 or any other adjacent  
10 parcels, the applicant shall provide for a future public roadway and emergency access  
11 as well as access to public utilities. An irrevocable offer of dedication through the  
12 Rockeridge Pointe Subdivision with sufficient width to accommodate future  
13 maximum dwellings located on all developable parcels in the immediate area, or  
14 another scenario acceptable to the City Engineer is required. Off-site public  
15 easements for public sewer and water utilities may also be required.  
16

17 23. City standard public improvements shall be installed within the boundary of the  
18 subdivision including but not limited to, full street widths, curb and gutter, sidewalks,  
19 streetlights, handicap ramps, sewer, water and storm drain systems, signing, striping  
20 and landscaping.  
21

22 24. In the event that the contractor damages any portion of Windsor Drive during  
23 construction, the project applicant shall restore Windsor Drive to pre-construction  
24 conditions prior to acceptance of the project by the City of Petaluma.  
25

26 25. The pavement sections for the proposed interior streets shall be designed for a traffic  
27 index of 5 (T.I. = 5) and shall contain a minimum of four inches of asphalt concrete.  
28

29 26. The pavement section for the emergency vehicular access road shall be designed to  
30 accommodate typical fire truck loads.  
31

32 27. Sidewalks shall be installed on both sides of all streets throughout the boundary of the  
33 subdivision with the exception of "A" Street. A sidewalk on one side of "A" Street  
34 shall be allowed between lot 45 and Windsor Drive if approved by the Planning  
35 Commission.  
36

37 28. Stop-controlled intersections shall be installed per City standards at all interior  
38 intersections.  
39

40 29. Parking shall be prohibited along the entire Windsor Drive (both sides of street) and  
41 Western Avenue (development side of street) parcel(s) frontages. No parking street  
42 signs shall be installed.  
43

44 30. All subdivision street widths shall be 32-feet wide with parking allowed on both  
45 sides. Parking may be limited in cul-de-sacs per Fire Marshals requirements. Cul-de-  
46 sac and hammerhead dimensions shall also be subject to the Fire Marshals approval.  
47

1 31. Maximum street grades shall be 15 percent.

2  
3 32. All retaining walls shall be located on private property.

4  
5 33. All PG & E distribution electric lines and other overhead utilities and service drops  
6 along the street frontages or through or traversing the site shall be placed  
7 underground. All new services shall be underground.

8  
9 34. All Windsor Drive and Western Avenue street transitions/conforms shall be subject to  
10 the review and approval by the City Engineer.

11  
12 *Sanitary Sewer Collection and Water Supply Utilities*

13  
14 35. Each lot shall have separate sanitary sewer laterals and water services.

15  
16 36. A 10-foot wide public water main and public access easement is required for the  
17 proposed water line located within the boundary of the subdivision and through two  
18 Cal Water parcels prior to final map approval. The access road within the easement  
19 shall be paved (or similar hardscaped treatment). The final location and grade of the  
20 easements shall be subject to the review and approval by the City Engineer.

21  
22 37. A 12-inch diameter water main shall be installed from the LaCresta water tank site to  
23 the subdivision per the preliminary water system calculations prepared by Milani and  
24 Associates.

25  
26 38. The homeowners association shall be responsible for contributing to the maintenance  
27 costs of the sanitary sewer pump station located near the project entrance along with  
28 the Victoria Subdivision Phase III homeowners association.

29 39. All water main piping shall be Ductile Iron Pipe (DIP) in hillside areas.

30  
31 40. All water main piping within the boundary of the subdivision shall be 12-inch  
32 diameter pipe as determined by the preliminary water system calculations prepared by  
33 Milani and Associates.

34  
35 41. All units with top finish floor elevations above elevation 270 feet require installation  
36 of a privately owned and maintained air-gap water pressure booster bump system.

37  
38 *Grading and Drainage*

39  
40 42. Hydrology calculations for the project shall be reviewed and approved by the Sonoma  
41 County Water Agency (SCWA) prior to final map and improvement plan approval.

42  
43 43. Hydrology calculations shall include all on-site drainage facilities including the  
44 proposed detention basin system and Western Avenue storm drain.

45  
46 44. Parcel "A" (detention basin site) shall be designated as a common area and  
47 maintained by the subdivisions homeowners association through the conditions,

1 covenants and restrictions. An operations and maintenance manual shall be created  
2 for perpetual maintenance of the detention basin during and after construction of the  
3 subdivision. Provisions in the manual shall include but not be limited to, construction  
4 and post-construction maintenance for dredging, periodic inspection, functionality,  
5 landscaping and repair.

6  
7 45. An annual report shall be submitted to the City of Petaluma Community Development  
8 Department identifying annual maintenance provisions as prescribed in the operations  
9 and maintenance manual.

10  
11 46. The detention basin shall be constructed and operational prior to and during the first  
12 year's rainy season defined as October 1 – April 15.

13  
14 47. A public storm drain easement shall be provided over the entire parcel "A".

15  
16 48. Additional geotechnical and hydrological information shall be provided for the design  
17 and construction of the detention basin at the improvement plan stage. The detention  
18 basin shall be designed to accommodate a 100-year storm event.

19  
20 49. Lot to lot drainage shall not be allowed without drainage/storm drain easements.

21  
22 50. The storm drain from the end of "H" Court to the detention basin shall be eliminated.  
23 All street storm drains shall be directed to the detention basin by a single pipe from  
24 "A" Street as shown on the tentative map.

25  
26 51. All backyard and hillside drainage shall be collected in swales and sub surface storm  
27 drain lines and discharged into a public storm drain system. Rooftop and driveway  
28 runoff from lots 31-45 shall not be allowed to flow across the northerly boundary of  
29 the subdivision.

30  
31 52. All storm drain systems located on lots 1-62 and parcels "B" through "I" shall be  
32 privately owned and maintained.

33  
34 53. Grading conforms to adjacent developments and parcels shall be subject to the review  
35 and approval of the City Engineer.

36  
37 54. The applicant shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the California State Water  
38 Resources Control Board and provide a copy of the filed notice to the City of  
39 Petaluma prior to final map approval.

40  
41 55. The applicant shall submit a detailed Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan  
42 (SWPPP) in accordance with latest state standards for review and approval by the  
43 City Engineer prior to final map approval. The SWPPP shall be available on-site in  
44 the job trailer at all times throughout the construction process. The SWPPP and NOI  
45 copy shall be submitted with the improvement plan application package. The  
46 developer and/or contractor shall update the SWPPP throughout the construction

1 process per the latest state standards. A section 404 permit (U.S. Army Corp of  
2 Engineers) may be required for work within the creek area.

3  
4 56. A detailed erosion and sediment control plan is required as a part of the improvement  
5 plans and is subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer.

6  
7 57. The applicant shall file a Notice of Termination (NOT) with the California State  
8 Water Resources Control Board and a copy to the City of Petaluma upon completion  
9 of the project.

10  
11 *Easements*

12  
13 58. Ten-foot wide public utility easements (P.U.E.) are required on all parcel frontages to  
14 public streets or letters from appropriate public utility companies approving reduced  
15 width P.U.E.'s will be accepted.

16  
17 59. Appropriate on-site and off-site public and private access, drainage, utility, etc.  
18 easements are required prior to final map approval.

19  
20 *Miscellaneous*

21  
22 60. The final map and improvement plans shall be prepared in accordance with latest City  
23 standards, codes, policies and ordinances.

24  
25 61. All public improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City of Petaluma  
26 prior to releasing the final 20 percent of certificates of occupancy.

27  
28 62. The homeowner's association shall maintain all private utilities.

29  
30 63. Any existing wells or septic systems located on the site shall be abandoned per  
31 County of Sonoma Environmental Health Department standards.

32  
33 64. The applicant shall submit either a digitized data fee in the amount of ten dollars per  
34 lot or provide electronic base map information for updating the City's base map  
35 system prior to final map approval.

36  
37 **From the Fire Marshal:**

38  
39 65. Proposed street widths of 28 feet are acceptable as long as no parking is permitted on  
40 either side of the street. Thirty two (32) feet street widths shall be permitted for  
41 parking to exist on both sides of the street.

42  
43 66. Cul de sac radius shall be designed to meet the turning radius of the Fire Department's  
44 aerial ladder truck.

45  
46 67. Hammerhead turn around appears to be substandard on "C" Street. Con  
47

- 1 68. Roadway grades shall not exceed 15 percent maximum.  
2
- 3 69. Fire hydrant spacing shall not exceed 300 feet and or 150 feet from the furthest  
4 structure. Hydrant locations subject to the approval of the Fire Marshal's Office.  
5
- 6 70. This subdivision is within the boundaries of the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone  
7 (VHFHSZ). Buildings constructed in this zone are subject to the conditions outlined  
8 in Section 17.20.060 Petaluma Municipal Code.  
9
- 10 71. All residences are required to be fire sprinklered in accordance with NFPA 13-D.  
11 Additionally, because the structures are in the VHFHSZ they must be "fully  
12 sprinklered" which includes extension of the sprinklers into the attic, garage or  
13 unprotected space. A minimum two-head calculation for the attic is acceptable.  
14
- 15 72. Fire flow is required to be a minimum of 1000 gpm at 20 psi residual. Verification of  
16 minimum flows must be calculated and provided to the Fire Marshal's Office by a  
17 registered engineer prior to issuance of a building permit.  
18
- 19 73. All fire lanes, EVA's, turnarounds and no parking areas shall be designated as such  
20 with appropriate signs and/or red curbs. Sign and curb language, including letter size,  
21 shall be in accordance with city standards.  
22
- 23 74. Open space areas are subject to the provisions of annual weed/brush abatement. A  
24 plan that outlines the criteria for provisions for abatement shall be developed and  
25 approved by the Fire Marshal's Office. The plan shall include provisions for fire safe  
26 landscaping, as required, and firebreaks in accordance with "fire safe standards"  
27 developed by the State of California.  
28
- 29 75. Barriers blocking the EVA must be approved by the Fire Marshal's Office.  
30 Typically, this is accomplished with a gate. All gate supports must be two feet wider  
31 than the approved roadway width of the EVA.  
32
- 33 76. Provide a dedicated access point from the hammerhead turn around (court H),  
34 approved by the Fire Marshal's Office, to allow emergency vehicle access to the  
35 brush/open space behind lots 16 to 21.  
36
- 37 77. Provide a dedicated access point from the cul de sac (court F), approved by the Fire  
38 Marshal's Office to allow emergency vehicle access to the brush/open space near and  
39 behind lots 30-34 at the end of the cul de sac.  
40
- 41 78. Provide a dedicated access point from the cul de sac (court G), approved by the Fire  
42 Marshal's Office, to allow emergency vehicle access to the brush/open space near  
43 and behind lots 23 to 26 at the end of the cul de sac.  
44
- 45 79. Proposed roundabout at Windsor Drive and the entrance to the subdivision shall be  
46 designed to accommodate the turning radius specifications of fire apparatus.  
47

1 **From Parks and Recreation:**

2  
3 80. Parcel "C" (proposed park) and the Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) to be deeded  
4 to the City of Petaluma, and maintained by the City of Petaluma.

5  
6 81. The interior park (Parcel "C"), shall be designed in conjunction with, and meet the  
7 approval of the Recreation, Music and Parks Commission, and the Parks and  
8 Recreation Department.

9  
10 82. The proposed EVA connection from "A" Street to Western Avenue to be constructed  
11 per City of Petaluma Standards, with an asphalt surface.

12  
13 83. Open Space (Parcels "A","B","D"), Common Landscaping and Detention Basin,  
14 shall be maintained by the Homeowner's Association.

15  
16 84. Parcel "I" shall be dedicated to the Sonoma County Regional Parks as part of Helen  
17 Putnam Regional Park.

18  
19 **From the Sonoma County Water Agency:**

20  
21 85. Drainage design for the project shall comply with the Agency's Flood Control Design  
22 Criteria. Evidence of compliance shall be submitted with the Improvement Plans.

23  
24 **From Pacific Gas and Electric Company:**

25  
26 86. Costs of any relocation of existing PG&E facilities necessitated by this project shall  
27 be the responsibility of the applicant.

28  
29 87. In order to provide gas and electric service to the parcels, PG&E will require the  
30 following:

31  
32 a. Property owner shall dedicate 7.5 foot wide Public Utility Easements (PUE's) along  
33 the front of all lots bordering "A" Street, "B" Street, "C" Street, "D" Court, and "E"  
34 Court "F" Court "G" Court as shown on the Vesting Tentative Map dated September  
35 3, 2002.

36  
37 b. Property owner shall offer for dedication "A" Street, "B" Street, "C" Street, "D"  
38 Court, and "E" Court, "F" Court, "G" as PUE's or franchise streets.

39  
40 **From the Police Department:**

41  
42 88. The width of the streets and cul de sacs shall be wide enough to accommodate  
43 emergency vehicle traffic, including fire engines.

44  
45 89. Windsor Drive shall have sidewalks on the north side of the street to accommodate  
46 pedestrian traffic. The new sidewalk shall connect to the existing sidewalk on the  
47 north side of the street at Edinburgh Drive.

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

**From the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee:**

*Bike Parking:*

90. A street-level bike rack shall be installed at Park Parcel C.

*Class I Bikeways:*

91. Developer shall install interior multi-use Class I pathways of 10 feet on 20 foot easements. These pathways shall originate from D Court, between lots 4 and 5 and lots 12 and 13, and between lots 56 and 57 and lots 21 and 22 to connect to Parcel D open Space. Pathways shall include low ground cover for high visibility and shall be maintained by the Landscape Assessment District.

92. There shall be a Class I path along Marin Creek. The perimeter path is particularly appropriate given that this site also contains the "urban separator General Plan overlay designation which requires a 300 foot setback from the south and west properties line" as noted in Rockridge Pointe Project description and Analysis, July 11, 2000. This path can be constructed of permeable surfacing.

93. The 10 foot water main access road shall also serve as a Class I pedestrian path accessible by bollard at either end of the road.

94. Class I path along both sides of Marin Creek one of which shall connect to the sidewalk on Windsor Drive. These paths shall have permeable surfacing.

95. The EVA path shall also serve as Class I path from Western Ave. terminating at A street.

*Class II Bikeways:*

96. There shall be Class II bike lanes along both sides of Windsor Drive.

*Signs:*

97. "Share The Road" signs shall be installed on the Class II lanes on Windsor.

98. There shall be signs indicating bike paths and parks/open space on Windsor, Western and within the project, including signage for Helen Putnam Park. In addition, there shall be signs regarding children's usage of bike/pedestrian paths between this project and Petaluma Junior High School, Petaluma High School and McNear School.

99. A signage plan shall be submitted to the PBAC for final approval prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

*Pedestrian Needs:*

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

100. A public access easement shall be provided on all of the dedicated open space. Maintenance shall be the responsibility of the Landscape Assessment District.

*Benches:*

101. There shall be 2 benches and a picnic table on Parcel C.

102. There shall be 4 benches in the open space on Parcel B.

103. There shall be 2 benches on each side of Marin Creek.

104. There shall be at least 2 benches in Parcel I, on the prominent knolls.

105. There shall be 2 benches along the eastern boundary of Parcel D.

*Drinking Fountains:*

106. A drinking fountain shall be provided in C Park.

*Intersection Improvements:*

107. There shall be a crosswalk across Western where the EVA/Class I path meets Western Ave.

*Lighting:*

108. Project lighting shall not direct glare into cyclist/pedestrian eyes. This includes security lighting.

*Pesticide/Herbicide Use:*

109. Under no circumstances shall any pesticide/herbicide be applied in areas used by pedestrians/bicyclists anywhere in this project or the surrounding areas without appropriate signs warning of the use of chemicals, a policy currently employed by the Music, Recreation and Parks Department. This project shall utilize Best Management Practices regarding pesticide/herbicide use and fully commit to Integrated Pest Management techniques for the protection of bicyclists and pedestrians.

---

**COMMISSION BUSINESS:**

**II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

M/S McAllister/von Raesfeld to elect Commissioner Barrett as Chair.

Vote: 6-0

1 M/S Glass/McAllister to elect Commissioner von Raesfeld as Vice Chair

2 Vote: 6-0

3 M/S to elect Commissioner Dargie as 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair

4 Vote: 6-0

5  
6 **Appointment to Committees:**

7 a. **SPARC:** Commissioner Glass volunteered to serve on SPARC  
8 Committee.

9 b. **Tree Advisory:** Commissioner Dargie volunteered to serve on the Tree  
10 Advisory Committee

11 c. **PBAC:** Announcement later  
12

---

13  
14 **III. HOLIDAY SCHEDULE** – There was a discussion and the Commission agreed  
15 to meet the Tuesday of Thanksgiving week if there are public hearing items. The  
16 second meeting in December falls on December 24, 2002, which is a City holiday  
17 so there will be no meeting.  
18

---

19  
20 **IV. DISCUSSION OF USING STORY POLES FOR PROJECTS DURING THE**  
21 **REVIEW PERIOD**

22  
23 This item as well as posting signs for proposed development was continued to the  
24 next agenda.  
25

---

26  
27 **V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.** None  
28

---

29  
30 **VI. LIAISON REPORTS:**

31 **City Council:** None

32 **SPARC:** Tubbs remodel approved.

33 **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** None

34 **Tree Advisory Committee:** Community Garden project between McNear fields  
35 and the Boys and Girls Club. Articles on tree walks will be in the Argus Courier.

36 **CPSP:** Community meeting at the Mystic on November 7, 2002 at 7:00 p.m.  
37  
38

---

39  
40 **Adjournment:** 11:52 p.m.  
41