



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 July 25, 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](mailto: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, Linda Mathies, Jack Rittenhouse \*  
Absent: Chris Lynch  
Historic: Hoppy Hopkins, Marianne Hurley  
Staff: George White, Planning Manager  
Jane Thomson, Code Enforcement Officer  
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

\*Chairperson

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of July 11, 2002 were approved as amended.  
Committee Members' Report: Tree Advisory – updated walking tours brochure – now available at the Museum and City Hall.  
Correspondence: Letter from a neighbor in support of the Casad demolition.  
Public Comment: None  
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

---

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

**I. CASAD DEMOLITION, 415 Upham Street**  
**AP No: 006-385-020**  
**File: SPC02031**  
**Project Planner: Jane Thomson**

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 approval to demolish the existing 685 square foot residence at 415 Upham Street.

Jane Thomson presented the staff report, and also gave a brief explanation of the grounds for a hardship. In addition, Ms. Thomson noted that she received e-mail today from a neighbor at 404 Upham who did not have an opinion either way.

Mark Friedman, the applicant: Spoke on behalf of the property owner, who wants to move back to Petaluma, needs a new house with greater accessibility, current house is structurally unsafe, cannot retrofit the inside. Requested the committee's approval to demolish the residence at 415 Upham Street.

Committee Member Barrett: Asked how long Mrs. Casad had owned the property, and if the porch had been constructed with a permit.

Mark Friedman: Mrs. Casad has owned property for 30 years, and that the laundry room (back porch) had been installed without a permit.

Public hearing opened:

Dennis Casad, 419 Upham: he is the owner's son, has lived next door for 20 years, explained to the Committee that his mother had owned the property for about 30 years, and has always rented to low income, is not a hands-on property owner, but has always given money to the tenants to make the repairs.

Tim Kellgren, 410 Upham: Thinks the Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee is important, but that the existing house is probably not one that could exist today. As a neighbor across the street, I want to support the demolition.

Public hearing closed:

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Hurley: Understands the need for housing that complies with today's standards. Visited the neighborhood; the house is one of four houses in a row built before 1880. Thought the report by Vicki Beard was very good. It is no less significant even though it has met only 1 historical criterion. There are very few of these cottages left in Petaluma. Referred to it as pre-Queen Anne architecture of the hall parlor style of which there are very few left that were built between 1850's to 1890's (early vernacular style). I support the evaluation. The owner is responsible for the upkeep even if it is a rental. Deferred maintenance is not a good enough reason for demolition. Applicant is not required to formally register the house as historically significant. Historical building code does not place stricter requirements and in fact allows more flexibility. Pest report says everything is fixable.

1 Committee Member Hopkins: Supports Marianne’s recommendation.

2

3 Committee Member Barrett: Troubled that the owner has let the house come into  
4 disrepair, which could have been prevented. Support staff’s recommendation to deny the  
5 demolition.

6

7 Committee Member Mathies: Owning a historical home is an honor and privilege. Don’t  
8 feel the demolition is valid, because lack of maintenance is no excuse, and is not a valid  
9 hardship – concur with staff’s recommendation.

10

11 Committee Member Gracyk: Support staff’s recommendation to deny the demolition, as  
12 the structure does not qualify for the hardship.

13

14 Committee Member Rittenhouse: The fact that the property has been in the family for 30  
15 years means that it could have been maintained; is not impressed that code violation  
16 happened during the family’s ownership. Hardship cannot be based on the family’s lack  
17 of control over the maintenance – cannot support that finding.

18

19 M/S Mathies/Barrett to deny the project based on finding No. 2 in the staff report.

20

21 All in favor:

22

- 23 Committee Member Hopkins: Yes
- 24 Committee Member Hurley: Yes
- 25 Committee Member Barrett: Yes
- 26 Committee Member Gracyk: Yes
- 27 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes
- 28 Committee Member Mathies: Yes
- 29 Committee Member Lynch: Absent

30

---

31  
32 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
33 **OLD BUSINESS;**  
34 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

35

36 **II. G&C AUTOBODY, 896 Lakeville Street.**  
37 **AP No: 005-020-043**  
38 **File: SPC01049 & CUP01030**  
39 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

40

41 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural approval to expand G&C Auto  
42 Body at 896 Lakeville Street.

43

44 Note: This item is continued from June 13, 2002.

45

46

1 Gene Crozat, Applicant: Presented the changes to the site plan since the last SPARC  
2 meeting.

3  
4 Public hearing opened:

5  
6 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Want people to have access from Lakeville to Hopper since there  
7 will be mixed-use development in the future.

8  
9 The applicant responded to Patricia Tuttle Brown and does not want a bike path for  
10 security reasons.

11  
12 Public hearing closed:

13  
14 Committee comments:

15  
16 Committee Member Barrett: Think pedestrian/bike access is essential between Lakeville  
17 and the railroad tracks – if it were possible to gain access on a different property in this  
18 area; would not condition this project. Referred to condition 11 regarding parking and  
19 landscaping, #17 – want to clarify that applicant covers costs even if the work is not done  
20 at the present time. Conditions #38 and 40 – want to make sure trees are selected from  
21 approved street tree list. Want the landscaping to be drought tolerate – reflecting the new  
22 City ordinance. Regarding the building design – like the overhang; big improvement  
23 over original plans.

24  
25 Committee Member Grayck: Suggested a reduction in the lawn for water usage  
26 purposes. Need to have an 18 in. to 2 ft clearance around trunk of trees. Would like it  
27 more interesting on the street side. Would like incorporation of a large canopy tree in the  
28 parking lot – do not want trees with seed pod to interfere with cyclists.

29  
30 Committee Member Mathies: Like the simpler style and the drive-through. Embellish  
31 landscaping in parking lot. Appreciate the reduction in lawn. Think metal roof would  
32 look better with this style building.

33  
34 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Appreciate the applicant's efforts. Would like to see  
35 landscaping added. Gates at front and rear (4 total) – do not see the reasoning. Want  
36 landscape islands in parking. Not sure what the function of the covered walkway is.  
37 Building in back does not match the front. Don't know the reason for shutters except  
38 dressing. If bike path goes on the property, the site plan will need to be redone. Project  
39 has made steps forward – do not see it as consistent set of drawings to be approved.

40  
41 Committee Member Barrett: Not sure multiplicity of gates is the solution to preventing  
42 theft.

43  
44 Committee Member Mathies: Think there is a better location for the bike path and we  
45 need to determine that location. Agree with Jack that we need consistent plans.

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

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Concerned about details and the overall look of the project. Need to have drawings that match.

Gene Crozat, Applicant: Responded to committee comments: does not want metal roof; stated purpose of overhang; does not want a bike path; does not feel trees are a necessity in the rear; does not think the front and rear buildings need to match.

Committee Member Barrett: Want access and can look for another area for access. Cannot see approving the project if the plans do not match the drawings. Agree to change parking out front to landscaping. Need to see discrepancies addressed before approval. Suggested approving the project with specific conditions then return to SPARC for final approval.

Gene Crozat, Applicant: Want approval of the “concept” before agreeing to come back with details.

Committee Member Gracyk: Pattern with large canopy trees. Want the project to be successful.

Committee Member Mathies: Sympathize with applicant regarding easement. Suggest bollards instead of gates – a more pleasing alternative.

A lengthy discussion ensued in which the Committee attempted to work with the applicant to approve the project with conditions that would come back for final review, however, the applicant insisted on getting approval “of the concept” before agreeing to conditions of a continuance.

Chair Rittenhouse repeatedly asked Mr. Crozat to wait until the committee finished their comments before speaking.

The committee asked Mr. Crozat to come back with details on plan revisions. He refused and said he wanted a decision and would go to the City Council if necessary.

M/S Barrett/Gracyk to deny the project on the finding that the committee does not have sufficient information to approve the project based on what has been provided – too many discrepancies between plans and drawings. Need final site plan and landscaping that match; detail on entry treatment and signage, color board, and pedestrian access.

All in favor:

Committee Member Gracyk: Yes

Committee Member Barrett: Yes

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

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

---

**III. WASHINGTON CREEK VILLAGE, East Washington Street.**

**AP No: 149-180-015 & 016**

**File: SPC01002**

**Project Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

Applicant is requesting approval for site plan, architectural and landscaping plans to construct 37, single-family residences on 9.23 acres.

Note: This item is continued from July 11, 2002.

The applicant, Cobblestone Homes, presented the changes to the site plan since the meeting of July 11, 2002.

Committee Member Barrett left the meeting.

Justin Hansen, Dalin Group: Presented the architectural changes to the homes; the sound wall; the benches and the lighting for the houses as well as the landscape lighting.

Phil Manoukian, Landscape Architect: Limited number of vines that would work well with masonry. Suggested deciduous vine.

Ira Bennett, Cobblestone Homes: Gave Cobblestone's reasoning for using vinyl windows and presented examples. Thinks it's overreaching to condition the type of window.

Public hearing opened:

Patricia Tuttle Brown: The light on the houses seems to shine up and down rather than just down. Think the bollard lights shine downward.

Committee Member Mathies: Glad to see the changes on the streetscape and addressing the neighbors concerns. One garage did not seem to have the same detail as others. Think the sound wall is ok, bench is definitely an improvement. Think the light is ok functionally – would like a little variety.

Committee Member Gracyk: Think the sound wall is a good choice except for the column and the cap; think the light is very attractive and will be effective. Thanked the applicant for the examples of color board, windows, and lights – is very helpful. Think the Boston ivy is a very good choice for the sound wall. Do not agree with ivy around the trunks of the trees. PUD modified no ray wood ash. Plant palate on the front of the homes seems more commercial – a little more variety, some perennials would be appropriate. Addition of a few native riparian shrubs on the creek is appropriate – need that middle layer. No ivy adjacent to the creek.

1 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicant for the amount of time and  
2 effort. Like the color board; am not thrilled with sound wall – better cap; consider a  
3 additional light fixtures that will accomplish the same thing. Windows have been highly  
4 debated on this committee. Do not agree with vinyl windows.

5  
6 Revised conditions: More than one type of light fixture on houses; sound wall precast  
7 cap, no vinyl windows; landscaping changes as noted above.

8  
9 M/S Mathies/Gracyk to approve project as conditioned.

10  
11 All in favor:

- 12 Committee Gracyk: Yes
- 13 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes
- 14 Committee Member Mathies: Yes
- 15 Committee Member Lynch: Absent

16  
17  
18 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**  
19 **DRAFT FINDINGS**

20  
21 **Washington Creek Village Subdivision**  
22 **East Washington Road Southwesterly of Prince Park**

- 23  
24 1. The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee authorizes the proposed  
25 construction of a 37 unit detached single family residential subdivision with the  
26 associated roadways, paths, utilities and 1.8 acres dedicated to the City for open  
27 space purposes.
- 28  
29 2. The project as conditioned, will conform to the intent, goals, and policies of the  
30 Petaluma General Plan. The General Plan contains objectives and policies which  
31 encourages the orderly and harmonious development of Petaluma to insure a  
32 choice of housing types and locations to all persons regardless of sex, cultural  
33 origin, age, marital status, or physical handicaps.
- 34  
35 3. The project as conditioned, will not constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the  
36 public welfare of the community because it will be operated in conformance with  
37 Performance Standards specified in the Uniform Building Code, the Petaluma  
38 Zoning Ordinance and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan.
- 39  
40 4. The City Council adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration at its meeting of  
41 February 25, 2002 and all mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are  
42 herein incorporated.
- 43  
44 5. That the plan for the proposed development is compatible with the area and the  
45 Development Guidelines will ensure that the proposed development and uses are  
46 compatible.

1  
2 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**  
3 **DRAFT**  
4 **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

5  
6 **Washington Creek Village Subdivision**  
7 **East Washington Road Southwesterly of Prince Park**  
8

9 Planning Department  
10

- 11 1. All mitigation measures and findings adopted in conjunction with approval of the  
12 Mitigated Negative Declaration (Resolution 2002-023 N.C.S.) for the Washington  
13 Creek Village subdivision project are herein incorporated by reference as  
14 conditions of project approval.  
15
- 16 2. All conditions/findings adopted in conjunction with Resolution 2002-024 N.C.S.  
17 adopting a 37-lot Tentative Subdivision Map are herein incorporated by reference  
18 as conditions of project approval.  
19
- 20 3. All conditions/findings adopted in conjunction with Resolution 2002-025 N.C.S.  
21 approving the Planned Unit District Development Guidelines for the Washington  
22 Creek Village subdivision project are herein incorporated by reference.  
23
- 24 4. *The plans submitted for building permit review shall be in substantial*  
25 *conformance with the PUD Development Plan Guidelines dated June 20, 2002,*  
26 *PUD Development Plan, Floor Plans, and Elevations dated July 17, 2002, with*  
27 *the Landscape Plan dated May 28, 2002, and with the Colors Board submitted*  
28 *July 25, 2002 (all of which are on file in the Petaluma Planning Division) except*  
29 *as modified by the following conditions.*  
30
- 31 5. *Prior to Building Permit Issuance, some of the residences shall be shown with a*  
32 *downward cast porch light fixture other than the one approved by SPARC. This*  
33 *alternative porch light fixture(s) shall be subject to staff review.*  
34
- 35 6. *Prior to Building Permit Issuance, all residences shall be modified so that no*  
36 *vinyl windows are proposed.*  
37
- 38 7. 4. Prior to issuance of 80% of the Certificates of Occupancy for the residential  
39 units the work approved/*required* within the creek setback shall be completed and  
40 approved by the Community Development Department and the Department of  
41 Parks and Recreation.  
42
- 43 8. *Prior to approval of the Final Map, the following modifications shall be made to*  
44 *the landscaping and irrigation plans:*

1 a. *The ivy shall be eliminated from under the Zelkova trees along East*  
 2 *Washington Street and replaced with another type of groundcover, subject*  
 3 *to staff review.*

4 b. *A few native riparian shrubs shall be added along the creek.*

5 c. *Any ivy adjacent to the creek shall be eliminated.*

6

7 *And the following modifications shall be made to the PUD Guidelines:*

8 a. *Ray wood ash shall be eliminated.*

9 b. *At the front yards, more variety including perennials shall be added and*  
 10 *the plant palette shall be made to feel less commercial.*

11

12 9. ~~5.~~ *Prior to approval of the Final Map, the Plan Unit Development Map shall be*  
 13 *revised and resubmitted to include:*

14 a. *The following language “No building additions that result in new floor*  
 15 *area shall be allowed except for the minor building additions allowed in*  
 16 *Section 3f “Development Standards-Minor Building Additions” and*

17 b. *A means of showing that Lots 12, 17, 18, and 19 will have photovoltaic*  
 18 *electric generating systems*

19

20 10. *Prior to approval of the Final Map, the PUD Development Guidelines shall be*  
 21 *revised to state that Lots 12, 17, 18, and 19 will have photovoltaic electric*  
 22 *generating systems and to show any other modification approved by SPARC.*

23

24 11. ~~6.~~ *Prior to the recordation of the Final Map, language shall be drafted and*  
 25 *submitted to the Community Development Department staff that will be recorded*  
 26 *on the deed of each new parcel indicating that the property is subject to the*  
 27 *restrictions and limitations of the approved Planned Unit District (PUD) as well as*  
 28 *the associated Design Guidelines and Unit Development Plan.*

29

30 12. *Prior to approval of the Final Map, the Sound Wall and Fence Details Sheet L3/4*  
 31 *shall be modified to be consistent with the PUD Guidelines and with the*  
 32 *placement of the homes on each lot (Lots 17, 29, and 36 are inaccurate).*

33

34 13. *Prior to the approval of the Final Map, the applicant shall provide the Planning*  
 35 *Division with documentation that the proposed sound wall complies with the*  
 36 *specifications of Illingworth & Rodkin’s Noise Assessment (May 1, 2001)*  
 37 *Mitigation Measure #1.*

38

39 14. *Prior to the approval of the Final Map, the sound wall shall be depicted with an*  
 40 *improved cap and may be depicted with improved columns, subject to staff*  
 41 *review.*

42

43 15. *Prior to the approval of the Final Map, bollard lighting shall be added to the*  
 44 *south side of the creek at the two ends of the path where there is not ambient*  
 45 *streetlighting.*

46

1       16. *The LLAD language shall also include maintenance responsibilities within the*  
 2       *Washington Creek area of the bike path, benches, trees, and irrigation system and*  
 3       *mowing of the grass area. The LLAD language and map landscaping and*  
 4       *amenities shall be submitted to the Planning Division and Parks and Recreation*  
 5       *Departments for their review and acceptance prior to Final Map approval.*

6  
 7       **Standard SPARC Conditions Of Approval:**  
 8

9       17. ~~7.~~ The site shall be kept cleared at all times of all garbage and debris. No outdoor  
 10       storage shall be permitted.

11  
 12       18. ~~8.~~ Construction activities shall comply with applicable Zoning Ordinance and  
 13       Municipal Code Performance Standards (noise, dust, odor, etc.).

14  
 15       19. ~~9.~~ At no time shall future business activities exceed Performance Standards  
 16       specified in the Uniform Building Code, Section 22-301 of the Petaluma Zoning  
 17       Ordinance, and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan.

18  
 19       20. ~~10.~~ External downspouts shall be painted to match background-building colors.  
 20       Scuppers without drainage pipes may not be installed because of probable  
 21       staining of walls (overflow scuppers are excepted).

22  
 23       21. ~~11.~~ Should any archeological/historical remains be encountered during grading,  
 24       work shall be halted temporarily and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to  
 25       evaluate the artifacts and to recommend further action. The local Indian  
 26       community shall also be notified and consulted in the event any archaeological  
 27       remains are uncovered.

28  
 29       22. ~~12.~~ All exterior light fixtures shall be shown on plans subject to staff review and  
 30       approval. All lights attached to buildings shall provide a soft “wash” of light  
 31       against the wall. All lights shall conform to City Performance Standards (e.g., no  
 32       direct glare, no poles in excess of 20 feet height, etc.) and shall compliment  
 33       building architecture.

34  
 35       23. ~~13.~~ All trees shall be a minimum fifteen-gallon size (i.e. trunk diameter of at least  
 36        $\frac{3}{4}$  inch measured one foot above the ground) unless otherwise specified (e.g.: 24”  
 37       box or specimen size) and double staked; all shrubs shall be five-gallon size. All  
 38       landscaped areas not improved with lawn shall be protected with two-inch deep  
 39       bark mulch as a temporary measure until the ground cover is established.

40       24. ~~14.~~ All plant material shall be served by a City approved automatic underground  
 41       irrigation system.

42  
 43       25. ~~15.~~ A master landscape plan of the street frontage areas shall be provided, to staff  
 44       approval, prior to issuance of a building permit. The landscape plan shall include  
 45       street trees with planting design and species to staff approval. Landscape shall be  
 46       installed to City standards prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.  
 47

- 1       26. ~~16.~~ Linear root barrier systems shall be utilized for trees near public streets or  
2       walkways as needed, subject to staff review and approval.  
3
- 4       27. ~~17.~~ All street trees and other plant materials within the public right-of-way shall  
5       be subject to inspection by the project landscape architect or designer prior to  
6       installation and by City staff prior to acceptance by the City, for conformance  
7       with the approved quality specifications.  
8
- 9       28. ~~18.~~ All tree stakes and ties shall be removed within one year following installation  
10      or as soon as trees are able to stand erect without support.  
11
- 12     29. ~~19.~~ All planting shall be maintained in good growing condition. Such  
13     maintenance shall include, where appropriate, pruning, mowing, weeding,  
14     cleaning of debris and trash, fertilizing and regular watering. Whenever  
15     necessary, planting shall be replaced with other plant materials to insure  
16     continued compliance with applicable landscaping requirements. Required  
17     irrigation systems shall be fully maintained in sound operating condition with  
18     heads periodically cleaned and replaced when missing to insure continued regular  
19     watering of landscape areas, and health and vitality of landscape materials.  
20
- 21     30. ~~20.~~ All improvements and grading shall comply with the Sonoma County Water  
22     Agency's Design Criteria.  
23
- 24     31. ~~21.~~ All work within the public right-of-way requires an excavation permit from  
25     the Community Development Department.  
26
- 27     32. ~~22.~~ Public utility access and easement locations and widths shall be subject to  
28     approval by PG&E, Pacific Bell, SCWA, all other applicable utility and service  
29     companies and the City Engineer and shall be shown on the plans.  
30
- 31     33. ~~23.~~ Underground utilities such as water meters and sewer laterals shall be placed  
32     under paving or as close as possible to private driveways, to avoid conflict with  
33     street tree planting locations within the street right-of-way. Transformer vaults,  
34     fire hydrants and light standards shall be located in a manner which allows  
35     reasonable implementation of the approved street tree planting plan for the project  
36     without compromising public safety.  
37
- 38     34. ~~24.~~ A reproducible copy of the finalized PUD Development Plan and written PUD  
39     Standards incorporating all project conditions of approval shall be submitted to  
40     the Planning Department prior to issuance of development permits.  
41
- 42     35. ~~25.~~ A reproducible copy of the Tentative Subdivision Map, reflecting all  
43     applicable adopted conditions of approval, shall be submitted to the Planning  
44     Department within 30 days of SPARC approval of the project.  
45

1 36. ~~26.~~ The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or any of its  
 2 boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or  
 3 proceeding against the City, its boards, commission, agents, officers, or  
 4 employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, the approval of the project when  
 5 such claim or action is brought within the time period provided for in applicable  
 6 State and/or local statutes. The City shall promptly notify the applicants of any  
 7 such claim, action, or proceeding. The City shall coordinate in the defense.  
 8 Nothing contained in this condition shall prohibit the City from participating in a  
 9 defense of any claim, action, or proceeding if the City bears its own attorney’s  
 10 fees and costs, and the City defends the action in good faith.  
 11

---

12  
 13  
 14  
 15 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
 16 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**  
 17

18 **IV. PARK PLACE, Lakeville Highway & Casa Grande Road.**

19 **AP No: 005-040-054; 055**

20 **File: PRE02015**  
 21

22 Applicant is requesting preliminary review to construct 20,000 square feet of  
 23 commercial retail space and 271 dwelling units.  
 24

25 John Whalen, Trammel Crow: Originally there was 250,000 square feet of office space  
 26 and 20,000 square feet of retail. Eagle Equity is now selling to a multi-family developer.  
 27 Current zoning is mixed use. Now proposing 250 residential units and 20,00 square feet  
 28 of commercial space with residential above.  
 29

30 RC Alley, Architects: Presented the site plan for 250 residential units and 20,000 square  
 31 feet of commercial space with residential above.  
 32

33 Public hearing opened:  
 34

35 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Want off road bike paths; auto centered design residents will deal  
 36 with lights from cars all the time. Would like more diversity, possibly some live/work  
 37 units.  
 38

39 Public hearing closed:  
 40

41 Committee Comments:  
 42

43 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Think it will be a land use issue. Is also a quality of  
 44 life issues regarding living on top of retail on Lakeville Highway. Definitely think you  
 45 need to work with PPP for circulation – it’s extremely dense. Very articulated in  
 46

---

1 elevations – need a context drawing to see the proposed project in relation to what is  
2 around it. Don't know if it's an appropriate site.

3  
4 Committee Member Mathies: Disappointed that the original project is not going to  
5 happen. Needs to have more variety – possibly a restaurant. Would be interested in  
6 seeing how some of these auto courts work.

7  
8 Committee Member Gracyk: Seems like a lot of hardscape. Seems there is no useable  
9 outdoor space – need amenities for residents. If you are looking at trees being a buffer,  
10 you will need large trees. Bike access is very important. Make sure paths for pedestrian  
11 make sense and do not end in a dead end road.

12  
13 Committee Member Rittenhouse: No differentiation in the massing – looks like a block.  
14

---

15  
16 **V. CLOVER STORNETTA, 529 Madison Street**  
17 **AP No: 007-041-002**  
18 **File: GPA0200; SPC02024; ZOA02001**  
19 **Project Planner: Irene Borba**  
20

21 Applicant is requesting preliminary review to construct a new office building and  
22 industrial warehouse for the existing Clover Stornetta facilities located at 529  
23 Madison Street.  
24

25 Wayne Miller, Architect: Presented the project.  
26

27 Public hearing opened:  
28

29 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Would like to see the park put back in that was part of the River  
30 Enhancement Plan. Would like to have access to the river – do not want a private park  
31 on the river. Eliminate Class II path on Edith and make the Edith Street landscape a  
32 little wider.  
33

34 Public hearing closed:  
35

36 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Great start. Question how the shared parking and truck  
37 circulation will work. Like the linear parking. Depression of parking is a plus for  
38 neighborhood. It is a standard SPARC condition to have landscaping for every 8 spaces  
39 – think it's a plus for the shade. Would be nice to include access to river and not have it  
40 fenced off. Show proposed landscape instead of parking – would soften riverside. Like  
41 the photovoltaics and the day lighting. Like the way the massing is broken up. Like the  
42 materials: the metal and the sunshades.  
43

44 Committee Member Mathies: The architecture looks like the use. Think it's important to  
45 look at the gating and what you are trying to achieve. Do think landscaping islands  
46 would break up the asphalt.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

Committee Member Gracyk: Like massing as well, the hip roof. Use the large canopy trees on Edith and Madison. Groundcover will not hold up. Am interested in seeing if you can use the runoff for irrigation.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Could add tanks as an element to the site plan.

---

**VI. REPORTS:**

**Planning Staff Reports:** None

**Liaison Reports:** None

**Adjournment:** 7:50

S:\Sparc\Minutes\072502.doc