



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 October 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: Chris Lynch, Janet Gracyk, Linda Mathies, Jack Rittenhouse*
Absent: Teresa Barrett

*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Phil Boyle, Assistant Planner
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 22, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S Mathies/Gracyk – 4-0.
Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: Memo from Phil Boyle re: condition on Traditions Roundabout. Phil Boyle presented drawings and correspondence from Traffic Engineer, Alan Tilton. Committee member Lynch suggested flaring the sections of the Class I paths at Corona Road where cyclist enter onto the Class I Paths from the roadway but not the exits. The committee suggested discussing the proposed change with the traffic engineer and to move forward with the change if the traffic engineer is in agreement.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

1 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
2 **OLD BUSINESS;**
3 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

- 4
- 5 **I. G&C AUTOBODY, 896 Lakeville Street.**
- 6 **AP No: 005-020-043**
- 7 **File: SPC01049 & CUP01030**
- 8 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**
- 9

10 Note: This item is continued from September 12, 2002.

11
12 The applicant has requested a continuance to October 24, 2002.

13
14
15 Public hearing began at 3:15 p.m.

16
17 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
18 **NEW BUSINESS;**
19 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

- 20
- 21 **II. Tubbs Residence Addition and Remodel, 1657 Madeira Circle**
- 22 **AP No: 137-270-015**
- 23 **File: PUD02081/SPC02037**
- 24 **Planner: Kim Gordon**
- 25

26 The applicant is requesting a minor modification to PUD unit development plan
27 for a 1,345 square foot addition to an existing one story single-family residence
28 and detached garage in the Sonoma Glen 3 Planned Unit District (PUD).

29
30 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

31
32 Claire Monteschio, Red Maple Workshop: Presented the project. Condition #3 – trellis
33 is currently a code violation. Applicant requested that it be removed as a condition.

34
35 Ken Berman, Red Maple Workshop: Presented some of the details of the project.

36
37 Discussion followed among staff, the committee and the applicant regarding Condition
38 #3.

39
40 Committee Member Gracyk: Thinks the addition fits into the neighborhood. Panel next
41 to garage does not make sense to me. Fine with the chimney. Don't think trellis needs to
42 be a condition of approval.

43
44 Committee Member Mathies: Agrees that it fits into the neighborhood. Think the
45 applicant will take care of trellis.

1 Committee Member Lynch: Agree with other committee members. The only thing I
2 would add is carrying through with gable so it doesn't look like an addition. Trellis in
3 front ties it all together. Take the applicant's word that they will take care of code
4 violation.

5
6 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Agree about detailing on the end gables. Agree with
7 Janet about the vertical panel. Not sure about overhang on garage – would rather see two
8 story wall with detailing. Include the trellis in the plans and submit with the building
9 department. Think the trellis should be conditioned. Condition that it be part of the
10 building permit.

11
12 Committee Member Lynch: Do think it should be conditioned. Asked for a letter from
13 Cliff Kendall, Building official saying that the code violation can be separated from the
14 building permit for the addition.

15
16 Committee Member Gracyk: Need to have the approval contingent upon the trellis being
17 on the revised site plan.

18
19 Add gable detail.

20
21 M/S Mathies/Lynch to approve the project per the findings and conditions.

22
23 All in favor:

24	Committee Member Gracyk:	Yes
25	Committee Member Barrett:	Absent
26	Chair Rittenhouse:	Yes
27	Committee Member Lynch:	Yes
28	Committee Member Mathies:	Yes

29
30 **DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FINDINGS**
31 **1,345 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY**
32 **RESIDENCE 1657 MADEIRA CIRCLE, APN 137-270-015**

33
34 1. The proposed project is exempt from the requirements of the California
35 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301, Class 1, Existing
36 Facilities, of the CEQA Guidelines, which allows additions to existing residences.

37
38 2. The project, as conditioned, will conform to the intent, goals, and policies of the
39 Petaluma General Plan to:

- 40
- 41 a. Provide a range of housing types.
- 42 b. Provide housing opportunities for persons of all income levels.
- 43 c. Insure a choice of housing types and locations to all persons regardless of
- 44 sex, cultural origin, age, marital status, or physical handicaps.
- 45 d. Maintain architectural diversity for 10% of the units within residential
- 46 developments and disperse them throughout the development.

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

- 3. The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the Sonoma Glen 3 Planned Unit District (PUD) Development Standards in that single-family residences are a permitted use; the project conforms to the height, lot coverage and setbacks requirements; and the project provides the required off-street parking.

- 4. The project, as conditioned, will not constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the public welfare of the community in that it will be operated in conformance with Performance Standards specified in that Uniform Building Code and the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance **(Except as Modified by Condition # 2)**.

- 5. The proposed project, as conditioned, conforms to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 26-406, Site Plan and Architectural Standards for Review, in that
 - a. The appropriate use of quality materials and harmony and proportion of overall design is reflected in the design of the single-family dwelling;
 - b. The architectural style is appropriate for the project and is compatible with the overall character of the neighborhood;
 - c. The siting of the structure on the property is appropriate, as compared to the siting of other structures in the neighborhood;
 - d. The bulk, height, and color of the proposed structure are compatible with the bulk, height, and color of other structures in the immediate neighborhood;
 - e. Ingress, egress and off-street parking conform to City standards.

- 6. The proposed project, as conditioned, conforms to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 19A-300, PUD Findings, in that
 - a. The plan for the proposed project presents a unified and organized arrangement of buildings which are appropriate in relation to adjacent or nearby properties.
 - b. That the development of the subject property, in the manner proposed by the applicant, will not be detrimental to the public welfare, will be in the best interests of the City, and will be in keeping with the general intent and spirit of the zoning regulations of the City of Petaluma, with the Petaluma General Plan, and with any applicable plans adopted by the City.
 - c. The proposed project will not result in the alteration of road alignment or an increase in unit yield.

1 **III REPORTS:**

2
3 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

4 **Liaison Reports:** None

5
6 **IV. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

7
8 Committee Member Lynch: Keller Street Parking garage has been approved for
9 improvements. The Redevelopment director said it would come to SPARC and it has
10 never happened.

11
12 Irene Borba: Building permit has been signed and it will not be coming to SPARC.

13
14 Chair Rittenhouse initiated a discussion regarding potential Brown act violation. To be in
15 violation there needs to be a quorum or a serial meeting building a consensus.

16
17 Committee Member Lynch: Stated that he has had plans pinned up in his office and/or
18 had discussions in his office, however, not for SPARC projects. Has had discussions
19 with other design professionals regarding large projects that are proposed for
20 development and he feels this meets the intent of the Brown act by asking for public
21 comment rather than excluding public comment.

22
23 Chair Rittenhouse: Clarified that the allegation came from a member of the public and
24 not from another SPARC member.

25
26 Committee Member Mathies: Thought the committee could use a refresher course
27 regarding the Brown act.

28
29 Committee Member Gracyk: Issues have come up re: Historic district guidelines. Think
30 it is important to get back to intent and have clearer guidelines. Possibly organize to go
31 through the process and review guidelines.

32
33 Committee Member Mathies: Would need input from Historic members.

34
35 Irene Borba: Could agendize and have discussion and then go from there.

36
37 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested Committee Member Gracyk come up with specific issues.

38
39 **Adjournment:** 4:10 p.m.