



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

Minutes

Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers
City Hall, 11 English Street

February 14, 2002
3:00 p.m.
Petaluma, CA

Telephone: 707-778-4301
FAX: 707-778-4498

E-Mail: planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us
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, Chris Lynch, Linda Mathies, Ross Parkerson*, Jack Rittenhouse
Historic: Hoppy Hopkins, Marianne Hurley

Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Tiffany Robbe, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Secretary

* Chairperson

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of January 24, 2002 were approved as amended.
Committee Members' Report: Chair asked about minutes for special meeting on January 31, 2002.
Correspondence: None. Passed out at places two letters re: Water Street.
Public Comment: None.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
PRELIMINARY REVIEW:

I. BURDELL BUILDING, 405 East D Street. Preliminary review to restore and remodel an existing commercial building.

1 David Martin, Oak Street: Presented the project.

2

3 **Public Comments:**

4

5 **Richard DeCarli:** Would like the whole area preserved historically.

6

7 **Committee Comments:**

8

9 Marianne Hurley: Stated that the building is eligible for National Register – has not been
10 nominated though. Is eligible because it is associated with an important person and
11 history of the town. Important for CEQA. Do not want historical value compromised.
12 Larger issues need to be addressed: removal of stucco already done from Lakeville side.
13 Sandblasting compromises brick. Concerned about sandblasting. Parts of building being
14 historically restored is great. Added features: large coupla – intrusion onto historical
15 warehouse. Same thing for dormers that have been added – have no historic reference.
16 To make more interesting you're compromising historic value. Recommend staying with
17 historic building as much as possible. Choice of doors on parking lot side – try to find a
18 barn like door as opposed to a modern style. Don't think entrance is in that category so
19 design is fine. Do not like trellis work – more industrial than craftsman.

20

21 Hoppy Hopkins: Pleased the building is being preserved. Agrees with Marianne.

22

23 Jack Rittenhouse: Don't see big picture in the proposal. Appears to have fixes here and
24 there, need to preplan how that all will work. Things being added that have no reference
25 to history of building. Windows should go back to original as much as possible. Go
26 back and look at master plan. Entry as proposed is not in scale with building.

27

28 Teresa Barrett: Parking needs to be broken up. Think you need a clear entrance way –
29 not opposed to proposed entrance. Trellis is ok.

30

31 Chris Lynch: Less is more – if master plan is not done – I would question the coupla.
32 Design is mixed and doesn't fit building. Trellis does not work for this building –
33 something more industrial like the history of building. Respect your work – suggest
34 having a master plan.

35

36 Linda Mathies: Glad your taking on process and coming in for preliminary review.
37 Asked Marianne Hurley if owner/applicant could get assistance if building is on National
38 Register.

39 Thought it might be good to research to get financial assistance.

40

41 Ross Parkerson: Happy that you are working on the building. Is an important building –
42 has an impact on Lakeville. Need to be careful about how you add to this building. Have
43 some sense of where you are going. Dormers, coupla and trellis distracts from
44 uniqueness of building.

45

46 David Martin: Can I back off on dormers and coupla and focus on entryway? Would
47 like to get rid of parapet wall and redesign entryway.

48

1 Ross Parkerson: You can come back for another preliminary review – we have passed on
2 our view and encourage you to focus on the theory of less is more.

3
4
5 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

6 **OLD BUSINESS:**

7 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
8
9

10 **II. BJM BUILDING, 90 Sycamore Lane. Request for Site Plan and**
11 **Architectural Review approval of a new 6,004 square foot commercial building.**

12 **APN: 006-450-002**

13 **Planner: Kim Gordon**
14

15 Applicant is requesting a continuance to March 14, 2002 (see attached letter).
16 M/S Barrett/Rittenhouse.

17
18 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

19 Committee Member Barrett: Yes

20 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

21 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

22 Committee Member Mathies: Yes
23

24
25 **III. ADOBE HOUSE II, 750 North McDowell Boulevard. Applicant is**
26 **requesting site plan and architectural review for construction of a 16,340 square**
27 **foot 2-story office building.**

28 **APN: 137-060-037**

29 **Planner: Phil Boyle**
30

31 Staff is requesting a continuance to February 28, 2002. M/S Barrett/Lynch.

32
33 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

34 Committee Member Barrett: Yes

35 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

36 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

37 Committee Member Mathies: Yes
38

39
40 **IV. DOWNTOWN RIVER APARTMENTS, 3-39 East Washington Street.**
41 **Applicant is requesting site plan, architectural and landscaping approval of a**
42 **proposal to construct an 81 unit affordable housing project, 5,000 square feet of**
43 **commercial space, and a 3,000 square foot community center**

44 **APN: 007-121-006; 007; 008; 009; 010; 011; 012; 013 and 017**

45 **Planner: Irene Borba**
46

47 Irene Borba presented the Staff Report.
48

1 Jeff Bennett, Eden Housing: Presented changes made to the project which were
2 requested by the SPARC Committee in October, 2001.

3
4 Paul Barnhart, Barnhart Architects: Presented the project and the proposed changes.

5
6 Moved building back 6 feet per the Central Petaluma Specific Plan

7 Raised the retail to meet zero net fill requirement

8 Split the elevator banks

9 Added a view deck on back

10 More access to retail on East Washington Street – elevated sidewalk so that it is
11 continuous

12 Glass on end of building to take advantage of the river

13 Proposed moving the bus stop and adding parking in front of retail or another option is
14 for shared parking, the difficulty is implementing this plan and land banking was another
15 proposal.

16 Exterior design and materials, treatment of building – presented three different options

17
18 **Public Comment:**

19
20 **Steve vonRaesfeld**, 117-10th Street: High prominence of site. Referred to page 3 of the
21 Staff Report. Do not feel meeting complied with the request stated on Page 3. Items 1
22 and 2 are conditions of approval – you do not see these at a design charette. Four issues:
23 Street and commercial interface

24 Decks need to be part of the building

25 Building articulation – looks like a block – needs to read as pieces

26 Ecco riverfront – don't apply in a token sense – is this an urban or suburban solution?

27
28 **Brent Russell**, 202 Webster Street: Was there a request for a walkway on the river as
29 part of this project?

30
31 **Committee:** Yes

32
33 **Richard DeCarli.** Concerned about future of downtown. Do not want modern building
34 to clash with history. Don't think a mixture of factory and modern art in the gateway to
35 downtown is appropriate. Would like to eliminate one story.

36
37 **Megan Gast**, Golden Eagle Shopping Center: Have concerns about parking and safety
38 crossing Washington Street.

39
40 **Angela DeCarli:** Downtown business owners oppose this project. Low cost housing in
41 the gateway to downtown is not good idea. When proposed it was one story shorter –
42 insulted by use of corrugated metal. City has not taken into account business and
43 property owners.

44
45 **Clare Monteschio**, 112 F Street: Sorry that it has not progressed further – lacks context
46 to existing site – could have more detail and more materials that exist in downtown.

47
48 **Shawn Montoya**, A Street: Main concern is the verticalness of project – building does

1 not fit the area. Ways to reduce the scale by stepping back. Sets a precedent for the area.

2
3
4 **Brent Russell**, 202 Webster: Size is not necessary a bad thing – depends on how it is
5 articulated.

6
7 **Committee Comments:**

8
9 **Committee Member Rittenhouse:** Difficult to critique. Disappointed that package was
10 the same as presented earlier to SPARC. Project seems rigid – not fluid in adapting to
11 this site and this Street. Appreciate courtyard concept – would like to reduce blockiness
12 – articulation of facade is not there yet. Not there on the materials – style and form needs
13 to be reconsidered. No provision for signage on retail. Not convinced retail is viable
14 here. Crosswalk is still a major issue of safety. Need to see how parking entrances will
15 be designed. Open spaces are nice – do not want to see parking in the back. Need to get
16 back to the basics on the building.

17
18 Committee Member Rittenhouse left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

19
20 **Committee Member Barrett:** Seemed like the packet did not take into consideration
21 suggestions that were made. Support the project and would like to see it happen. Do not
22 like the way it looks and want to know how retail will work here – access is an
23 unresolved issue. Like the idea of sharing parking – don't understand why the
24 handicapped parking is where it is. Do not like corrugated metal unless you are a silo –
25 looking east is ok, looking west it does not meld. Would like it to look more urban –
26 expected to see more changes in facade.

27
28 **Committee Member Lynch:** At preliminary we were generally favorable – gave a lot of
29 direction which was not met. Spoke of reducing mass in front. Is not feasible to have a
30 new building to look like an old one, however, you can do something with vertical
31 massing to fit in contextually. Combining new materials with a pleasing historic massing
32 is a way to get a result. Trying to do too much. Look into the symmetrical facades.
33 Needs more work. Balconies need to be more enclosed as part of the architecture.
34 Applaud the shared parking idea – is crucial to make the commercial work. Consider
35 wide bank of stairs into entry – is on the south side and will be sunny. Avoid sliding
36 glass doors on balconies. Have the bike access where fire lane is proposed. Cyclone
37 fence along river is a big mistake. Safety issue of crossing Washington still needs to be
38 addressed. Such an important project – need to be able to see exactly what you are
39 proposing.

40
41 **Committee Member Mathies:** In favor of the project and affordable housing. The
42 facade is the issue for me. Petaluma has many different style of architecture. Building
43 needs to be its own building and make its own statement. Do not like the idea of using
44 parking in play area. Do not need bike path in front and behind – one or the other.

45
46 **Committee Member Parkerson:** Very interested in how the project was going to
47 resolve itself – chosen as an overall proposal to introduce a diversity of projects in terms
48 of the Central Petaluma Specific Plan. Petaluma is a unique town with considerable

1 historic reference and diversity. Receding the retail space is a good idea. Need to deal
 2 with the change in grade – think you have done a good job. Adjustments need to be
 3 made, however, the overall sense is good. Think housing is a good use for this site.
 4 Develop the design from the inside out. Is not in conflict with what is proposed in the
 5 Central Petaluma Specific Plan.

6
 7 **Linda Mandolini**, Executive Director, Eden Housing: Aware of the location of the
 8 building. Would like guidance to go forward – not clear on materials. Need to build a
 9 parking garage that is efficient. We very much want good design. Would like guidance
 10 on massing, materials, design, windows, etc.

11
 12 **Committee Member Lynch**: Understand your frustration because we say different
 13 things – you need to let the building itself speak to the type of materials. Come back to
 14 us with several options.

15
 16 **Steve vonRaesfeld**: Think a charette would be important to look at process – sit with
 17 ideas before you have rendered elevations.

18
 19 **Committee Member Lynch**: Can we have consensus on the issues?

20 Balconies (more enclosed)

21 Massing – less symmetry - more daylighting in the inter-courtyard

22 Commercial needs to work – access is crucial

23 Windows – more variety of windows; did not want sliding glass doors

24
 25 **Committee Member Parkerson**: Changes in receding retail is good, like the idea
 26 proposed by Committee Member Lynch regarding the steps is good. Like the statement
 27 Eden is making here.

28
 29 M/S Barrett, Lynch to continue to March 14, 2002.

30 Committee Member Barrett: Yes

31 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

32 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

33 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

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

38
 39 **V. KJELDSSEN DUPLEX, 1ST STREET BETWEEN G & H (tentatively**
 40 **addressed as 550 & 552 First Street). Preliminary review to construct a three-story**
 41 **duplex on a 3,405 square foot lot in the Riverfront Warehouse District.**

42 **APN: 008-192-004**

43 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

44
 45 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report.

46
 47 **Chris Kjeldsen**, Owner: Gave a history of purchasing the property and the proposed
 48 project.

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

Brent Russell, Architect: Presented the project.

Joe Durney, neighbor: Looks like an exciting project.

Committee Coments:

Committee Member Mathies: Suggested changing material of the garage doors to be more attractive (maybe barn-like). Not drawn to entry – need to feel invited. Front of house needs less emphasis on the garage and more on the entry. Think you might regret not putting in a fireplace. Not sure about the deer fencing.

Committee Member Lynch: The design is the same as if it was a three unit building. Redesign it as a duplex. Consider tandem garage so you are not forced to use the driveway for parking. Think it needs to be redesigned – design is not quality. Materials proposed are very plain, vinyl windows, board and bat siding.

Committee Member Barrett: Feel the same as Linda regarding front door – needs to have a sense of entry. Looks like a triplex. Does not look honest (too easy to convert).

Committee Member Parkerson: Rear staircase makes no sense – with a different design the stairs can go on the inside & provide more backyard area. Thinks you need to have an entry that is visible. Dislikes deer fencing. Massing is fine. Reduce the impact of the garage doors. Needs more character and sensibility of getting in and out of the building.

VI. REPORTS:

Planning Staff Reports: None

Liaison Reports: None.

Adjournment: 6:20

S:\Sparc\Minutes\021402.doc
