



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 March 14, 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, Chris Lynch, Linda Mathies, Ross Parkerson\*, Jack Rittenhouse
- Staff:** George White, Planning Manager  
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner  
Anne Windsor, Secretary

\* Chairperson

---

- Approval of Minutes: **Minutes of March 14, 2002.**  
Committee Members' Report: None.  
Correspondence:  
Public Comment: Chris Lynch asked about the awnings on the old Kragen Auto Building.  
Discussion followed.  
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
- 

**SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**  
**OLD BUSINESS:**  
**PUBLIC HEARING:**

- I. BJM BUILDING, 90 Sycamore Lane. Request for Site Plan and Architectural Review approval of a new 6,004 square foot commercial building.**  
**APN: 006-450-002**  
**Planner: Kim Gordon**

1           **Note: This item is continued from February 14, 2002.**

2

3 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

4

5 Brent Russell, Architect: Presented the changes to the project.

6

7 Brian Miller, 252 Edinburgh: Owner of the company.

8

9 **Public comment:**

10

11 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Thanked the planner, Kim Gordon for Conditions of Approval.  
12 Discussed the Class II Bike Lane on Petaluma Boulevard North and left the decision to  
13 the SPARC Committee.

14

15 **Public comment closed:**

16

17 Committee Member Barrett: Would approve the project if the storage area remained  
18 storage and was a Condition of Approval. Change the laurel tree to a different species  
19 from the approved street tree list.

20

21 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Read recommendations from the previous SPARC  
22 meeting. Building is larger this time. Storage has increased more than 2 times. Storage  
23 appears to be warehousing per explanation of applicant and owner. If a warehouse,  
24 applicant is 3 spaces short on parking. Do not understand design. There are inherent  
25 problems with a showroom on 2 different levels. There is an issue of access to  
26 showroom in the future. Putting in an elevator later is difficult. Have reservations about  
27 the design for the planned use of the building. Looks residential/office as opposed to a  
28 showroom – referred to design center down the street. Symmetry and repetition of  
29 windows does not speak to the use. Do not like canvas awning, disturbing that detail of  
30 awning is not provided. Do not like asphalt shingles. The buildings the applicant  
31 provided as examples are smaller buildings. Building massing is a “big block” with the  
32 long mass – repetition of tower element does not work. Did not highlight entry.

33

34 Committee Member Lynch: Agree with Jack. Previous comments from the committee  
35 were not addressed. The only thing that has changed is the style. Design in reverse –  
36 traditional style but a commercial showroom – is not appropriate. Locks you into  
37 symmetry you do not need. Do not understand 2<sup>nd</sup> story showroom without an elevator.  
38 Don't buy percentage of mix of uses – the ratio of storage to retail is difficult to  
39 understand. From description, storage is a warehouse use. Don't agree with percent as  
40 storage. Design specifically to this use in terms of style and size. Regarding the bike  
41 lane – like the idea of painting it on the street – would be for it if it works.

42

43 Committee Member Mathies: Agree with committee members. Style seems odd for the  
44 type of business. Parking still too tight. Logo on building makes more sense instead of  
45 awning. Would like to know ahead if bike lane could actually fit. Windows are busy.  
46 Suggested large window to show wares.

47

48 Committee Member Parkerson: I am disappointed. The issues raised previously were

1 legitimated, however, they were not addressed. The site is tight in terms of size of  
2 building and the amount of parking. Applicant did not clarify storage vs. warehouse  
3 issue. Did not relate design to the use. A building for this use can work on this site.  
4

5 Brian Miller: Design is because we want an attractive building. Window space does not  
6 draw customers. Want to hide storage in a nicely designed building so it does not look  
7 like a warehouse. I am not trying to sell products by the look of the building. My  
8 business is by referral.  
9

10 Brent Russell: Responded to comments from the committee.  
11

12 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Do not agree you need to have a frontage on all four  
13 sides. With this many windows you will be hot and particularly with no shading and rolls  
14 of carpet will be visible from the street – not appropriate.  
15

16 Committee Member Mathies: Do not think there is anything wrong with looking like a  
17 warehouse if that's what you are.  
18

19 M/S Barrett/Lynch to deny the project without prejudice per the stated findings:

- 20 1. The height, bulk and mass of the building in relationship to the site
- 21 2. The relationship of warehouse/storage use to the parking and architecture
- 22 3. The site plan is inadequate related to parking for the proposed uses
- 23 4. Architecture does not reflect the retail and warehouse use of the building  
24

25 All in favor:  
26

27 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes

28 Committee Member Barrett: Yes

29 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes

30 Committee Member Lynch: Yes

31 Committee Member Mathies: Yes  
32  
33

---

34  
35 **II. DOWNTOWN RIVER APARTMENTS, 3-39 East Washington Street.**  
36 **Applicant is requesting site plan, architectural and landscaping approval of a**  
37 **proposal to construct an 81 unit affordable housing project, 5,000 square feet**  
38 **of commercial space, and a 3,000 square foot community center**  
39 **APN: 007-121-006; 007; 008; 009; 010; 011; 012; 013 and 017**  
40 **Planner: Irene Borba**  
41

42 **Note: The applicant is requesting a continuance to April 11, 2002 (please see**  
43 **attached letter).**  
44

45 M/S Barrett/Mathies to continue to April 11, 2002.  
46

47 All in favor:  
48

1 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes  
2 Committee Member Barrett: Yes  
3 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes  
4 Committee Member Lynch: Yes  
5 Committee Member Mathies: Yes  
6

---

7  
8 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

9 **NEW BUSINESS:**

10 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

11  
12 **III. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH STEEPLE REPLACEMENT, 939 B Street.**  
13 **Request for site plan and architectural review to replace church steeple**  
14 **APN: 008-361-045**  
15 **Planner: Kim Gordon**  
16

17 Kim Gordon presented the project.

18  
19 Brent Russell, 202 Webster, Architect,: Presented the project.

20  
21 Ted Arntz, 1608 San Morino Drive: Gave some additional background to the project.

22  
23 **Public comment:**

24  
25 Marjorie Bauer, 802 Vineyard Place: Member of the church – steeple has been a difficult  
26 situation since the church was built because of problems with leakage, cracks, etc. Is  
27 time for renewal – the congregation as a whole is in favor.  
28

29 Lowell Mc Cagney, 12 Laurel Avenue: Think this is wonderful news. Am a neighbor  
30 and the steeple height takes away some views. Would like the reduction in size.

31  
32 Barbara Pagent, Laurel Avenue: Agreed with the other Laurel Avenue resident.

33  
34 Sue Russell, 202 Webster: Spoke to the improvement in acoustics.  
35

36 **Public comment closed:**

37  
38 Committee Member Parkerson: Sensible idea to change the steeple. Like the idea of  
39 using the old stained glass windows. Seems to be more in line with scale of the main  
40 building.  
41

42 Committee Member Lynch: Difficult because there are good practical reasons to reduce  
43 the steeple. Need to be careful before making such a rash change. A steeple is like  
44 sculpture – from aesthetic view it is nice. Problem for me is practical because when you  
45 remove the steeple it does not seem like a church anymore. Amount of windows will  
46 bring too much light. Would like to see this replaced with another steeple.  
47

1 Committee Member Mathies: Agree with Chris – loosing the vertical element you loose  
2 the statement of the church. In redesign would like to see a more vertical element. Do  
3 not agree with the dormers. I understand the practical needs and the need to replace what  
4 you have - would like to see you recreate something similar to what you have – more  
5 vertical and no dormers.

6  
7 Committee Member Barrett: Glad you want to take off the steeple – do not think the  
8 dormer is not a good addition. Might want to darken the windows.

9  
10 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Have concerns about the replacement. The building  
11 interior has a hierarchy and focus to the lectern. Think there will be an overload of light  
12 on the interior. Would like to see the stained glass windows being used now and the  
13 windows designed into the hierarchy of the building.

14  
15 Lesley Pillsbury, 549 Elmwood Drive: Church is not a building. Do not need a steeple  
16 to be a church. Do not plan to look in one direction all the time. Do not need to worry  
17 about money for air conditioning because the church does not have air conditioning.

18  
19 Donna White, 1909 Caufield Lane: This would save us a lot of money. The Presbytery  
20 has approved this design and I urge you to approve.

21  
22 Marjorie Bauer: Wanted to comment on the light: Presently there are narrow vertical  
23 stained glass windows – would welcome more light. Floor of church does not have any  
24 clear glass.

25  
26 Sue Russell: Do not have the money to restore the stained glass windows at this time.

27  
28 Carol Schellenberger, Interim Pastor: My first Sunday at the church there were buckets  
29 all over to address the rain problems. The church is dark and unattractive. Theology of  
30 the church is that God is in our midst and we do not need a steeple to have His presence.

31  
32 Brent Russell: Responded to Committee's comments.

33  
34 Committee Member Parkerson: Think it would be a cleaner architectural statement  
35 without the dormer. OK with the project.

36  
37 Committee Member Rittenhouse: What windows are tinted and operable? Do not see  
38 that on the plans. Think you need to explore the architecture more.

39  
40 Committee Member Mathies: Agree with Jack — would be a shame to not keep the  
41 integrity of the design. Would like to see some other options.

42  
43 Committee Member Barrett: Dormer is distracting.

44  
45 Committee Member Lynch: Would like to see a different design incorporating some day  
46 lighting and giving a nod to the previous steeple. Am not asking for tower to remain –  
47 recommend daylight modeling.

48

1 Sue Russell: Regarding the dormer – it shows the entrance to sanctuary and enhances it.  
2 We are just removing the steeple and would like you to respect our desire as a  
3 congregation. We are willing to take the risk regarding the light.

4  
5 Jean Murphy, 102 – 7<sup>th</sup> Street: Neighbor and knew the original architect. The  
6 congregation has studied and decided this is what we want – have thought out in terms of  
7 our relationship to faith, and money. The church is very wet and dark in the winter. It  
8 needs more light.

9  
10 Patricia Franz, 1147 St. Anthony: Summer or winter it is always cold. Do not think there  
11 will be a problem with air conditioning or light.

12  
13 Margery Bauer: Do not understand your argument – it is our project – do not understand  
14 why you feel the need to overturn our decision.

15  
16 Lowell Mc Cagney: Being a neighbor, the lower building is much more preferable to me  
17 as a neighbor.

18  
19 Downtown Merchant, 315 Walnut: Think it's great that people have passion – as a  
20 citizen – I like having a review board. The architecture looks like all the Sheraton's.

21  
22 Committee Member Parkerson: Stated the committee's job as a review board.

23  
24 M/S Rittenhouse/Lynch to deny the project without prejudice per the stated findings:

- 25  
26 1. The proportion, scale, and form of the proposed steeple is relation to the existing  
27 use and architecture is inappropriate.  
28  
29 2. The proposed steeple design is an inadequate response to the original architecture.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34 All in favor:

35 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes  
36 Committee Member Barrett: Yes  
37 Committee Member Parkerson: Yes  
38 Committee Member Lynch: Yes  
39 Committee Member Mathies: Yes  
40

---

41  
42 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
43 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

44  
45 **IV. PUTNAM PLAZA RENEWAL**

46  
47 Steve Hood, 969 Petaluma Boulevard North: Gave background and presented the  
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  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**Committee Comments:**

Committee Member Parkerson: Think the paint is recent and gives the park a splash. The park as it is now is a respite. Part of the wonder of the park is its diversity. Like the sound of the water fountain. Think this is the wrong project.

Committee Member Lynch: Agree with Ross. What makes Petaluma unique is the architecture. Would like to see this money going into something for the kids. Do not agree with the music.

Steve Hood: Talked with the tenants – they do not want to run off the kids.

Committee Member Barrett: You compared this to Sonoma and Healdsburg parks – they do not match. I have talked with some kids – do not want music. Do not think there is room for another plaque there.

**Public comment:**

Patricia Tuttle Brown: Piped music from a pedestrian standpoint is a disaster. Project focused on the negative. Bike committee feels lighting should be hooded. Difference of the buildings has ambience. Provide live music on a regular basis. A new bathroom would be a good use of money. Fix up the alley and make people want to walk down it

Scott, Merchant downtown for 14 years. Think this is a thinly veiled way of getting rid of the kids. Think the seating and cleaning up of trash are a good idea. Sonoma and Healdsburg are very different towns. Like the idea of live music downtown. Encourage cleanliness and better trash removal. Spending money on landscaping might be a good idea.

Gina Pittler, Vice President, Petaluma Downtown Association: Do not want to encourage kids to leave. Have concern about painting and graffiti.

---

**V. CITY OF PETALUMA TRANSIT MALL, Copeland Street between East Washington Street and East “D” Street.**

Tom Krakow, Engineer, Introduced the team and the project.

Richard Thompson, Architect: Presented the project.

Committee Member Lynch: Like it in general – simplify the structure, maybe a little more industrial feel. No problem with light fixtures.

Committee Member Parkerson: No place for anyone to park a car.

Committee Member Lynch left the meeting at 6:55.

1  
2 Committee Member Mathies: Like the project and the fixtures. Would prefer a non-  
3 illuminated sign; like the concept of the art wall.

4  
5 Committee Member Mathies left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

6  
7 Don MacNair, MacNair Landscaping: Presented the landscape design.

8  
9 **Public Comment:**

10  
11 Gina Pitler, owns property across the street. Spoke about the pedestrian corridor from the  
12 turning basin to the depot on Lakeville. Have concerns about turning radius of buses  
13 turning from D onto Copeland. Have concerns about parking.

14  
15 Committee Member Parkerson: Overall concept is good. Believe parking will be a  
16 problem. Makes sense to have all the buses in one place. Needs to be an adjustment in  
17 the City's bus system moving from 4<sup>th</sup> & C to this location. Asked if there were enough  
18 bike lockers? Do not think four racks will be sufficient. Will need more telephones.  
19 What about public restrooms? Need at least 3-4 drinking fountains. Need a taxi stand,  
20 coffee stand and a transit attendant. Need to provide the public necessities.

21  
22 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Ross on bathroom; agree about doing as little as  
23 possible on the opposite side of Copeland; hope you will take the tree selection to the  
24 Tree Advisory committee; don't like plastic on the kiosk and the sign; agree you need to  
25 have more water fountains, and bike racks. Like the idea of the art board.

26  
27 Committee Member Rittenhouse: You do not have the space to provide all the facilities  
28 you need here. Have some problems functionally with the parking, fountains, bike racks.  
29 Like the architecture, however, it does not seem to work functionally. Think there should  
30 be recycling as well as trash.

31  
32 Bryan Albee, Sonoma County Transit Authority (SCTA): Typically public restrooms,  
33 water fountains, etc. are difficult to maintain.

---

34  
35  
36 **VI. REPORTS:**

37  
38 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

39 **Liaison Reports:** None

---

40  
41  
42  
43 Adjournment: 8:00 p.m.