



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

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

Minutes

Regular Meeting December 12, 2002
City Council Chambers 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 11 English Street Petaluma, CA
Telephone: 707-778-4301 E-Mail: planning@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, Janet Gracyk, Chris Lynch, Linda Mathies
(arrived at 3:15), Jack Rittenhouse
Historic: Hurley (absent), Hopkins
***Chairperson**
Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Tiffany Robbe, Associate Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of November 14, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett – 4/0, Gracyk abstained.
Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: Letter from George Allen opposing SPARC action regarding disallowing vinyl windows on new projects.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began @ 3:05

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
NEW BUSINESS:
PUBLIC HEARING:

1 **I. CBD DOWNTOWN STREETScape MASTER PLAN**
2 **Staff: Paul Marangella, Director of Economic Development**
3 **Planner: Irene Borba**
4

5 Request for historic and cultural preservation committee approval of the details
6 for the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan including lighting,
7 sidewalks/pavements, improvements, street furnishings (benches, trash
8 receptacles, kiosks, bike racks, water fountains), street trees and other plantings
9 (including irrigation plan), street furniture locations.

10
11 Jeanne Miche, Project Manager: Introduced the project.

12
13 Sandy Reed, Landscape Architect: Introduced the design, engineering and lighting team.
14 The team is here today to seek direction from SPARC regarding lighting, street furniture
15 and street trees.

16
17 Angela McDonald, HLB Lighting Design: Presented three options of lighting for the
18 committee to review.

19
20 Sandy Reed: Presented the samples for the proposed sidewalk repair and replacement.

21
22 Public hearing opened: No public comment.

23
24 Public hearing closed:

25
26 Committee Comments:

27
28 Committee Member Hopkins: Like the look of the historical lighting.

29
30 Committee Member Mathies: Like the transitional lighting, however, if it limits the
31 abilities, would not want do that. Like Family C lighting, however, would not want to go
32 “cutsie”. Like the idea to add chicken or egg design on bike racks, benches, etc. If
33 quality is good from the local concrete person, would prefer to use those services.

34
35 Committee Member Lynch: Prefer Family A, transitional, however, want something
36 durable so would like Family C if it has the ability to customize. Need a transitional light
37 to get to Family C. Prefer B or C. Regarding the concrete, I like the overlay. Thought
38 we were evaluating the overlay – if we are using it, why not use it everywhere and give it
39 a clean look. Like the warmer color with some texture. Regarding waterfront – not sure
40 about twinkle lights. Prefer low lighting on the riverfront and up lighting on the
41 buildings.

42
43 Committee Member Barrett: First liked A, however, if C provides a longer life and more
44 flexibility that would be ok, however, would like it simplified. Regarding concrete, was
45 impressed that the overlay looked as good as it did. Think we can try it and see how it
46 works. Think twinkle lights on trees will look like main street in Disneyland. Think

1 flags and banner are overused – think it is abused. If flags are used – would like them
2 decorative, not advertisements.

3
4 Committee Member Gracyk: Don't see how the overlay concrete will wear over time.
5 Like the old concrete because of the exposed aggregate look. Agree with other
6 comments regarding the colors and using a local supplier. Agree with other committee
7 members regarding lights. Like direction you are going with benches. Would like all the
8 slats the same on the benches for maintenance purposes. Suggest continuing lighting
9 around the corners. Like pulling people in areas where they wouldn't normally go. Like
10 up lighting on the trees. Like the idea of having custom pieces of sculpture downtown.
11 Presented tree options to the landscape architect.

12
13 Chair Rittenhouse: Can't mimic historic era completely – think Family C is best for
14 durability, however, doing it on a minimal scale would work best. Like the evolutions of
15 sidewalks because it shows a history of how it has evolved. Think sidewalks should be
16 done on a strong permanent basis. Prefer low lighting on the waterfront and lighting the
17 buildings is the way to go. Would like lighting on the buildings to show the architecture.
18 Like the twinkle lights as holiday idea instead of all the time. Like using the local artists
19 for benches, bike racks, etc. whenever possible.

20
21 Sandy Reed: Asked for direction and clarification for the lighting, direction for
22 furnishings, the use of bollards and artists' designs as part of furnishings.

23
24 Consensus of committee:

- 25 ▪ Family C lighting for durability and flexibility (preferably simple)
- 26 ▪ Chicken and egg designs as vandal proof as possible
- 27 ▪ Low lighting on riverfront – up lighting on buildings
- 28 ▪ No twinkle lights on trees except at holidays
- 29 ▪ Concrete overlay could be use sparingly as needed – would like to see areas in
30 which it will be used – use local concrete provider.

31
32 Public hearing ended @ 4:30

33
34
35 Public hearing resumed @ 4:40

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

38 **OLD BUSINESS;**

39 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

40
41 **II. STAPLES, 207 South McDowell Blvd.**

42 **AP No: 007-280-071**

43 **File: SPC02039**

44 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

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

Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural committee approval of proposed architectural, site, parking and landscaping plans for a 24,000 square foot building.

Continued from November 14, 2002.

George White: Introduced the project for Kim Gordon the project planner.

Fred Becker, Rauschenback, Marvelli & Becker: Went over the issues identified at the last SPARC meeting and the proposed changes.

Brian Ball, Ball & Gee Landscape Architects: Presented the landscape plan.

Public hearing opened:

Dusty Resneck, PBAC: Went over the Bike Committee's conditions. Asked to have the sign turned off after hours and a bike rack at the bus stop. Committee has asked for pedestrian access in the back of the shopping center. Asked for a designated pedestrian/bike path throughout the shopping center. Asked for Class II bike lane on South McDowell. Asked for signs for safety, incentives for walking and biking, signage for herbicide use, and a break room.

George White: There were revised PBAC conditions dated October 31, 2002, which is what the committee reviewed.

Public hearing closed:

Craig Spaulding, City Engineer: Addressed the pedestrian crossing in front of Staples. Will amend original condition and recommend it be moved, however, will leave it up to the Committee to discuss.

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Gracyk: On the south elevation the sidewalk is very narrow – can we gain some area to soften that hardscape?

Fred Becker: We are limited by easements and therefore stuck with the square footage of the building.

Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested a clinging vine so that it will actually grow up the trellis. Like plant choices. Look at pink cloud at the loading area. Asked about asphalt in the easement area.

Craig Spaulding: On the south elevation trying to match existing area. Asphalt over utilities is easier to get to according to water Resources. Small shrubs are ok.

1

2 Fred Becker: Pointed out that there were two easements that go through there.

3

4 Committee Member Gracyk: Like the idea of pulling the striping across the lot further
5 for a long range goal.

6

7 Committee Member Barrett: Like the pedestrian crossing where it is and like it extending
8 through the middle. People are slowing down as they come toward the stop sign. Would
9 not be opposed to brighter striping (like yellow) and even raising the asphalt. Like the
10 changes on the west elevation. Agree with Janet regarding using a vine that does not
11 have to be trained. Appreciate the rear patio space with the bench and phone.

12

13 Committee Member Lynch: Do not like the idea of the rear plaza location – make the
14 plaza on the opposite corner. Like everything else that has been done. Think the
15 pedestrian crosswalk will be used – especially if the bold striping is used.

16

17 Committee Member Mathies: Disappointed with the plaza – I envisioned it in front of
18 the store. Think the more appropriate place for the crosswalk is at the stop sign. If you
19 want to draw attention to the store entrance, have two crosswalks. Would still like to
20 have a place for cart storage. Agree with other landscape comments.

21

22 Chair Rittenhouse: Think the changes are good regarding the ADA access and the
23 crosswalk. The architecture does not relate to the plaza area – think plaza should be
24 moved to the front. Think the mid block crossing will work, however, move the plaza to
25 the front and take a couple of parking spaces from there. Asked about the sign program.
26 If the applicant is willing to transfer the plaza, the phone, bench and bike rack should be
27 moved.

28

29 Fred Becker: Responded to the Committee regarding moving the plaza.

30 Chair Rittenhouse: Move handicap parking over two spaces.

31

32 Fred Becker: Trying to spread handicap spaces out between the two uses. Can add a
33 crosswalk at the stop sign.

34

35 George White: Do not want two crosswalks.

36

37 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked applicant if he would swap two handicap spaces and create
38 plaza out front by moving phone, bench and bike rack.

39

40 Consensus of committee for additional conditions of approval below:

41

- 42 ▪ Keep crosswalk where it is presently and use bold striping.
- 43 ▪ Post warning signs in both directions regarding pedestrian crossing
- 44 ▪ Move plaza area from the back to the front, eliminating two parking spaces, and
45 move drinking fountain, bench and phone to front plaza

46

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

Landscape architect: Asked for clarification regarding planting of trees near the easement.

Craig Spaulding: Ok to plant just outside the line of the easement.

M/S Mathies/Barrett to approve the project per the findings and amended conditions referenced above.

All in Favor:

- Committee Member Gracyk: Yes
- Committee Member Barrett: Yes
- Chair Rittenhouse: Yes
- Committee Member Lynch: Yes
- Committee Member Mathies: Yes

Public hearing end @ 5:30

DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FINDINGS
STAPLES AT WASHINGTON SQUARE
207 SOUTH MCDOWELL BLVD., APN 007-280-071

1. The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee (SPARC), authorizes the construction of a 24,000 square foot office building at Washington Square Shopping Center in the Central Commercial zoning district at 207 South McDowell Blvd., APN 007-280-071. The overall height would measure 24 feet from finished grade to the top of the main roof and a maximum of 38 feet from finished grade to the top of the roof at the main entry on the east elevation.
2. The proposed project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15302, Class 2(b), Replacement or Reconstruction, of the CEQA Guidelines, which allows the replacement of a commercial structure with a new structure of substantially the same size, purpose and capacity.
3. The project as conditioned will conform to the intent, goals and policies of the Petaluma General Plan. The General Plan contains objectives and policies, which encourage the use of commercial lands for economic activities that contribute to local employment and income.
4. The construction of the proposed 24,000 square foot building intended for commercial uses at 207 South McDowell Blvd, as conditioned, will not constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the public welfare of the community because it will be operated in conformance with the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance.

- 1 5. The proposed structure and site plan, as conditioned, conforms to the
- 2 requirements of Site Plan and Architecture Review Standards for Review of
- 3 Applications 26-406 (A) of the Zoning Ordinance as:
- 4
- 5 a. Quality materials are used appropriately and the project is in harmony and
- 6 proportion to the surrounding structures,
- 7
- 8 b. The architectural style is appropriate for the project and is compatible with
- 9 other structures in the immediate neighborhood,
- 10
- 11 c. The siting of the new structure is comparable to the siting of other
- 12 structures in the immediate neighborhood, and
- 13
- 14 d. The bulk, height, and color of the new structure is comparable to the bulk,
- 15 height, and color of other structures in the immediate neighborhood,
- 16
- 17 e. The landscaping is in keeping with the character and design of the site.
- 18
- 19 f. Ingress, egress, internal traffic circulation, off-street parking facilities, and
- 20 pedestrian ways have been designed to promote safety and convenience
- 21 and shall conform to the approved City standards.
- 22

DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 STAPLES AT WASHINGTON SQUARE
 207 SOUTH MCDOWELL BLVD., APN 007-280-071

- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28 1. Approval is granted for the design of a proposed one story 24,000 square foot
- 29 building and associated site, parking and landscaping plans, which shall be
- 30 substantially as shown on the plans received in the Planning Division and date
- 31 stamped December 2, 2002, except as modified by the conditions of approval.
- 32
- 33 2. Prior to issuance of a certificate of a building permit, the applicant shall provide
- 34 documentation that the lot line adjustment has been recorded.
- 35
- 36 3. Due to the proximity of residential uses, construction hours are limited to Monday
- 37 through Friday from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm and Saturday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.
- 38 Construction is prohibited on Sundays and all holidays recognized by the City of
- 39 Petaluma. This condition is more restrictive than construction hours stated in
- 40 Article 22 of the zoning ordinance (Performance Standards).
- 41
- 42 4. On plans submitted for building permit, the location of the shower is subject to
- 43 staff review and approval.
- 44
- 45 5. Plans submitted for building permit shall include 7 clothes lockers that shall be
- 46 close to the shower. The location of the lockers is subject to staff review and
- 47 approval.

- 1
2 6. Plans submitted for building permit shall include kitchen and eating facilities and
3 are subject to staff review and approval.
4
- 5 7. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each individual tenant, the
6 applicant shall provide documentation, which shall be given to the tenants, which
7 encourages “Incentive for Employees/Customers to Walk/Bike to Work” for
8 review by the planning staff and the PPBAC.
9
- 10 8. The applicant shall be required to utilize Best Management Practices regarding
11 pesticide/herbicide use and fully commit to Integrated Pest Management
12 techniques for the protection of pedestrian/bicyclists. The applicant shall be
13 required to post signs when pesticide/herbicide use occurs to warn pedestrians and
14 bicyclists.
15
- 16 9. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or a sign permit, the Master Sign
17 Program for the Washington Square Shopping Center shall be amended to reflect
18 the construction of the Staples building and the removal of the existing building.
19 The Master Sign Program Amendment shall be submitted to the Planning
20 Division and is subject to staff review and approval.
21
- 22 10. Signs are not approved as part of this project. Sign permits must be obtained
23 through the Building Division and be designed to conform to the Zoning
24 Ordinance requirements for signs.
25
- 26 11. On plans submitted for building permit, these conditions of approval shall be
27 included on the first plan sheet.
28
- 29 12. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide a glass sample
30 for staff review and approval.
31
- 32 13. *Prior to the submittal of a building permit application the following modifications*
33 *shall be made to the project plans:*
34 *○ A note indicating that the mid block crossing will be accentuated with bold*
35 *white or yellow striping.*
36 *○ The location of pedestrian crossing warning signs in both directions.*
37 *○ The relocation of the plaza area from the back to the front, eliminating*
38 *two parking spaces, and the associated relocation of the drinking fountain,*
39 *bench and phone to the modified front plaza.*
40
- 41 ~~13.14.~~ The applicants/developers shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or
42 any of its boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any claim,
43 action, or proceeding against the City, its boards, commissions, agents, officers,
44 or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of the project when
45 such claim or action is brought within the time period provided for in applicable
46 State and/or local statutes. The City shall promptly notify the

1 applicants/developers of any such claim, action, or proceeding. The City shall
 2 coordinate in the defense. Nothing contained in this condition shall prohibit the
 3 City from participating in a defense of any claim, action, or proceeding if the City
 4 bears its own attorney's fees and costs, and the City defends the action in good
 5 faith.

6
 7 ***Note: This project is subject to special development fees that will be collected at***
 8 ***the time of building permit issuance. Details can be provided from the Building***
 9 ***staff in the Community Development Department.***

10
 11 **From the Engineering Division**

12
 13 14.15. Trees shall not be planted within easements or over existing utilities.

14
 15 ~~15. On plans submitted for building permit, the crosswalk connecting parking lots~~
 16 ~~east of Staples shall be moved to the four-way stop just north of the proposed~~
 17 ~~location.~~

18
 19 16. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the lot line adjustment shall be recorded.

20
 21 17. On plans submitted for building permit, indicate the surface water flows and any
 22 proposed storm drain improvements around the perimeter of the proposed
 23 building.

24
 25 18. On plans submitted for building permit, include all applicable items from the
 26 attached *Commercial Checklist*.

27
 28 19. Plans submitted for building permit shall include two signs for the parking
 29 area/drive aisle located to the rear (west) of the building. A *one way* sign shall be
 30 located at the north end (entry) into the parking area/drive aisle and one *do not*
 31 *enter sign* shall be located at the south end (exit) of the drive aisle. The signs and
 32 their location are subject to staff review and approval.

33
 34 20.. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the signs shall be installed and the
 35 circulation arrows painted in the parking area.

36
 37 **From Water Resources and Conservation**

38
 39 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall address the following items to
 40 the satisfaction of the Department of Water Resources and Conservation:

41
 42 21. Provide maximum water demands for domestic, irrigation, and all Fire
 43 Department requirements.
 44

1 22. Abandon any unused water, sewer, storm drain stub-ins to the subject property to
2 Petaluma City Standards and the satisfaction of Water Resources and
3 Conservation.

4
5 23.. New water connection shall comply with Petaluma City standard details #880,
6 870, 863, 876.01, and all other standards that apply to this project.

7
8 24. The “lease area” of the building requires a separate 1” domestic water service
9 with backflow device (see City Standard 876.01). Gallon per minute demands
10 will determine meter size.

11
12 **From the Fire Marshal**

13
14 25.. Plans submitted for building permit shall include a double detector check valve
15 assembly on the fire service main and is subject to staff review and approval.

16
17 **Standard SPARC Conditions of Approval**

18
19 26. The site shall be kept cleared at all times of all garbage and debris. No outdoor
20 storage shall be permitted.

21
22 27.. Construction activities shall comply with applicable Zoning Ordinance and
23 Municipal Code Performance Standards (noise, dust, odor, etc.).

24
25 28.. At no time shall future business activities exceed Performance Standards specified
26 in the Uniform Building Code, Section 22-301 of the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance,
27 and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan (**Except as modified by Condition 3**
28 **above.**)

29
30 29.. All exterior light fixtures shall be shown on plans subject to staff review and
31 approval at time of building permit. All lights attached to the buildings shall be
32 downcast, shall provide a soft “wash” of light against the building, and shall
33 conform to City Performance Standards.

34
35 30. External downspouts shall be painted to match background-building colors.
36 Scuppers without drainage pipes may not be installed because of probable
37 staining of walls (overflow scuppers are excepted).

38
39 31. All trees shall be a minimum fifteen-gallon size (i.e. trunk diameter of at least $\frac{3}{4}$
40 inch measured one foot above the ground) unless otherwise specified (e.g.: 24”
41 box or specimen size) and double staked; all shrubs shall be five-gallon size. All
42 landscaped areas not improved with lawn shall be protected with two-inch deep
43 bark mulch as a temporary measure until the ground cover is established.

44
45 32.. All plant material shall be served by a City approved automatic underground
46 irrigation system.

47

1 33. All planting shall be maintained in good growing condition. Such maintenance
 2 shall include, where appropriate, pruning, mowing, weeding, cleaning of debris
 3 and trash, fertilizing and regular watering. Whenever necessary, planting shall be
 4 replaced with other plant materials to insure continued compliance with
 5 applicable landscaping requirements. Required irrigation systems shall be fully
 6 maintained in sound operating condition with heads periodically cleaned and
 7 replaced when missing to insure continued regular watering of landscape areas,
 8 and health and vitality of landscape materials.

9
 10 34. On plans submitted for building permit, all outdoor mechanical equipment, roof
 11 top equipment, fire mains, etc. shall be fully screened and are subject to staff
 12 review and approval.
 13

14
 15 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

16 **NEW BUSINESS:**

17 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

18
 19 **III. CERF SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING, 445 Black Oak Drive**
 20 **AP No. 019-540-020**
 21 **File: 02SPC0056**
 22 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**
 23

24 Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural committee review of landscape
 25 plan and design modifications for a previously approved single-family residence.
 26

27 Tiffany Robbe: Presented the project.

28
 29 Jim Cerf: Gave a history of the project and the proposed changes.

30
 31 Jim Catlin, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.
 32

33 Public hearing opened:

34
 35 Public hearing closed:

36
 37 Committee Comments:

38
 39 Committee Member Lynch: Gave some history of the project. The architect redesigned
 40 the house by cutting and pasting instead of actually redesigning the house. Still do not
 41 like seeing the garage doors as you drive up. Making the changes you want will take
 42 away all the landscaping in front and leave just asphalt.
 43

44 Committee Member Mathies: My preference would be to have the garage entrance on
 45 the side, however, it is your home. If you have both garages facing front, I don't agree to
 46 close in the courtyard. Landscaping is ok.

1
2 Committee Member Lynch: Applicant can close in the courtyard.

3
4 Committee Member Barrett: If neighbors are ok and the applicant wants the garages in
5 front, is ok, however I feel like it compromises the entryway. Like the closed courtyard.
6 Like plan 1, exhibit C.

7
8 Committee Member Gracyk: Mitigate the retaining wall with plantings. Like the
9 openness for the courtyard – do not think closing the courtyard off will protect from the
10 wind. Do not have to have strictly native trees, especially near the entryway. The
11 plantings in front of red bud, papyrus could maybe be thinned. Would expect more
12 natives where the arbutus is (near the property line) and move arbutus toward the front
13 entryway. You are not required to use all native plants.

14
15 Chair Rittenhouse: Spoken to the applicant, have known the applicant for 20 years. Feel
16 in a project that is this complex should have an architect, civil engineer and landscape
17 architect from the beginning. Agree with comments made today and if garage 2 is
18 important to your use then do what you want. You will block off some wind by
19 enclosing the courtyard, go for what you would like. Encourage the landscape architect
20 to integrate landscaping into the land rather than the property lines.

21
22 M/S Rittenhouse/Lynch to approve the landscape plan and proposed modifications to the
23 approved plan per plans date stamped November 15, 2002.

24
25 All in favor:

- 26 Committee Member Gracyk: Yes
- 27 Committee Member Barrett: Yes
- 28 Chair Rittenhouse: Yes
- 29 Committee Member Lynch: Yes
- 30 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

31
32 Public hearing closed @ 6:40
33

34
35 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
36 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

37
38 **IV. REDLICH TRIPLEX, 550 First Street**
39 **AP No: 008-192-004**
40 **File: 02PRE0045**

41
42 Applicant is requesting a preliminary site plan and architectural review of a
43 proposed triplex.

44
45 Continued from November 14, 2002.
46

1 Harriet Redlich, Architect, Central Avenue: Would like comments on the proposed
2 project.

3
4 Committee Comments:

5
6 Committee Member Lynch: As proposed, the parking in front of the building is not
7 acceptable. There will be opportunities when the Specific Plan is passed and you will
8 have more freedom. Would not approve this as it is because you have no connection to
9 the street. Architecture could be very good depending on the materials. Wouldn't go
10 with plywood siding – metal would probably work better. Like the tower element,
11 however, there is no shadow line so it doesn't really look like a tower. Like the roof
12 deck.

13
14 Committee Member Gracyk: Parking is difficult. Attracted to this type of living space –
15 push the architecture so it's not all vertical materials, livelier colors, and the tower pulled
16 out or possible parking behind. The lap pool would be better on the roof instead of the
17 ground level.

18
19 Committee Member Barrett: Parking is the difficult. If the project is mixed use – there is
20 difficulty getting to the second story.

21
22 Chair Ritenhouse: It's a difficult lot because of the parking requirements – nearly
23 impossible. Until the requirements are changed, don't believe the site can support a
24 triplex. Site could probably support a duplex. Not opposed to the height or the units the
25 way they are laid out. The detailing of how it's executed is crucial – how do you solve
26 parking, where is the entry, how to you have outside space Would like lighting on the
27 buildings to show the architecture?

28
29 Committee Member Mathies: Reiterate other comments – on a narrow lot there is no
30 other alternative for parking – do the best to soften it.

31
32 Committee Member Barrett: Asked what the parking guideline is currently.

33
34 George White: The multi-family standard is 1.5 spaces per unit.
35
36

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

39
40 **VI. DISCUSSION OF PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN 2004-2025.**
41 **EXISTING CONDITIONS, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES**
42 **REPORT.**
43

44 George White: Pamela Tuft suggested moving this item to the Agenda of January 9,
45 2002 and beginning the meeting 1 hour earlier.
46

1 The committee was agreeable to this.
2
3

4 **VII. REPORTS:**

5
6 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

7 **Liaison Reports:** Teresa Barrett is the SPARC liaison from the Planning
8 Commission. Tree Committee : Poultry Street developer came to the committee is ask
9 for recommendations. The comunity garden is underway. Tree recommendations were
10 made for the Burdell building at 405 East D Street. Planning Commission discussed
11 General Plan at the 2nd meeting in November. DSEIR for Factory Outlet Mall Expansion
12 was contnued to January 14, 2003.

13 Janet Gracyk asked for Tree Comittee standards for tree wells.

14 Committee Member Lynch : Asked if window appeal has been scheduled for City
15 Council yet ?

16
17 George White : Do not have a scheduled date yet.

18
19 **Adjournment:** 7:15

20
21