



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 24, 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, Ross Parkerson*, Jack Rittenhouse
Historic: Hoppy Hopkins, Marianne Hurley
- Staff:** George White, Planning Manager
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Secretary

* Chairperson

- Approval of Minutes: Minutes of January 10, 2002 were approved as amended.
Committee Members' Report: Chair Parkerson attended Old Elm Village grand opening – suggested walking through the project – good example of good architecture. Gate buildings at Payran are very interesting.
Sandwich board sidewalk signs downtown getting out of hand.
Correspondence: None. Passed out packets for special meeting on January 31, 2002.
Public Comment: None.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
-

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

- I. VICTORY CHEVROLET BUILDING, 13 Petaluma Boulevard South. Preliminary review to remodel and restore an existing commercial building.**

1 Vin Smith: Presented an overview of the project.

2

3 Rick Strauss, Architect: Presented an architectural overview of the adaptive reuse of the
4 building.

5

6 **Committee Comments:**

7

8 Committee Member Lynch: Suggested metal roofing material for a historic look as
9 opposed to current materials.

10

11 Committee Member Hurley: Referred to issues from Heritage Homes.

12

- 13 • Brick on front columns; may or may not need to retain
- 14 • Punching out brick without having a tenant – seems premature – difficult not
15 having a tenant.
- 16 • Would prefer fewer bricks on side wall to be taken out to preserve the historic
17 quality.
- 18 • Replacing transom windows is questionable regarding Secretary of Interior
19 standards. All seal sash windows to remain if repairable.
- 20 • Suggested using a tile as close to original tile rather than stucco.
- 21 • Would prefer to keep as much original materials as possible.

21

22 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Think Basin Street is on the right path – adaptive reuse
23 needs to be flexible, therefore do as little as possible prior to securing your tenant. Think
24 multiple tenants is a good idea. Concerned about parking lot lights. Show how ADA can
25 be accomplished. Rear entry could be elegant. Would like drawing elevations to include
26 roof. Addressing the roof is a concern – especially if the building in back is higher and
27 will have a view of this roof. Reconsider cars coming out so close to Boulevard – look at
28 site circulation – relook at handicap spaces and compact parking spaces. Light fixtures
29 for parking lot and building itself is critical. Consider some more metal than just awning
30 in front.

31

32 Committee Member Barrett: Like the building. Have problems with parking and the
33 entrance being so close to Petaluma Boulevard – C or 2nd Street entrance would be better.
34 Think there are too many parking spaces without landscaping in between.

35

36 Committee Member Lynch: Would like something other than blacktop for roof. Do not
37 like faux on front. Would like to see steel on windows or as close to that as possible. I'm
38 in favor of as much day lighting as possible. Agree with parking issues because the use is
39 changing, entry needs to be changed. Looks like you are doing your part to restore.

40

41 Committee Member Mathies: Like the idea of the building being restored. Parking does
42 not seem to be safe on B Street. Brick on front should go – agree to maintain as much
43 brick as possible. Would like the idea of a theatre or good retail store such as REI.

44

45 Committee Member Parkerson: See that you are paying attention to Brainard Jones'
46 marvelous sense of architecture, proportion and scale. Front elevation is very unusual.
47 Would rather see unified process of design now with the total building in mind. Agree to

1 look at the parking to make the circulation work properly. Move driveway further away
2 from the boulevard.

3
4 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Commended the developer. Bike Committee would like soft
5 wash lighting – Foundry Wharf is a good example.

6
7 There was a discussion regarding frontage improvements for a new building versus a
8 restored building. Intensification of use would require parking.

9
10 Vin Smith: Wanted clarification regarding finger islands and landscape required.
11 Consensus of committee was to move entrance at 2nd instead of C and to improve site
12 circulation.

13
14 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested C Street entrance moved away from the
15 Boulevard – deal with the 3 parking spaces on B Street.

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

18 **OLD BUSINESS:**

19 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

20
21
22 **II. PETALUMA POULTRY PROCESSING, 2700 Lakeville Highway. Request**
23 **for Site Plan and Architectural Review approval of an expansion to an**
24 **existing poultry processing plant.**

25 **APN: 005-040-048**

26 **Planner: Irene Borba**

27
28 Continued from December 13, 2001.

29
30 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

31
32 Chris Lucia, Tierney Figureo Architects: Presented an architectural overview of the new
33 freezer and addition to Petaluma Poultry.

34
35 Committee Member Lynch: Wanted a contextual drawing for a sense of surroundings
36 due to so much recent development in this area. – how does the parcel connect to
37 neighboring parcels? Asked staff to show what bike Committee recommendations that
38 staff did not included.

39
40 Landscape Architect: Gave overview of revised landscaping plan.

41
42 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Spoke about what Bike Committee was recommending. Patricia
43 posted a vicinity map to look at the Pedestrian and Bike Committee's vision of the entire
44 area and continuity of bike paths. Primarily want an off road path.

45
46
47 **Committee Comments:**

1 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Confused about purpose of addition other than closing
2 off staircase.

3

4 Chris Lucia, Architect: Relocating the front door.

5

6 Bob Wolf, Petaluma Poultry: The cost of a larger addition was prohibitive since at a later
7 time they will probably be moving. They wanted to emphasize the entrance, add lunch
8 space, and relocate handicap parking.

9

10 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Do not see an identity on the entrance. Site circulation
11 is better, however, it does not tell me what the building is about – seems like just a band-
12 aid to front door.

13

14 Committee Member Barrett: Appreciate landscaping changes. Agree with Bike
15 Committee to put an off road path through property.

16

17 Committee Member Lynch: Want to see all the relationships of development in the area.
18 Items not included that should be: Include all the bike spaces that Bike Committee is
19 asking for, upgrading of Adobe Creek trail should be taken care of by other developers in
20 the area (line 34, pg. 4), 10 ft. strip on Lakeville – Cal Trans does not have jurisdiction on
21 private property – set a precedent and start path even if it does not get connected now.
22 Regarding architecture: Agree with Jack – same problem now as preliminary – this is
23 office park architecture – do something that speaks to your poultry processing identity.
24 Be creative – does not have to cost more money. Previous application with addition took
25 away from freezer – explore metal, industrial – something that speaks more to what you
26 are doing.

27

28 Committee Member Mathies: Appreciate change in landscaping on long wall – would be
29 nice to carry landscaping around where there is currently only 3 trees. In favor of a strip
30 on the property for a path even if it does not presently connect to other paths. Pull in
31 heritage of plant with the architecture – tie in with old hatchery – opportunity to be
32 creative. Like the plaza area and table area for employees out front.

33

34 Committee Member Parkerson: Comparing site plan with the preliminary review
35 drawings – was disappointed. Make a simple architectural statement in the front instead
36 of trying to dress up. A path on the property would be a reasonable request. Needs to be
37 fair regarding ratio of bike parking spaces for additions versus a new building.

38

39 Bob Wolf, Poultry Processing: Not very popular in Sonoma County because of the type
40 of business – have kept a low profile on purpose. Adding a path in front would take
41 away the landscaping that shields the business. Have 20 bike spaces and incentive plans
42 for employees who walk or bike to work.

43

44 Committee member Rittenhouse: Appropriate to suspend bike path on Lakeville for now
45 – not terribly safe.

46

47 Committee Member Lynch: Do not feel all the landscaping has to be taken out in order
48 to fit bike path on Lakeville – think that path is crucial.

1 Landscape Architect: Biggest problem is the existing trees – can do a meandering path,
2 however, some trees will have to come out.

3
4 Committee Member Lynch: Have the opportunity to move the driveway and redo some
5 of the asphalt.

6
7 Committee Member Mathies: Does the property owner have to assume liability? Feel
8 the path may be unsafe.

9
10 George White: Would need to have an easement.

11
12 Eliminate condition regarding bike spaces.

13
14 Jerry Tierney, Architect: Am hearing many different things – simple, industrial, would
15 like some direction.

16
17 Committee Member Parkerson: Plaza is important to entry and the final architecture.

18
19 A motion was made by Committee Member Rittenhouse and seconded by Committee
20 Member Lynch to continue to February 28, 2002 meeting.

21
22 All in favor:

23
24 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

25 Committee Member Barrett: Yes

26 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

27 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

28 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

29
30
31 **III. BJM BUILDING, 90 Sycamore Lane. Request for Site Plan and**
32 **Architectural Review approval of a new 6,004 square foot commercial**
33 **building.**

34 **APN: 006-450-002**

35 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

36
37 Applicant is requesting a continuance to February 14, 2002.

38
39 A motion was made by Committee Member Barrett and seconded by Committee
40 Member Rittenhouse to continue the BJM Building to February 14, 2002.

41
42 All in favor:

43
44 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

45 Committee Member Barrett: Yes

46 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

47 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

48 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

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
48

**IV. MCBRIEN RESIDENCE, 414 G Street. Preliminary Review of a second single family dwelling on an 11,250 square foot lot.
APN: 008-116-018
Planner: Kim Gordon**

Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

James McBrien: Presented the new site plan to the Committee.

Alison Steele, 408-4th Street: Asked who has purvue over wheelchair accessibility.

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Lynch: Appreciate applicant's effort. Parking at face value works – now have large amounts of asphalt – need to explore paving or areas of paving with landscaping in between. Explore road oyle (decomposed granite) – complies with all weather surface required by the City.

Regarding architecture: Went to neighbor – would be nice to see how it relates to the project. Suggested talking to a particular neighbor who would be impacted. Whatever you can do to push away from neighbor's fence. Looks like a ranch style home from the 40's – would like you to emulate the front house as best you can, siding, window dimension/style, roof pitch.

Committee member Mathies: My main issue is all of the pavement – “Hollywood strips” would be a solution for the three spaces minimum. Impossible to duplicate front house with the need for two car garage. Whatever you can do to follow the theme of the front house with materials. Add window on south elevation in bedroom 1 and on west elevation in bedroom 2. Alleviate paving. Window boxes are good – could add to east elevation.

Committee Member Barrett: Concerned about amount of paving – want to see less asphalt – suggestions made were good.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Primary concern is paving and access. Suggested having a topographical map done. Rotate the dominating element of garage to the west elevation – very simple moves can be done to have a good site plan.

Committee Member Parkerson: Appreciated the effort from the applicant. Architecture very diverse in the neighborhood. Think Jack's suggestion is a good one. Regarding setback of adjacent property – if possible provide more space from neighbor.

V. KFC/S&W RESTAURANT REMODEL, 701 E. Washington Street.

1 Jim Nicol, Reginal Director, Harman Management. Corporation: Presented the project –
2 proposing to bring A&W back to Petaluma.

3
4 Gary Semling, RHL Design, Project Architect: Presented proposed architecture for
5 façade remodel.

6
7 **Committee Comments:**

8
9 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Don't know if accessibility for handicapped space is
10 correct. Like A&W food – understand the push to use common facilities. This is a
11 corporate level design concept – too bright and bold – develop a building that works and
12 is much more subtle for East Washington Street. Towers and bright colors are too much.

13
14 Committee Member Barrett: There is a movement to beautify this part of town – am
15 concerned about design – is already short on parking spaces – this is an intensification of
16 the use. Would not like to see towers and colors shown.

17
18 Committee Member Parkerson: Do not want to see this approach to architecture – we are
19 trying to loose the glare on Washington Street. Take existing building and get rid of red
20 tile and look around at the architecture. One tower is too much and two is way over.
21 This is not a way to introduce a thoughtful change. Be simple and straightforward.

22
23 Committee Member Lynch: Need to blend in and customize your franchise to this town.
24 Think you need to do some design work on the building. If the sign is going to be moved
25 - new standards will have to be adhered to.

26
27 Committee Member Mathies: We will not be happy with the cookie cutter approach.
28 This is not what Petaluma is all about.

29
30
31 **VI. REPORTS:**

32
33 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

34 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission reviewed Draft Environment Impact
35 Report for Redwood Technology, asked to bring final EIR back to the Planning
36 Commission. Reviewed Lot split on Upham & Douglas which needed a variance.

37
38 Adjournment: 6:35