



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
City Council Chambers
City Hall, 11 English Street
Telephone: 707-778-4301
FAX: 707-778-4498

November 14, 2002
3:00 p.m.
Petaluma, CA
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, Jack Rittenhouse*
Absent: Janet Gracyk
*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of October 24, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S Rittenhouse/Lynch – 4-0
Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: Memo from Irene Borba regarding Downtown Streetscape Master Plan; Memo from Anne Windsor regarding the Planning workshop at Sonoma State University; comments from Janet Gracyk regarding projects presented today.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began @ 3:10 p.m.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
NEW BUSINESS:
PUBLIC HEARING:

1
2 **I. STAPLES, 207 South McDowell Blvd.**

3 **AP No: 007-280-071**

4 **File: SPC02039**

5 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

6
7 Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural approval of proposed
8 architectural, site, parking and landscaping plans for a 24,000 square foot
9 building.

10
11 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

12
13 Jeff Becker, Rauschenbach Marvelli Becker Architects: Presented changes to the project.
14 Had concerns regarding condition 4, page 8 requiring a shower. Staples has concerns
15 regarding security (employee theft) and liability concerns regarding possible falls in a
16 shower. Asked for clarification regarding condition 8. Regarding condition 9 – stated
17 that Staples is a tenant and has no control over maintenance and spraying of weeds.

18
19 Public hearing opened:

20
21 Patricia Tuttle Brown, PBAC: Went over Attachment J – Interior bike storage spaces
22 should be 4; want bike parking at each customer entrance. Regarding providing a
23 shower – is part of the municipal code – in addition, lockers need to be near showers. Do
24 not want glare lighting – condition that lights are not on 24-hours per day. No flood
25 lights- more for advertising than security. Would like benches in the landscape area.
26 Would like drinking fountain outside, hopefully next to the bench and the phone. Would
27 like crosswalk. Can Staples provide a Class II path through the parking lot or a path from
28 the creek in the rear of the shopping center, or a sign regarding the Lynch Creek Trail.

29 Public hearing closed:

30
31 Committee Comments:

32
33 Committee Member Barrett: South elevation is weakest part of the building –
34 landscaping would soften this elevation. Would be helpful to have a landscape architect.
35 Do not think bench near loading dock is a good idea, possibly relocate in landscaping
36 area. Need a cart gathering area, preferably in front of the store and in parking area.
37 Drinking fountain outside – nice public amenity. Need to provide shower- part of code.
38 Condition lockers to be near showers. Handicap access is ok. Agree with Patricia
39 regarding flood lights. Flood lights are for advertising not security.

40
41 Committee Member Mathies: Create a plaza type area since shopping center is over
42 parked, at a minimum there needs to be a central corridor path for pedestrians. Need a
43 cart gathering area. Nothing special about this façade – looks like big hats on top of a
44 box. Do not need harsh up lighting. Condition the shower for employees.

1 Committee Member Lynch: Surprised at the direction the project has gone. SPARC
2 suggested going toward the design of the new pad building instead of Mervyns and
3 Safeway. Like Linda's idea of creating a plaza area for people to hang out and have
4 coffee, wait for a ride, etc., possibly on the Deaf Dog side. Need to have connection to
5 the front of the store, carry 20' width from entry through parking lot to drive aisle– needs
6 to happen even if you don't have a plaza. Massing element below roof on arcade is odd.
7 All bike committee recommendations should be included, including a shower. Drinking
8 fountain outside. Possibly provide a sign for the Lynch Creek Trail. Loading dock- pipe
9 rail insufficient, more landscaping, continue cmu wall until its a visual obstruction.
10 Landscape diamond to have trees every three spaces instead of islands. Since trellis is
11 gone, possibly add Boston Ivey to take away from starkness. Oleander is not a good
12 choice for landscaping. No floodlights. On north elevation modify architecture to align
13 with existing ADA path. Colors OK.

14

15 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with other comments. Suggest handicap access and walkway
16 have some landscaping, possibly absorb compact stalls. Provide cross walk and
17 pedestrian access across main roadway to parking opposite the store. There is very little
18 landscaping – strange to design colonnade on north elevation. Walk through the
19 landscaping to get to the sidewalk adjacent to the building. Look at circulation on deaf
20 dog side. Parking and circulation is odd at rear of the building due to location of island.
21 Need loading dock integrated in a better way. Opportunity to plant more trees in the
22 parking lot and create a plaza space. Colors nice.

23

24 Fred Becker: Looking for a conditional approval today or Staples may withdraw the
25 project. Responded to committee's comments.

26

27 Committee Member Lynch: Some major circulation issues that need to be addressed.

28

29 Committee Member Mathies: Disappointed in the design and do not want to approve a
30 project that I am not happy with. Need path through parking lot.

31

32 Committee Member Barrett: Think landscaping is inadequate; plaza would be a small
33 gesture and a win win situation for everyone.

34

35 Chair Rittenhouse: Think there are major circulation issues – do not like Staples
36 demanding a conditional approval or they will withdraw the project. This is the first
37 formal SPARC application with staff and community input.

38

39 Fred Becker: Looking for clarification from the committee and a list of items to be
40 addressed by Staples.

41

42 Committee Member Lynch: Can live with the architecture as long as the circulation
43 problems can be dealt with in a safe way. Address the awnings.

44

45 Committee Member Barrett: Concentrate on circulation and landscaping.

46

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Revisit colonnade. Prefer suspended canopy.

2
3 Issues:

- 4 • Site circulation and connections, look at walkway at G&G Market, pathway out of
- 5 the main entrance thru parking lot; redo ADA access; develop outside plaza area
- 6 for seating
- 7 • Diamond tree plantings in parking lot
- 8 • Formal landscaping plan – including landscaping against building where possible.
- 9 • Grow something on the building for screening
- 10 • Look at canopy
- 11 • Consistent columns
- 12 • Consensus regarding PPBAC conditions – lockers next to showers, showers, 4
- 13 interior spaces
- 14 • Cart gathering area
- 15 • Bring landscape architect to next meeting

16
17 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to continue to December 12, 2002.

18
19 All in favor:

- 20
- 21 Committee Member Barrett: Yes
- 22 Chair Rittenhouse: Yes
- 23 Committee Member Lynch: Yes
- 24 Committee Member Mathies: Yes
- 25

26 Public hearing items finished @ 5:00 p.m.

27
28
29 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
30 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

31
32 **II. PAULA LANE SUBDIVISION, 431 Paula Lane.**
33 **AP No. 019-080-009 and 010**
34 **File: SPC01048**
35 **Planner: Irene Borba**
36

37 Applicant is requesting a preliminary site plan and architectural review of an
38 11.22-acre site located at the corner of Paula Lane and Sunset Drive. The
39 proposed project consists of 21 single-family homes on lots ranging from 10,000
40 to 30,780 square feet.

41
42 Marti Buxton, Mission Valley Properties: Presented the project and gave background of
43 the project.

44
45 John Pikowski, Architect: Presented the architecture.

1 Rod Scaccalosi, CSW Stuber-Stroeh: Addressed the detention/retention basin.

2

3 Public comment:

4

5 Paul Selinger, 1411 Sunset Drive: President, Paula Lane Action Network – have an
6 alternative plan to leave the property as open space.

7

8 Susan Kirks, 245 Paula Lane: Addressed three concerns:

- 9 • History of the site where she lives – want the structures to be preserved.
- 10 • Wildlife – construction would be detrimental as would lighting to many birds,
11 badgers and deer.
- 12 • Open space – devised a plan to use the open space as public open space.

13

14 Judy Reynolds, 210 Paula Lane: Development does not adhere to the feathering concept
15 in the General Plan. As a member of the Paula Lane Action Network we oppose this
16 subdivision. Need to nourish rural legacy.

17

18 Gloria Gilardi, Oppose the subdivision, specific concerns regarding water and traffic.

19

20 Rollin Bruce: Am in the process of building a new home at the lower end of Sunset
21 Lane. All the water will flow to my property. Do not want this development to
22 negatively impact my property. Am not opposed to the development – would like less
23 density.

24

25 Stan Gold, King Road: Have experience with inappropriate annexation – quality of life
26 deteriorates. Council has to decide if the project will enhance the developer or the
27 neighbors.

28

29 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Basic concern is open space. If the project is developed – we
30 would like pedestrian access around the perimeter of the property. If there is a
31 detention/retention pond, do not cut off public access.

32

33 Public comment closed:

34

35 Committee comments:

36

37 Committee Member Barrett: Site plan is too dense – need a 300' urban separator. Do not
38 agree with removing trees that are in good condition. Lot 1, 21, 17 and 18 should go. I
39 am in favor of increasing density in the core of our City, however, not on the urban
40 growth boundary. Cannot badger proof only certain areas. Need to make sure
41 detention/retention pond will work properly.

42

43 Committee Member Mathies: Would like to see smaller houses and less of them so that
44 they can be placed better on the site. The placement is a strict grid – do something
45 different. Think that there needs to be a minimum standard for landscaping plans. Entry
46 way is not dominant enough on most plans. House that is a bungalow needs a porch. Old

1 world model does not look like a typical old word model. Think the split-level works the
2 best. Open space path should go around perimeter of site.

3
4 Committee Member Lynch: Agree with Teresa regarding density. Development is not
5 feathered. Need more moderate sized housing. Houses are imposing on the site,
6 particularly 17 and 18. Keep houses off the knoll – get rid of 17, 18 19 and 21 – would
7 be able to keep existing structures and some of the trees. Will need sections of the site,
8 outline slopes, will need pad elevations and story poles.

9 Architecture – cut back on the size of the homes to be able to use better materials. Have
10 a range from 1600 square feet. Want to see a rural vernacular on this site. Do not think a
11 forced diversity is appropriate. Push garages way back, pull entries and porches forward,
12 use better quality materials. Reevaluate the pad on grade system. Need design guidelines
13 for landscaping.

14
15 Chair Rittenhouse: Have some of the same concerns that I had for the Magnolia Place
16 site. Is not necessary to use the pad grading system. Needs to be very well thought out –
17 architecture presented is contrived. Need to incorporate a rural setting – style of homes,
18 size of homes, density.

19
20
21 **III. HAYSTACK LANDING, 215 Weller Street.**

22 **AP Nos. 007-143-003, 004, 014, and 015**

23 **File: 02PRE0049**

24
25 Applicant is requesting a preliminary site plan and architectural review of a
26 mixed-use development project.

27
28 Gina Pittler, Applicant: Took into consideration the committee's comments from the last
29 meeting.

30
31 Wayne Miller and Mary Dooley, Project Architects: Presented the project.

32
33 Public comment:

34
35 Jim Ryan, Public Facilities & Services: Have been working with the applicant regarding
36 this project and the new transit mall. Working with the City's design team regarding the
37 roundabout at Copeland. Will review with the project architect the new angled parking
38 proposed.

39
40 Public comment closed:

41
42 Chair Rittenhouse: Plaza is a disconnect because it is a barrier. Like density of urban
43 edge at the roundabout instead of green space – 3 and 4 stories ok. Like the diagonal
44 parking. Town homes are not dense enough – need more density – more urban edge.
45 Need more guest parking for the townhouses – suggested pulling it out of green area.

46

1 Committee Member Mathies: Like the more open plaza. Agree with hard line next to
2 street. Like the last concept shown and the diagonal parking. Concept is much improved
3 from the previous rendition.

4
5 Committee Member Barrett: Think the townhouses need more massing and density.
6 Agree with Linda regarding the open cut through.

7
8 Chair Rittenhouse: Need private open space for the townhouses and the flats. Cannot
9 raise the plaza for the open corridor. Need hard edge at corner of Weller and D where
10 townhouses are.

11
12 Mary Dooley: Asked for feedback on the open corner of the townhouses.

13
14 Committee Member Barrett: Think it would be beneficial for the townhouses to be
15 closed for the residents.

16
17 Committee Member Mathies: Don't mind if it's open if it's gated.

18
19 Chair Rittenhouse: Keep with the grid of the city – keep the open space in the center of
20 of the townhouses.

21
22

23 **IV. REDLICH TRIPLEX, 550 First Street**
24 **AP No: 008-192-004**
25 **File: 02PRE0045**

26
27 Applicant is requesting a preliminary site plan and architectural review of a
28 proposed triplex.

29
30 Item was continued to the next available hearing.

31
32 **V. REPORTS:**

33
34 **Planning Staff Reports:** None
35 **Liaison Reports:** None

36
37 **Adjournment:** 8:15