



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
41
42

Minutes

Regular Meeting January 10, 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, Chris Lynch, Linda Mathies(Absent), Ross Parkerson*, Jack Rittenhouse
Historic: Hoppy Hopkins, Marianne Hurley (Absent)

Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Jane Thomson, Code Enforcement Officer
Tiffany Robbe, Assistant Planner
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Anne Windsor, Secretary

* Chairperson

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of December 13, 2001 were approved as amended.
Committee Members' Report: None.
Correspondence: At places was a letter from Neighbors of Whole Foods.
Public Comment:
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

I. LANDMARK TREE NOMINATION, Grossland/12th Street. Request for landmark designation of the six (6) oak trees located along the southeast corner of Grossland Way and 12th Street.
Planner: Jane Thomson
Jane Thomson presented the staff report.

1 Ross Parkerson, Chair: Spoke about the process of nominating trees for Landmark
2 Status.

3
4 Committee Member Barrett made a motion seconded by Committee Member Lynch to
5 designate the six (6) oak trees located along the southeast corner of Grossland Way and
6 12th Street as Landmark trees.

7
8 All in favor:

9
10 Committee Member Hopkins: Yes
11 Committee Member Rittenshouse: Yes
12 Committee Member Barrett: Yes
13 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes
14 Committee Member Lynch: Yes
15 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

16
17 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

18 **OLD BUSINESS:**

19 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

20
21
22 **II. DOUGLAS STREET PEP, 200 Douglas Street. Request for Site Plan and**
23 **Architectural Review approval for 22 apartment units affordable to low and**
24 **very low-income seniors, one manager's unit and a community room.**
25 **APN: 008-161-014**
26 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

27
28 Continued from November 8, 2001.

29
30 Committee member Barrett recused herself because she resides within 300 feet of the
31 project.

32
33 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report.

34
35 Wayne Miller presented the project revisions to the Committee.

36
37 Vera Ciammetti, Executive Director: Recognized Dick Lieb for all his work and
38 renamed the project Dick Lieb Senior Apartments. Stressed the importance of approval
39 of the project for funding.

40
41 Greg Mitchell, 219 Baker Street: Has concerns regarding landscaping. Asked for a plant
42 list to be available.

43
44 Chris Lynch: Commended the architect for addressing all the committee's
45 recommendations. Asked for neighbor friendly fence in the back and sustainable fence in
46 front. Research the vinyl windows regarding sustainability.

47
48 Linda Mathies: Reiterated Committee Member Lynch regarding changes to the project.

1 Sconces and bollards are too plain. Understand copula for ventilation purposes. Colors
2 much improved.

3
4 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Thanked the architect for changes made, liked fencing
5 integrated in the front. Agree with Linda regarding sconces. Colors much better.

6
7 Committee Member Parkerson: Thanked architect for making it a better project.
8 Comments regarding the Community room paid off in providing a much improved living
9 space – is beneficial to site, neighborhood and residents. Like the landscaping plan
10 which did not change significantly.

11
12 A motion was made by Committee Member Lynch and seconded by Committee Member
13 Mathies to approve the project as amended.

14
15 All in favor:

16
17 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

18 Committee Member Barrett: Recused

19 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

20 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

21 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

22
23
24 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

25 **NEW BUSINESS:**

26 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

27
28 **III. WHOLE FOODS EXPANSION, 621 East Washington Street. Request for**
29 **Site Plan and Architectural Review approval to construct a 7,300 square foot**
30 **addition to the existing 15,240 square foot market. Proposal includes**
31 **removal of the existing stand-alone building on the corner of East**
32 **Washington Street and Vallejo Street to allow for additional on-site parking**
33 **and landscaping.**

34 **APN: 007-057-040 & 041**

35 **Planner: Irene Borba**

36
37 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

38
39 Committee Member Lynch: Asked questions regarding the side fence, setbacks and
40 lighting.

41
42 Dave Johnson, Johnson-Lyman Architects: Presented architectural changes and site plan
43 since the preliminary review presented on May 24, 2001.

44
45 Committee Member Lynch: Exterior uses on west side - what time of day are mats
46 washed?

47
48 John Sutti: From 7-9:00 a.m. Is a requirement from Board of Health.

1 Committee Member Lynch: Asked various questions related to noise by delivery trucks
2 and freezers

3

4 John Sutti: They are removing the existing compressor room and moving to center of
5 store on the roof. Will be all new equipment and much quieter. Walked the
6 neighborhood for 3 days, knocked on doors, left letters if people were not home. Moving
7 shed in back attached to fence and putting in a new fence. Talked to neighbor about
8 materials for replacing fence. Will be a concrete wall.

9

10 Committee Member Lynch: Asked about concrete out front and for description of trellis
11 on corner.

12

13 There was a discussion with architect regarding the existing sign. Presently Whole Foods
14 is not planning to do anything with the sign.

15

16 Public hearing opened:

17

18 Pat McShane, 34 Myrtle Court: Concerned with two issues: The site has been five
19 different stores and was always a part of the neighborhood. Since Whole Foods came in
20 there is no neighborhood feeling. Is a member Payran-McKinley Action Committee –
21 current problems with Whole Foods regarding noise levels all night long and parking for
22 employees. Confused about parking configuration. Delivery trucks cut off access to the
23 street.

24

25 Andrea Doughty, 145 Vallejo: Live directly across from loading dock. Has made 13
26 attempts to stop all night deliveries. Talked with manger, owner, police, owner of
27 property and Jane Thomson. Wants loading dock moved or limited from 7:00 a.m. to
28 10:00 p.m. due to loud equipment. No one knocked on her door. Asked about noise
29 ordinance – sometimes more than 3 deliveries. If dock is open and expanded 7,000
30 square feet everything will increase. Trucks can be there as long as an hour.

31

32 Steve Parsons, 42 Avery Way: Also directly across from loading dock. Wants sound
33 wall to come closer to Washington Street – constant noise when trucks are there.
34 Limiting hours would be helpful.

35

36 Don Doughty, 145 Vallejo Street: Design looks better. Trucks are parking on street and
37 are very noisy – would like loading dock moved or a variance and increase height of
38 wall. Further noise created from trucks backing up.

39

40 Robert Arnold, 140 Vallejo Street: Lives directly behind the store. Concerns of noise –
41 if more than 1 truck arrives they park in front of my house. Want wall as high as possible
42 for sound and visual impact. Want to know when construction would begin and how
43 long would it take? Employee parking is also a problem.

44

45 John Sutti: Construction will take approximately 4 months.

46

47 Community organizer from St. Joseph's Health System: Concerns regarding noise and
48 parking on street by employees. There is a high rate of elderly in the neighborhood.

1
2 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Read letter from neighbor, Linda Moreau. Bike committee would
3 like benches on Vallejo and clarification about seating in trellis area, and a shower for
4 employees. Employee parking is a problem for the neighborhood

5
6 Committee Member Lynch: Asked for a study to create compact parking stalls.

7
8 Dave Johnson: Responded to comments from committee and public. Regarding the
9 sound wall – can close driveway off , however, this is a problem for the police from a
10 security standpoint.

11
12 Discussion regarding the driveway and setbacks that would require a variance.

13
14 Public hearing closed.

15
16 Committee identified project issues:

- 17 ▪ Parking,
- 18 ▪ Noise from trucks
- 19 ▪ Delivery times
- 20 ▪ Truck access

21
22 Committee Member Comments:

23
24 Committee Member Lynch: Questions of staff: Difficult because it's a permitted use.
25 Would like to try to mitigate issues if possible. Store is going to intensify use. Loading
26 area is an issue – entire perimeter is an issue. Need to mitigate noise from mat washing.
27 Architectural things that can happen to mitigate – propose adding a wall of 6 feet on west
28 – new gate to access PEP project. Shed in back needs to be removed. Loading dock is
29 difficult – if it can be roofed – move driveway, push wall and would be single-loaded –
30 would solve sound issues and by enclosing it would help tremendously. Do not see
31 another place to put loading dock – difficult to move to west side. Parking on street,
32 can't have 40 employees parking on site but at least 8 or more – squeeze more parking
33 into site. Designate at least 10-15 spaces for employees. Encourage more pedestrian
34 friendly – want a shower in light of remodeling the whole store. Can compactor can go
35 inside? Hours – how can we regulate?

36
37 Linda Mathies: Expansion is good in bringing neighborhood issues to light. Easiest and
38 cleanest way is to limit times – is this enforceable? Also, if police department is willing
39 to extend wall and eliminate driveway that would be a good solution. Do not think you
40 need to cover. Critical to designate employee parking, set company policy that
41 employees will not park in front of residences – has been happening in the last couple of
42 months. Bathrooms not being renovated, however, check the possibility to incorporate a
43 shower.

44
45 Jack Rittenhouse: Add door in the loading dock area into store, needs to be enclosed
46 unless they will eliminate nighttime delivery, agree to move driveway forward toward
47 Washington Street. Parking – maximize amount of parking by adding compact stalls,
48 employees need to park out on Washington or designated on perimeter. Limit delivery

1 after 10 p.m. Encourage bike lockers, shower, etc – the additional costs would be
2 minimal since the store is being completely remodeled.

3
4 Committee Member Mathies: How will a covered loading area work for dumpsters and
5 compacters?

6
7 Jane Thomson: Need to consider all equipment stored in the loading dock area.

8
9 Committee Member Barrett: Police want all trucks off Vallejo north of Avery – need to
10 adopt and enforce. Should restrict hours – a much more effective solution and less
11 costly. Need to mitigate by changing hours of delivery. Agree there should be a shower.
12 Meet with neighbors and talk to Clover regarding being a good neighbor. Restrict
13 employees parking off site. Having benches on Vallejo or Washington and Vallejo –
14 possibly rethink trellis area regarding seating. Lighting is crucial on site.

15
16 Committee Member Parkerson: Parking – needs more careful thinking to provide as
17 much parking as possible, need at least 1/3 of the employees to park on site. Agree with
18 moving wall and getting rid of driveway. Covering would reduce noise – am in favor of
19 restricting hours. Apply same hours as the G&G Supermarket. Enforce trucks to park
20 north of Avery on Vallejo. Design mat washing in the project to be done in a different
21 area. Can there be signs posted? Need shower.

22
23 Committee Member Lynch: Suggested enclosing loading dock and asking applicant to
24 design as part of project so hours are not a problem to enforce.

25
26 Committee Member Mathies: Architecture: Nice element at trellis, need to keep seating,
27 like metal awning, colors and rustic feel. Suggested looking at the standard lighting in
28 Tahoe City. Concerned about gate to PEP, bring forward from a security standpoint.
29 Thinks the applicant can meet the standard hours for delivery trucks.

30
31 Committee Member Maties left at 5:35 p.m.

32
33 Committee Member Barrett: Trellis on corner is confusing – consider police issues.
34 Maybe do something toward the sign. Eliminate cart roundup out there and put in some
35 parking. Include benches on Vallejo. Need for more specifics on lighting, agree with
36 drinking fountain - near transit would be a good site.

37
38 Committee Member Barrett left at 5:45 p.m.

39
40 Committee Member Lynch: Architecture: Want cart storage near Washington moved.
41 Not sure what plaza is doing there – do something classy, public art possibly – tree will
42 not stand out. Sign – would love to condition project to redo sign. Would like to clean
43 up East Washington Street. With the structure being removed in front and store being
44 moved out – do not need large sign – think it is a mistake to leave. Lights – some weak
45 areas – don't want glare on East Washington. Landscape – like Sycamore because they
46 are large and provide shade in summer. No sod on Vallejo, lose specimen tree – made a
47 statement on plaza area. Liked the massing of design – didn't like hardboard, liked silo –
48 new design is more generic – like the awnings and flaps as far as entry element – trusses

1 are overdone. Push the design a little – feel this is not as nice. Steel I beams instead of
2 heavy timbers. Prefer corrugated metal instead of standing seam – same underneath as
3 on top. Stucco panels – too busy. Don't mind board and batten – the way used here is
4 not successful.

5
6 Committee Member Rittenhouse: I will not repeat all site comments. Liked the silo
7 design better. Massing of structure brought into loading dock can be dressed up and
8 styled like the rest of the building. Standing seam metal more office like – if going rustic
9 would prefer corrugated metal. Steel or combination better than wood – maintenance
10 issue and not very attractive. Would like entry addressed more. Not clear what is
11 happening out front in the marketplace area. Would prefer another color stucco. Sign –
12 time to make change and reduce and make more stylized – can be effective without being
13 so large. Need to start making East Washington Street attractive. Trellis on corner does
14 not seem relevant to project – happy with topiary or more soft scape – could become
15 attractive nuisance for teenagers.

16
17 Committee Member Rittenhouse stated that Committee Member Barrett to agrees with all
18 of the conditions from police department.

19
20 Committee Member Parkerson: Agree with architectural critique – did not want radically
21 redesigned – something in between the two designs. Wood can be a problem. Less is
22 more – business about design – be as straightforward as you can. Comments about
23 materials are good ones. Design for plaza – the simpler the better. Sign – Petaluma is
24 trying to remove old signs from 50's and 60's. Want to dress up sign – minor part of
25 what has been said today. Make entrance and exit from store clear architecturally. No
26 praise for trusses.

27
28 John Sutti: Want to take care of neighbors – important issue. Delivery hours are difficult
29 to enforce. Think enclosing loading dock is the solution and possibly changing the hours.
30 Asked for G&G Supermarket hours. Would like to try for a variance. Closing driveway
31 is ok. Want clarity on trellis area – benches instead of trellis on corner. Do not see
32 problems with any other suggestions.

33
34 Committee Member Rittenhouse made a motion which was seconded by Committee
35 Member Lynch to continue to February 28, 2002.

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

39
40 **IV. KAISER PERMANENTE, Lakeville Highway. 54,000 square foot**
41 **expansion of the existing 38,000 square foot medical office building.**
42 **APN: 005-090-071**

43
44 Gary Jereczek, Architect: Presented the proposed changes to the project.
45
46
47
48

1 Committee Comments:

2

3 Committee Member Parkerson: Like the site plan better, like the outdoor area, think not
4 mimicking the other building is good.

5

6 Committee Member Lynch: Gateway building site: success of existing building is in its
7 massing, like site plan better, still a lot of parking area, consider rotating the new building
8 – is too much of a big box; tilt up not as compatible with existing building; look at
9 sustainability with sunshade, PVs, daylighting, etc; use energy 10 software; change the
10 “box “ concept.

11

12 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Building needs to step up; proposal is not compatible
13 with existing building; rethink – needs more creativity, work on massing and open spaces
14 should be usable. Massing most important.

15

16

17 **V. REPORTS:**

18

19 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

20 **Liaison Reports:** None

21

22 Adjournment: 6:50 p.m.

23

24

25